



City of Dublin

**Land Use and Long
Range 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

JULY 18, 2013

AGENDA

NEW CASES

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Links at Ballantrae 13-057FDP/FP (Approved 7 – 0 Final Development Plan) (Recommendation of Approval 7 – 0 Final Plat)</p> | <p>Rings Road Final Development Plan/Final Plat</p> |
| <p>2. Parkcenter Circle PUD 13-056Z/PDP (Approved 6 – 1)</p> | <p>5515 Parkcenter Circle Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan</p> |
| <p>3. Goldfish Swim School 13-062CU (Approved 7 – 0)</p> | <p>6175 Shamrock Court Conditional Use</p> |

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Warren Fishman, John Hardt, Victoria Newell, and Joe Budde. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Jennifer Readler, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Rauch, Alan Perkins, Jonathan Lee, Aaron Stanford, Justin Goodwin, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

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

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any comments or corrections regarding the June 6, 2013 meeting minutes.

Mr. Fishman referred to his comment on Page 5, explained that he did not say the 'brick also looked bad'. He asked for that portion is removed from the minutes.

Ms. Kramb referred to the last sentence of the third paragraph on Page 5 and noticed a verb was missing. She said the sentence should read " she said was okay....".

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the June 6, 2013 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any comments or corrections regarding the June 20, 2013 meeting minutes. [There were none.] Mr. Taylor moved to accept the June 20, 2013 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Hardt seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted all the cases on the agenda tonight were eligible for consent. She indicated she had heard from Ms. Kramb and Mr. Hardt and they would like to remove the Parkcenter Circle case from the Consent Agenda. Ms. Amorose Groomes determined that the order of the cases would be heard 1, 3 and 2.

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

**1. Links at Ballantrae
13-057FDP/FP**

**Rings Road
Final Development Plan/Final Plat**

Chair Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application as a request for the development of a subdivision plat for 45 single family lots and approximately 7 acres of open space located on the north side of Rings Road, 1,000 feet west of Eiterman Road. She said the Commission has the final authority on final development plan applications and would make a recommendation to City Council regarding the final plat, requiring two motions. Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in the applicant and staff.

Ms. Amorose Groomes indicated to Ms. Husak a full presentation was not necessary.

Mr. Taylor said he was not present for the preliminary development plan, but he noticed the fence was indicated at 4 feet 8 inches tall where 4-foot is permitted.

Ms. Husak indicated she had noticed that also and the fence would be required to meet the 4-foot requirement at the building permit stage.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the Commission could condition the issue. Ms. Husak indicated they could.

Ms. Kramb said the Commission received a letter from an adjacent resident and asked if Engineering would clarify why there is not landscaping shown in the right-of-way on the eastern corner of the Patch property on Rings Road.

Mr. Stanford clarified her question was regarding the area at the northwest corner of the new intersection at Churchman Road and Rings Road. Ms. Kramb confirmed this.

Mr. Stanford said Engineering reviews proposed intersection modifications to ensure site distance requirements are met. He said this is a safety concern to ensure these areas are clear of obstructions.

Ms. Kramb asked Mr. Stanford to confirm the proposed plans include plant material located as close to the limits of the site triangle to ensure we have planted as much as we could to address the applicant's concerns. Mr. Stanford said there is limited flexibility as it gets closer to Rings Road and he would caution too much further to the south.

Ms. Kramb stated she wanted to clarify that it is planted as far south as possible without causing engineering problems. Mr. Stanford replied there may be an opportunity to go a little further to the south but we would probably need to move further to the west to provide better screening from the headlights towards the house.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked that a condition be added for staff to continue to work with the applicant regarding additional plantings.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone from the general public who would like to speak with respect to this application. She asked them to come forward to the stand and state their name and address for the record.

Mr. Ray Alsko (6807 Ballantrae Place, Dublin) indicated he lives behind Lot 24 at the intersection of Marmion Drive. He expressed concerns about the timing of the proposed project and maintenance of the vacant field. Ms. Amorose Groomes said they would be subject to the city's grass and weed requirements and they would refer this issue to Code Enforcement, but he continued to have problems to use the website to notify Code Enforcement.

Ms. Husak commented along the northern and western property lines a 25-foot tree preservation zone is required, which is an area designated with little maintenance to preserve the existing trees.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she wanted to discuss the portion of the applicant letter regarding the Amlin sign, and the sign is not the city's responsibility. Ms. Betty Patch (6800 Rings Road, Amlin) indicated the Amlin sign is located in Dublin. She said the letter was talking about the area around the sign and how it needs to be maintained. Ms. Amorose Groomes said they will have Code Enforcement look into the maintenance of this area within the right-of-way.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for any other discussion or comments. [There were none.] She asked if the applicant was present and agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Ben Hale, Jr. (Smith and & Hale, Columbus) representing the applicant, agreed to the conditions.

Motion #1 and Vote

Ms. Kramb moved to approve the Final Development Plan application with two conditions:

1. That the applicant revise the fence detail to a height of 4 feet, prior to submitting the final plat to City Council; and,
2. That the applicant continue to work with staff and the property owner on appropriately located landscape screening for 6800 Rings Road in terms of right-of-way location and visibility triangle requirements.

Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion #2 and Vote

Mr. Fishman moved to make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Final Plat application with one condition:

1. That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat, including the addition of the road name for Churchman Road, are made prior to City Council submittal.

Ms. Newell seconded the motion. Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

**2. Parkcenter Circle PUD
13-056Z/PDP**

**5515 Parkcenter Circle
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**

Chair Amorose Groomes introduced this application as a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a rezoning with preliminary development plan regarding parking and sign requirements for an existing office building located on the north side of Parkcenter Circle, west of the intersection with Paul Blazer Parkway.

Ms. Rauch stated the property located at 5515 Parkcenter Circle is framed by four roadways; three public: Rings Road to the north, Paul Blazer to the east and Parkcenter Circle to the south; and one private: Atrium Parkway to the west. She said the site is outlined in yellow and shows the unusual property lines, which limits the parking configurations and includes area in the southwestern portion with development that is not on their property. She said there are access and easement agreements that were established with the original development, which also limit parking locations. She said the site contains 116,000 square feet of building space with parking located to the south and west with the majority of it located to the north of the building. She indicated the areas in the northern portions of the site that includes the floodplain, a large open space area with significant landscaping, and the off-site storm water pond that serves this site and the surrounding properties.

Ms. Rauch stated there are two major parts to this proposal: signs and parking lot with landscaping modifications. She said with regard to the signs the existing development text permits two monument signs with a total of 52 square feet, divided equally between the two signs, 10 feet in height, four colors and increased secondary image. She said the applicant is requesting a series of different signs. She said the applicant is proposing three monument signs, one at the main entrance off Blazer Parkway and two along Parkcenter Circle, one of which Planning recommends be removed. She said the applicant also indicated canopy signs, which would be address only signs with an increased letter height of 24 inches, where 18 inches would be permitted. She indicated the proposal includes a tenant wall sign along the western elevations, which Planning recommends removal. She said the final sign component is the proposed: one external directional sign located along Parkcenter Circle, which meets Code and three internal directional signs located at the building entrances, which could include tenant names and addresses.

Ms. Rauch said the second part of the application, which includes more significant changes to the proposed parking provisions. She indicated Code requires parking for office at a ratio of 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet, with the site providing 571 spaces, at a ratio of almost 5 per 1,000. She said the applicant is requesting to provide parking at a ratio of almost 6 per 1,000. She said as outlined in the report, the request is related to changes in the development world where larger office buildings can lease less space and employ more people creating a need for additional parking. She indicated the applicant is proposing three modifications to create additional parking spaces. She said the northern parking area is proposed with a decrease in the width of the parking spaces from nine feet to 8.5 feet. She stated this method has been approved by the Commission for other buildings within the City. She said they are also proposing to remove interior landscape islands and based on the information provided the site will continue to meet the interior landscape requirements. She said Code does not identify where or how many spaces are required per landscape islands.

Ms. Rauch the most significant change is the removal open space area in the northern parking area, which proposes the removal of existing landscaping and a significant number of landmark trees. She said the applicant has provided a detailed tree that identifies seven trees in that area, five of which are in poor condition and are recommended for removal. She said when staff reviewed this proposal there was very significant discussion about tree preservation and economic viability of a site. She stated that staff posed two discussion questions: does this proposal present sufficient examples of site modifications that should be permitted to make a site more viable even though they may run counter to the current intent of the Code and the character defined by the City; or

should the City continue with its current practices and Code and accept that this may result in a less competitive economic development environment. She said based on these questions Planning did not review this proposal lightly or come to a recommendation quickly. She said staff worked with the applicant to determine if other alternatives would be feasible, but the site has a number of limitations, leaving the proposal as the most practical options.

Ms. Rauch said Planning has identified several alternatives regarding the tree removal and replacement for the site and follows: 1) require the total inch replacement for the site regardless of tree condition. Meaning they would be required to replace 280 inches, 2) require the total inch replacement for the large trees within the open space regardless of condition only. Meaning they would be required to replace 213 inches, and 3) approve the removal of the open space and trees within this area as an alternative. Should the applicant determine this not be necessary once a tenant is secured they would not be required to construct the additional parking within this area. She said Planning recommends alternatives 2 and 3, which are incorporated in the proposed conditions. She said Planning also modified the second condition, the very last word regarding the documentation portion to be *owner*, instead of *tenant*.

Ms. Rauch said Planning recommends approval of this Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan with six conditions:

- 1) The development text and plans be modified to require the total inch replacement for the trees (84-97) within the open space regardless of condition, which would require the replacement of 213 inches.
- 2) The removal of the open space and trees and replacement with parking only be accomplished should the applicant determine this is necessary once a tenant(s) is secured and written documentation of need is provided from the *owner*.
- 3) The trees planted on site be staggered along the perimeter of the parking areas, to the extent possible to fill in the sparse areas.
- 4) One of the two proposed signs located along the Parkcenter Circle frontage be eliminated.
- 5) The overall height of the canopy sign be limited to 15 feet.
- 6) The applicant eliminate the provisions for a tenant sign on the building elevation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the applicant was present.

Mr. Ben Hale (37 West Broad Street, Columbus, OH) stated they agree with the conditions. He said over the last few years this property has been shown to a number of potential tenants, but nothing has been secured because the building did not have enough parking. He said these tenants would not consider the building if the site did not have the parking ratios. He said the applicant is in agreement they will not construct the additional parking unless it is determine to be needed. He said in order to attract a tenant they need the approval in place so we are able to offer them the additional parking. He stated they agree with the tree replacement as outlined by staff, but no changes will be made on this property until we have proven to the staff it is necessary for the tenant. He said the proposal meets the interior landscape requirements and lot coverage. He said the applicant has agreed to make the changes to the sign proposal as Planning recommends. Mr. Hale stated they desire better identification and the opportunity to permit multiple tenant options should the building be occupied with multiple tenants. He said they will return with a final development plan for signs, landscape and tree replacement details.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if anyone in attendance would like to speak with respect to this application. [There was none.]

Ms. Kramb said she agreed with Planning to permit only two monument signs with the external directional sign with the address only, and agreed with removing the tenant sign. She confirmed the reduced parking space width had been approved before by the Commission and agreed with that modification. Ms. Kramb said agreed with the removal of the landscape islands, as long as the site

continued to comply with Code. She raised concerns about removing the northern open space area with the landmark trees. She stated she thought there should be complete tree replacement regardless of condition. She said the open space area was originally an amenity, or a park and purposely located there and she could not imagine cutting down all of those trees.

Mr. Hardt said this application general struck him, because the planning report included information from economic development stating different parking ratios are needed for office buildings today, which seems plausible. He said what is alarming is that two years ago the Commission reviewed a Code amendment to the parking provision that recommended the opposite. He said he thought it was an example of how careful we need to be when we proposing changes to the Code, because we were asked to do something a few years ago that was contrary to what the market is telling us. He said we disapproved the proposed modification for a variety of other reasons, but would have been interesting if they had been approved. Mr. Hardt stated that as far as this application is concerned, he wanted to confirm the interior landscape requirements and the overall lot coverage requirements per code would be met.

Ms. Rauch confirmed his inquiry stating that the final interior landscape requirements would have to confirm at the final development plan stage, but based on the preliminary information the proposal would meet those requirements and the lot coverage requirements.

Mr. Hardt asked for examples of other sites where the width of parking stalls have been reduced. Ms. Rauch stated Metro Place was one example. Ms. Husak listed IGS and stated a portion of their lot is identified for compact spaces.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed with Planning on the use of only two monument signs, the removal of the tenant sign and the use of the canopy signs. He asked to review the final design of the canopy signs, because they can be done really elegantly or really badly. He said that he did not have a problem with the text saying the canopy signs are permitted as long as the signs are return for review. He requested a condition be drafted requiring the applicant to show the canopy sign details as part of the final development plan.

Mr. Hardt said we have had a number of instances where various different companies have asked for relief to respond to current market conditions and I am supportive of that. He said we want to create an environment where we encourage businesses to locate and grow, but the piecemeal process to address the individual needs is not effective. He said we need to address these issues for parking and signs more holistically. He said we have a Code that is archaic and out of date and we should modify the entire Code once and for all.

Mr. Hardt said as long as the proposal meets our landscape and parking lot requirements, and with the caveat that the open space area will not be removed until necessary, he was supportive of the application.

Ms. Newell said she was in favor of the two monument signs. She said she did not expect the land to always stay exactly the way it is, but she was conflicted about removing the open space area. She said the only way she could support the proposal was because we were requiring the applicant to prove they absolutely need the parking before they remove the open space. She said she would the applicant to relocate the amenities from open space area and reincorporate them elsewhere on the site.

Ms. Rauch suggested a condition of approval to work with the applicant to incorporate the amenities elsewhere on the site. Ms. Newell agreed.

Mr. Budde stated there were a number of excellent comments and he finds that staff has done a good job of working with the applicant. He said he was supportive of the project and as it is a needed change given the difficulty in leasing the building. He said given the continued compliance with the Code he was supportive.

Mr. Fishman agrees with what everyone said, but he wished they could find another way or place to park the cars, such as a joint agreement with adjoining building. He recalled being on the Commission when the site was originally developed and several members were passionate about the trees and he would hate for them to be removed. He said he did not want to sacrifice the beauty of Dublin. He said he wanted to emphasize changing the Code decrease the size of the building and increase the amount of land for building sites.

Mr. Taylor said he agreed with Mr. Hardt. He said it might be ok to remove the open space area in the overall scheme of things, if other things can happen. He said he agreed with Mr. Hardt about updating the Code. He asked the applicant to describe the character of the tenants who want this extra space.

Mr. Chris Potts with Colliers International (6891 Old Court, Westerville) said this buildings been a project for Colliers for three years with Nationwide Insurance as the most recent tenant. He said in today's environment tenants want to drive more efficiency and productivity with their office space, which results in more employees needing more parking. He said they have been approached by adjacent building owners requesting shared parking agreements and we turned it down and we turned the income for the ownership, because we did not want to give up our parking. He said the same thing would happen if we approach Atrium II, because they have vacant space that needs to be filled. He said we are competing against each other with the same goal of leasing property and large vacancies in other markets. Mr. Potts said it is common practice for tenants viewing the market to say we have a parking requirement and your building is not even going to make the list because it does not meet our standards. He said the office space per person is decreasing and driving this need from tenants.

Mr. Taylor said he did appreciate the two questions proposed on Page 8 as that is the core of the discussion. He thanked staff for identifying these.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed the proposal met the lot coverage requirements. Ms. Rauch said the proposal indicated 65 percent, where 75 percent is permitted. She said this would be verified in detail at the final development plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated a previous Commission worked hard to save the landmark trees and it is very difficult to think about removing them. She said the only redeeming quality to removing the trees is the type of trees that they are removing. She stated silver maples barely made her list of landmark trees because of their nature as trees with short life space and surface root systems. She said it is likely they did well here because they sit low on the site adjacent to the pond. She stated the only reason she was supportive of the tree removal was because they are silver maples, and if they were oak trees, or another type of maple tree it would be far more difficult.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said we need a better long term solution and she believed structured parking was an answer. She said she was not inclined to save the parking lot islands because they are not inhabitable for trees unless we do some significant work to them. She said it is unfortunate, but the trees are not the best trees we could have for this site.

Mr. Hardt said he would cast a positive vote for this proposal on the basis that the Code requirements for landscaping and lot coverage were met.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see an enhanced outdoor environment for the employees with the final development plan with additional site amenities.

Mr. Fishman asked if the applicant was replacing the higher number of inches. Ms. Rauch said Planning recommended the replacement of 213 inches, which was not a complete replacement, it was replacement of those inches in the open space. She said the complete tree replacement is 280 inches of trees.

Mr. Fishman said the applicant should replace the 280 inches. Ms. Rauch said the 280 inches was for all the inches on the entire site that are removed, regardless of their condition.

Ms. Rauch said the higher replacement number was an alternative provided by Planning, which the Commission could require.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated there is a lot of area on the site for tree replacement. Ms. Rauch agreed and identified that was the reason why Planning provided the Commission with an alternative.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said because of the number of landmark trees proposed to be removed she felt the increased replacement was justified.

Mr. Fishman said we do not want the fee paid in lieu, but the trees planted on the site. Ms. Rauch agreed, but stated there will come a point where a maximum number of trees can be provided on site with best management practices.

Ms. Rauch clarified the conditions have been modified to reflect the Commissioners' discussion. Mr. Hale agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to approve this Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan application with 8 conditions:

1. The development text and plans be modified to require the total inch replacement for the trees for the site regardless of condition, which would require the replacement of 280 inches as shown on the preliminary development plan and any additional inches identified for removal on the final development plan or during construction.
2. The removal of the open space and trees and replacement with parking only be accomplished should the applicant determine this is necessary once a tenant(s) is secured and written documentation of need is provided from the owner.
3. The trees planted on site be staggered along the perimeter of the parking areas, to the extent possible to fill in the sparse areas.
4. One of the two proposed signs located along the Parkcenter Circle frontage be eliminated.
5. The overall height of the canopy sign be limited to 15 feet.
6. A final sign plan be presented as part of the final development plan.
7. The applicant eliminate the provisions for a tenant sign on the building elevation.
8. The applicant work to relocate the amenities from the open space area elsewhere on the site, should the area be removed.

Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, no; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 1.)

3. Goldfish Swim School 13-062CU

6175 Shamrock Court Conditional Use

Chair Amorose Groomes introduced this application for the conversion of an existing 8,450-square-foot industrial tenant space to an indoor recreation facility with a swimming pool. She said the site is located on the west side of Shamrock Court, approximately 750 feet south of the intersection with Shier-Rings Road.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated a presentation was not necessary. She asked if anyone from the general public present this evening who would like to speak with respect to this case. [There was none.]

Mr. Robert Wineman (28400 Northwestern Highway, Southfield, MI) introduced himself as the applicant.

Ms. Amorose Groomes indicated there are no conditions proposed by Planning.

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the Conditional Use with no conditions. Mr. Hardt seconded the motion. Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Communications

Mr. Langworthy highlighted a memo that will be provided to the Commission and City Council regarding two of the long range planning projects. He said the projects include the Shier Rings Corridor study, which is a roadway character study and the Metro/Blazer area plan study. He said Planning is also in the process on reviewing Zoning Code revisions, which was discussed tonight by the Commission. He said these revisions for seek to incorporate the duplications between the Innovation and Bridge Street District, and resolve any conflicts created as a result.

Ms. Readler said briefs were being field regarding the Homewood case, which was in the Court of Appeals. She said a decision will be forthcoming dependent on the court schedule.

Commission Roundtable

John Hardt stated that he would like to make a quick observation. He said that at the previous Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, a considerable amount of time was spent discussing the design of John Shields Parkway, which subsequently went to City Council for determination. He said that to say he was disappointed in the outcome would be an understatement. He said that, after thinking about the discussion, it occurred to him that there was some disconnect in the way some of these decisions are handled. He pointed out that, anywhere else in the city, if an applicant proposes a street that is ultimately intended to be dedicated to the City, there is an expectation that the street will meet the City's engineering and right-of-way standards, and that's all there is to it, because he assumed there is an engineering manual with details explaining how that street has to be built, with pavement sections, sidewalks, curbs and so on. He said that when those streets are reviewed by the Commission, all they see is the right-of-way with the understanding that there will be a compliant street. He wondered why the Bridge Street District would be any different, and why there isn't just a standard street section for streets in the Bridge Street District, so that builders are required to build the streets per the City's standards. He said he found himself wondering after the meeting why we were debating the design of the street when the Commission had never been faced with that type of debate before.

Claudia Husak noted that the preliminary plat for John Shields Parkway was submitted with the street section meeting the engineering requirements, and the Commission was not satisfied with the design as proposed.

Mr. Hardt stated that the Commission had not had the opportunity to see the engineering standards. He said that unlike other streets in Dublin, where there is a general understanding of what the streets will look like, the Bridge Street street sections may be completely different.

Steve Langworthy said to keep in mind that the plat typically involves only what is located within the public right-of-way, which includes the street, sidewalk, planting areas, and that is generally all there is, for either residential or commercial streets. He said that the differences occur beyond the right-of-way. He said that beyond the right-of-way, development is proposed in accordance with applicable zoning regulations. He agreed that in Bridge Street, where buildings may have a zero-setback with things in the right-of-way that might not normally be in the right-of-way elsewhere in the city. He asked the

Commissioners to recall the street sections prepared by the City's transportation consulting firm, Nelson\Nygaard, and explained that versions of those street sections will eventually become the City's standard street sections for the Bridge Street District. He said that as those street standards are developed, they will be added to the "portfolio" of engineering standards for other streets, for a more standardized process going forward.

Justin Goodwin said that Planning and Engineering are working closely to develop the full palette of standard street types based on the Nelson\Nygaard sections. He said that there would be multiple sections since there are different streets with different characters, but from this point forward, the City will be able to give developers sections and expectations for various parts of the Bridge Street District. He noted that this was still a work in progress, but Planning and Engineering are working on these sections to avoid that issue in the future.

Chris Amorose Grooms stated that all of this illustrates the point that Mr. Taylor has been making since the beginning, that because there is no master plan we may be making poor choices on how each street is designed. She said that it's only now that we have buildings approved that we're going to start thinking about what we want the streets to look like, which she thought was very backwards. She said that we should have decided what the streets were going to look like before we started shopping around to have people put buildings on these streets.

Mr. Goodwin said he understood Ms. Amorose Grooms' concern, which is a major consideration for the planning for the Scioto River Corridor. He said that the City does not know exactly what the building types will be in those areas, but the City is working on what the actual street standards will be, almost on a daily basis.

Mr. Hardt said, to Mr. Langworthy's point, that in the Bridge Street Corridor, the street, sidewalk and the interface of the buildings with the sidewalk are of greater importance than in other parts of the city, at least in some ways. He asked if the Commission would have an opportunity to review the street sections.

Mr. Langworthy stated that he was not familiar with the process used to document the original street standards, and whether that was part of the adoption of the original subdivision regulations or simply an engineering standard. He noted too that the subdivision regulations were in need of an update and was planned once the Zoning Code is updated, and that might be the point at which the street sections are codified.

Mr. Hardt asked about the timeframe for updates to the Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Langworthy stated that Planning was working on language currently and estimated that the Planning and Zoning Commission could begin reviewing Zoning Code updates after the first of the year, and during that review period Planning and Engineering could begin working on the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Newell said she agreed with Mr. Langworthy. She said that she had made a similar comment during the early reviews of the Bridge Street District vision that she did not think the Bridge Street District would achieve our desired results unless there was at least a tapestry of streets. She said she thinks there needs to be a little bit more definition in terms of what we expect development to be.

Richard Taylor presented photos from a recent trip he had taken to Manhattan of a bike stand for rental bikes, which is similar to bike rental facilities in Denmark; street scenes in Little Italy; and pictures of Bryant Park, which is a great example of an urban oasis. He also spoke to the liveliness of the street in Little Italy and how the buildings changed from building to building.

Mr. Langworthy noted the presence of a terminal vista. He further noted that interesting spaces like these tend to grow in an organic fashion, rather than being planned in advance.

Mr. Taylor presented a picture showing where the new Wendy's is supposed to be built and he said he had sent Ms. Husak an email today with two questions: 1) He asked when the new building was intended to be complete, because he thought they had originally stated it would be done by April, and 2) he asked about the height of the weeds.

Ms. Husak responded that Wendy's has an approved building permit, but she did not know what the construction delay was.

Mr. Langworthy said that Wendy's has been making periodic changes to the interior of the store. He explained that this is intended to be their "model" store, and he thought they were still making some minor changes to the floor plans. He said they were not planning to change the building footprint.

Mr. Taylor said he had hoped that was the reason, and not that the lot would be put up for sale. He pointed out that when an applicant comes in and they are in a big rush to get something rezoned, that rush should be taken with a grain of salt, because obviously there was no hurry.

Mr. Langworthy noted that there were a lot of moving pieces involved with that site because of the purchase of their current property by the City, and that needed to be finalized before they could move ahead.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that nothing has happened on the corner, either. Mr. Taylor said it all just seemed like a rushed process to get the development done. Mr. Langworthy stated part of it was working towards the closing.

Warren Fishman said that he wanted to mention his disappointment with the bike facilities discussion for John Shields Parkway in the Dublin Village Center. He said that he didn't want to sound defensive, but he was surprised that the Commission did not receive greater staff support when the preliminary plat was presented to City Council, and it was approved in an arrangement that was completely different than what the Commission had approved. He said that in the future, there needs to be a better understanding between staff and the Commission. He said that this will be very disappointing to a lot of bicyclists. He said that he attends many bicyclist meetings, he is on the Bicycle Advisory Task Force, and he is a bicycle ambassador. He said that these streets were imagined to be highly bikable and walkable, and that was the first major development in the Bridge Street District with a lot of significance. He reiterated his disappointment.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she concurred with Mr. Fishman's disappointment. She said that part of her disappointment was that a lot of time and energy was spent on that discussion. She noted that the Commissioners volunteer their time and energy to serving on this board, and when the Commission is asked for an opinion, it should be given its due consideration. She said that it was the Commission's perception that their opinion on the project was not appropriately presented to City Council because Staff did not agree with the recommendation. She said that was probably one of her greatest frustrations, when the Commission is asked to make a decision or a recommendation about a project, and Staff does not agree, there is a perception that the comments are dismissed or at least discounted because Staff views the situation differently. She said that it is difficult to sit on the Commission and take a position and then have Staff go to City Council and represent the Commission with less than 100% enthusiasm because most of that enthusiasm is used to represent Staff's perspective.

Mr. Langworthy stated that Staff attempted to take a balanced approach in their presentation to City Council. He said he would go back and watch the presentation to be sure, but he said they tried to make sure that all views were at least presented. He said he thought that the Council discussion reflected different viewpoints as well. He pointed out that in listening to the discussion there were several different views presented, and noted that in the end Council had a split vote. He thought this was evidence that

City Council had a thorough discussion on each of the potential options, including the Commission's, so he didn't believe that Council dismissed the Commission's views.

Mr. Fishman stated that his perception was that City Council member John Reiner reflected the Commission's views, but even he felt and that the other Council members believed that since Staff didn't support the Commission's position, they should dismiss the Commission's recommendation. He stated that he was just so disappointed because the Commission worked so hard with the applicant, and he was not sure that the applicant cared that much because they just wanted to get it passed, and he thought it would have passed just as easily with the Commission's recommended street section. He said that in the future, there needs to be more effort to align the recommendations.

Mr. Langworthy reiterated that City Council received all of the street section alternatives.

Mr. Fishman noted that staff is paid for their professional opinions and expertise, and he believed that several Council members voted based on that understanding. He said that this was just his perception, and it was not his intent to put Staff on the defensive, but he thought we should learn from this experience.

Mr. Langworthy said he just wanted to make clear to the Commission that Planning does try to accurately represent the Commission's views, even if Planning disagrees with them, but there is a professional responsibility to to present alternatives. He said that was part of our responsibility to City Council – to make sure that our professional opinion is expressed. He said that he was pleased that 95% of the time Staff and the Commission are in agreement. He said that there are fairly rare instances where Planning does not agree, but an effort is still made to present the Commission's view. He said Planning tries to take a balanced approach to make sure the Commission's views are properly represented, and pointed out that the meeting minutes are available to City Council as well. He said that if the Commission feels that they are not being fairly represented, Planning could work harder on that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she understood that it is difficult to enthusiastically represent something that Staff does not agree with, but she thought that this was an important one, and she wished the Commission could have had a bigger voice in the matter.

Mr. Langworthy said that Planning understood that there was a bigger discussion to be had by City Council, with differing recommendations, so in the end, once Planning presented all the options, we more or less stepped back and let the Council discuss their views. He said once Council worked through their individual comments and discussion points as they went.

Joe Budde said after the last Commission meeting, he reflected on the discussion, and he thought that the hole in the presentation and the discussion was that, if we could understand the bigger plan better, it would have helped the discussion. He said, for example, the questions of whether we need a bike lane on John Shields Parkway in that section, and what the path that someone that lives in these 324 apartments would be. He said that when he visited Easton recently and was just driving through the center, he thought, nobody is going to ride a bike down this road anyway. He thought that the Commission spent an awfully long time talking about something that, if they had had a better understanding of the overall bikeway plan, that this might not have been the issue that it was. He said he was hopeful that there will be plenty of other bicycle routes when this is all built and full of bicyclists.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed with the other Commissioners' comments, but what bothered him the most is that we don't have a plan for the Bridge Street District in the sense that we don't have a map that says what should go where. He said that we do have a *vision*, it's in a document that was discussed at length, and debated and adopted. He said that when he went back and searched how many times the word "bicycle" appeared in the Vision Plan. He said that what bothered him the most is that throughout the whole process there wasn't anyone who stuck up for the plan, and the City's goals and intentions. He

noted that the Commission had gone to Chicago to see the benefits of a 100-year-old plan that the City adhered to, to this day. He said that the City had goals and objectives and vision statements, and since this particular developer didn't want to address the goals, we were just ok with it.

Ms. Newell pointed out that the applicant commented that they had a much different idea of where bicyclists would be riding, and she noted that the Commission had never received any presentation about the proposed bicycle network or other options for bicycle facilities. She said that, as a designer, it's easy to design something when you have limitations and constraints on your site, because they start to dictate the overall project design. She said that a blank sheet of paper with no definition is the hardest thing to design to, and she believed that the applicant envisioned Easton for this area. She said she didn't think that is what the Commission had envisioned, and she didn't truthfully know what City Council's vision for this area is, but that is why she has said before that there has to be something in place to give some direction and definition for what we want to see.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she understood Ms. Newell's point, which has been the Commission's point since day one. She said they were tasked with writing and reviewing a Code, but it's difficult to write a Code if there is no plan for what we are writing a Code to implement.

Amy Kramb said City Council's determination demonstrated what they think the vision for the Bridge Street District should be. She said she thought that they believed it would be Easton, which is disappointing.

Mr. Taylor said Ms. Kramb's comment about Easton was interesting, and asked if that was truly the intent for this area. He recalled earlier conversations with Council members and with David Dixon and Ben Carlson from Goody Clancy, and even Terry Foegler about Easton, and that project not being a good model for what we would like to see here. He said that Easton is nice, but we want to go above and beyond here; and yet, the Bridge Street District is being developed piece by piece exactly like that. He said that what nailed down his understanding about this is his recent email conversation with a City Council member, who quoted Easton as a model for an example for this street. He said that Council member also used Gay Street between 5th and 4th Streets as an example. He said he pointed out that Gay Street is a residential street with a couple of office buildings, a parking lot by the Cathedral, and \$500,000 condos, which is not really a biking demographic. He said that this is a 324-unit apartment building full of hopefully 20-something kids with bicycles, so it's hard to compare that to Gay Street or Easton. He said he thought the Commissioners all understood the vision for the Bridge Street District, but he had the impression that there is at least one Council member that does not understand that vision at all after all this time, which may be a large part of the problem.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that she was struggling with working through meeting minutes on the iPad and requested a printed copy in her packet.

Mr. Hardt said he had the same problem, but he used Adobe Acrobat to search the PDF for his name, and reviewed those comments and took note of any edits.

Ms. Newell requested that the planning documents be rotated in the right direction since they are difficult to read otherwise.

Ms. Husak agreed to look at the document orientation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 22, 2013.