



**To:** Members of Dublin City Council

**From:** Marsha I. Grigsby, City Manager 

**Date:** October 31, 2013

**Initiated By:** Steve Langworthy, Director of Land Use and Long Range Planning

**Re:** Ordinance 91-13 – Modifications to Sections 153.057 and 153.058 of the City of Dublin Codified Ordinances (Zoning Code) to Amend the Bridge Street District General Purpose and BSC Districts Scope and Intent. (Case 13-095ADM)

## Summary

At its October 10<sup>th</sup> meeting the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of revisions to §153.066, *Review and Approval Procedures and Criteria*, which received Council's first reading on October 28<sup>th</sup>. The revised §153.066 added references to §153.057 and 153.058 that are necessary to effectively implement §153.066. The Commission discussed these further Code Sections and recommended their approval at their October 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. This memo summarizes the proposed revisions.

## Background

During their review of §153.066, Commission members expressed concern that a development proposal could potentially meet all of the proscriptive requirements of the Bridge Street District zoning regulations, but still result in a product that did not meet Dublin's expectations of high quality or further the City's goals of creating vibrant, walkable urban places as envisioned by the Bridge Street District Plan. Commission members recommended adding a detailed list of "principles of walkable urbanism" to the Code. After discussion regarding the most effective means to use this language, Planning worked with the Commission to incorporate the modifications summarized below as a new subsection of §153.057.

## Summary of Modifications

### *Principles of Walkable Urbanism*

The new subsection (D) of §153.057 explains that the principles are intended to serve as a guiding framework to be used in the review of zoning and development proposals subject to the Bridge Street District regulations. The principles are divided into four categories:

- (1) General Principles;
- (2) Streets, Parking and Transit;
- (3) Open Space; and
- (4) Buildings.

In total, the principles include 17 guiding statements that allow the required reviewing body to assess the overall quality of an application and the degree to which it achieves the City's planning goals, in addition to the detailed requirements of the Code.

At Council's first reading of Ordinance 84-13 (§153.066) on October 28<sup>th</sup>, Council was informed about pending revisions to §153.057 regarding the phrase "walkable urbanism." As part of this discussion, Council noted specific interest in the importance of reinforcing Dublin's desire for architectural diversity and ensuring development that is compatible with its surroundings. To accomplish this, the proposed principles of walkable urbanism specifically address the goals of architectural quality, character and variety. Additionally, the revised review criteria for Site Plans in §153.066, as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission, address both of these topics, including the following criterion used to evaluate development proposals:

"The relationship of buildings and structures to each other and to other facilities provides for the coordination and integration of the development within the surrounding area and the larger community and maintains the image of Dublin as a high quality community with a commitment to exemplary planning and design."

The revised review criteria of §153.066 and the principles of walkable urbanism proposed in §153.057 together provide a strong and broad level of review authority that achieves Council's goals for ensuring architectural quality, diversity and compatibility for new developments in the Bridge Street District.

#### *Reference to the Dublin Community Plan*

References to the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report have been changed in §§153.057 and 153.058 to refer to the Bridge Street District Plan, now adopted as part of the Community Plan. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended this change (also proposed in §153.066) to eliminate potential for confusion by an applicant or user of the Code. The updated Community Plan, adopted by Council on July 1, 2013 (Ordinance 54-13) incorporates all relevant text and images from the original Vision Report, adopted by Council on October 25, 2010 (Resolution 50-10).

This change reflects the City's policy of referencing the Community Plan within the Zoning Code as Dublin's primary policy document where such references are appropriate. Similar references to the Community Plan will be added throughout the remainder of the Bridge Street District zoning regulations as the Planning and Zoning Commission continues its review of the Code.

#### **Recommendation**

Planning recommends City Council approval of Ordinance 91-13 at the second reading/public hearing on November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

# RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Ordinance No. 91-13 Passed \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE MODIFYING SECTIONS 153.057 AND 153.058 OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN CODIFIED ORDINANCES (ZONING CODE) TO AMEND THE BRIDGE STREET DISTRICT GENERAL PURPOSE AND BSC DISTRICTS INTENT. (CASE 13-095ADM)**

**WHEREAS**, it is necessary from time to time to amend Dublin's Zoning Code to protect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the City of Dublin; and

**WHEREAS**, Dublin City Council adopted the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report on October 25, 2010 and has since integrated the policy recommendations of the Vision Report into the Dublin Community Plan as the Bridge Street District Plan, adopted on July 1, 2013; and

**WHEREAS**, Dublin City Council adopted the Bridge Street Corridor Districts as part of the City of Dublin Zoning Code, including Sections 153.057-153.066, on March 26, 2012, to implement the five Vision Principles identified in the Vision Report; and

**WHEREAS**, Section 153.066 of the City of Dublin Zoning Code states that the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Architectural Review Board may evaluate and monitor the application of the requirements and standards of Sections 153.057 through 153.066 and recommend to City Council any changes needed in the BSC district standards and requirements to better implement the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and discussed the proposed amendment to Sections 153.057 and 153.058 and recommended its adoption on October 17, 2013 because it serves to improve the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the City of Dublin.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED** by the Council of the City of Dublin, \_\_\_\_\_ of its elected members concurring, that:

Section 1. Sections 153.057 and 153.058 of the City of Dublin Zoning Code are hereby amended and shall provide as follows:

**§ 153.057 General Purpose**

- (A) The primary purpose of the Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) districts is to implement the Vision Principles for development and redevelopment of the Bridge Street District consistent with the directions articulated in the 2010 Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report as incorporated into the Dublin Community Plan (Bridge Street District Plan). This is with the full recognition that the Plan may be revised and acknowledging that the illustrations in the Plan are conceptual and not regulatory. The Community Plan identifies the Bridge Street District as the centerpiece of the city with a focus on historic and cultural acknowledgement, preservation and creation of outstanding open spaces, and the presence of mixed use districts. These features allow for a wider range of choices for housing and employment, create interesting places and walkable districts, and enable buildings of lasting, memorable and high quality architectural character that maintain Dublin's commitment to exemplary planning and design.
  
- (B) The Bridge Street Corridor districts are intended to bring to life the five Bridge Street District Vision Principles by enhancing economic vitality; integrating the new center into community life; embracing Dublin's natural setting and celebrating a commitment to environmental sustainability; expanding the range

# RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Ordinance No. 91-13

Passed Page 2 of 6, 20    

of choices available to Dublin and the region; and creating places that embody Dublin's commitment to community.

(C) Specific Purposes

- (1) More specifically, the purpose of the Bridge Street Corridor districts is to promote development that creates an emerging center for urban lifestyles within a walkable, mixed use urban environment that will enhance central Dublin's image as an exceptional location for high quality business investment.
- (2) These districts are further intended to create places that embody Dublin's commitment to community through the preservation of those areas having architectural landmarks and traditional design, creating complete neighborhoods, and providing designs that honor human scale in their details. In addition, the Bridge Street Corridor will continue to serve as a center of community for current and future Dublin residents.
- (3) The BSC districts also provide a simplified, but thorough, development review process that provides a high degree of predictability and consistency. The process also sustains Dublin's reputation for high quality development while allowing BSC property owners to compete efficiently and effectively in the marketplace.
- (4) Because the Bridge Street District Plan is a transformative redevelopment concept designed for long-term implementation, a secondary purpose of the Bridge Street Corridor districts is to allow property owners the flexibility to take advantage of new and innovative business opportunities that are consistent with the Plan.

(D) Principles of Walkable Urbanism

To advance the purposes of the Bridge Street Corridor districts as described in §153.057 (A) through (C), the following principles of walkable urbanism serve as a guiding framework to be used in the review of zoning and development proposals subject to the provisions of §§153.058 through 153.066. Individual principles may not apply in all circumstances, but should be used where appropriate to ensure the requirements and standards of these zoning districts are applied in a manner that contributes to the creation of walkable, mixed use urban environments as envisioned by the Bridge Street District Plan.

- (1) General Principles  
The designs of buildings, streets, and open spaces within the Bridge Street District should contribute to the creation of an urban neighborhood pattern of development, characterized by:
  - (a) Quality architecture and urban design emphasizing beauty and human comfort and creating a sense of place;
  - (b) Pedestrian-friendly design that places a high priority on walking, bicycling and use of public transit;
  - (c) Creation of interesting and convenient destinations within walking distance for visitors as well as ordinary activities of daily living; and
  - (d) Respect for the natural environment.
- (2) Streets, Parking and Transit

# RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Ordinance No. 91-13

Page 3 of 6  
Passed \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_

Streets should be capable of accommodating multiple modes of transportation and should facilitate the creation of a public realm designed primarily for people, characterized by:

- (a) Streets and blocks arranged to allow for comfortable walking distances, to disperse traffic and to reduce the length of automobile trips;
- (b) A connection to and enhancement of the existing street network;
- (c) A recognition of the role of buildings and landscaping that contributes to the physical definition of streets as civic places;
- (d) On-street public parking wherever possible;
- (e) Shared parking and other strategies to reduce the size of surface parking lots and enable efficient and creative site design; and
- (f) Residential and business uses that have convenient access to existing and future transit stops.

(3) Open Space

The Bridge Street District should have a variety of functional, well-designed open spaces that enhance the quality of life for residents, businesses, and visitors. Open spaces should:

- (a) Include a wide range of characters from small intimate spaces to larger neighborhood and community uses, including small parks and playgrounds to provide gathering spaces for neighborhoods;
- (b) Be arranged and designed as part of a district-wide open space network that defines and connects neighborhoods and the larger Dublin community;
- (c) Be located within convenient walking distance of all residents and businesses.

(4) Buildings

Buildings should have a range of high-quality residential, commercial, mixed-use and civic architectural styles to reinforce the unique identities of each part of the District. Buildings should be characterized by:

- (a) Easily convertible spaces that allow for uses to change over time;
- (b) Residential uses with a variety of housing types, sizes, and price levels;
- (c) A broad mix of shops, offices, and housing integrated within and among a variety of building types; and
- (d) Architecture that reflects Dublin's commitment to high quality and enduring character.

**§ 153.058 Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) Districts Scope and Intent**

(A) Scope

The following Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) districts are hereby created. The districts described by §153.058 are intended to be used for all land within the Bridge Street Corridor. Unless otherwise specifically noted, after the effective date of this amendment all development and redevelopment within the BSC districts shall be consistent with the general purpose of the BSC districts as specified in § 153.057 and subject to the regulations of §§ 153.058 through 153.066. Other provisions of Chapters 152 and 153 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances apply in the BSC districts to the extent those provisions are not inconsistent with the provisions of §§ 153.058 through 153.066. Nothing

# RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Ordinance No. 91-13

Page 4 of 6  
Passed \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_

contained herein shall prohibit an application for rezoning to any non-BSC district provided in this Chapter.

**(B) Intent**

The Bridge Street Corridor zoning districts are generally based on the District Framework of the Bridge Street District Plan. The purpose of the Framework is to allow development regulations to be adapted to the unique conditions present in each area. Although each district is unique, the five Vision Principles are intended to create a cohesive area, based on the concepts of walkability and urban vitality to support the quality of life for residents of all generations. The titles of each district are intended to describe the predominant land use character and/or special geographic locations rather than a single type of use. The following further describes the intent of each BSC district.

**(1) BSC Residential**

The intent of this district is to accommodate single-family, two-family, townhouse, live-work and multiple-family uses in mid-rise development. The BSC Residential district integrates existing and new residential developments to create true neighborhoods and add to the population base needed to help support nearby retail and office development. Uses are generally limited to residential and small-scale residential support uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

**(2) BSC Office Residential**

The intent of this district is to accommodate a mix of office and multiple-family residential development at higher densities and in larger buildings. This district offers great flexibility to take advantage of visibility and access for office uses, with opportunities to create residential neighborhoods to support the adjacent BSC districts. Uses include a mix of residential, personal service, and commercial uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

**(3) BSC Office**

The intent of this district is to allow a mix of offices and retail support uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A. The BSC Office district provides significant additional development capacity and redevelopment opportunities that foster office uses with a walkable design along signature streets, and provides increased accessibility and an improved roadway network to ease traffic pressure along major roadways.

**(4) BSC Commercial**

This district applies generally to existing retail centers and other low-rise commercial uses, including single use freestanding retail buildings, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Properties initially zoned into this district may be eligible for rezoning to the BSC Vertical Mixed Use District or to other surrounding BSC districts when future redevelopment to higher densities is desired.

**(5) BSC Historic Core**

This district applies to the historic center of Dublin and reinforces the character of this area as the centerpiece of the Bridge Street Corridor. The district focuses on ensuring sensitive infill development and redevelopment and providing an improved environment for walking while accommodating vehicles. The district accepts building types that are consistent with the historic development pattern of Historic Dublin, subject to review by the Architectural Review Board, and permit similar uses that support a highly walkable setting, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

# RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Ordinance No. 91-13 Passed Page 5 of 6, 20    

- (6) **BSC Historic Residential**  
The intent of this district is to permit the preservation and development of homes on existing or new lots that are comparable in size, mass, and scale, while maintaining and promoting the traditional residential character of the Historic Dublin area. The purpose of these regulations is to protect the scale and character of the original platted village by maintaining regulations consistent with the previous Historic Residential zoning in place prior to the adoption of this amendment, as listed in Table 153.059-A.
- (7) **BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood**  
This district applies to the majority of the commercial areas at the east end of the Corridor. The standards of the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood create an active, walkable destination through integration of a strong mix of uses. Development within this district relies on the provision of physical and visual connections through improved access and enhanced visibility from Sawmill Road, and links to adjacent neighborhoods and open spaces.
- This district accommodates a wide variety of building types and permitted uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Redevelopment of the BSC Sawmill Center area creates a walkable, mixed use core as the east anchor of the Corridor. The district is subject to the specific neighborhood standards defined in §153.063(C), establishing open space patterns, location requirements for building types, and permitting pedestrian-oriented, mixed use shopping areas.
- (8) **BSC Historic Transition Neighborhood**  
This district complements the BSC Historic Core district by accommodating a variety of building types within a finer grained street and block network and uses consistent with that district. It accommodates uses similar to those in the BSC Historic Core district, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Development allows an extension of the walkable mixed use character of the BSC Historic Core district on the larger parcels within this district. The district is subject to the specific neighborhood standards defined in §153.063(D). These requirements establish open space patterns and location requirements for building types, provide additional residential opportunities, and extend the small scale commercial activities of the BSC Historic Core district.
- (9) **BSC Indian Run Neighborhood**  
This district applies to the larger parcels north and west of the Indian Run and south of I-270, including adjacent properties fronting the north side of Bridge Street. The BSC Indian Run Neighborhood district is intended to develop as a new walkable, mixed use district that takes advantage of excellent highway visibility, an improved road network, and proximity to Historic Dublin and the natural areas flanking the Indian Run. Development within the district relies on a comprehensive road network providing connections within the Indian Run district and to the rest of the Corridor, as well as sensitivity of development at its edges given its proximity to Historic Dublin and the Indian Run.
- This district accommodates a wide variety of building types and permitted uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Redevelopment of the area creates a walkable, mixed use core as the west anchor of the Corridor. The district is subject to specific neighborhood standards defined in §153.063(E). These regulations are intended to establish natural and man-made open space patterns; build pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular

# RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Ordinance No. 91-13

Passed Page 6 of 6, 20    

networks; provide location requirements for building types; and foster a pedestrian-oriented, neighborhood scale mixed use shopping area.

(10) **BSC Vertical Mixed Use**

The intent of this district is to allow a wide variety of mid-rise, mixed use development, including vertical mixed use with ground floor retail, and large format retail with liner buildings, as listed in Table 153.059-A. It is intended to be available for areas initially zoned into the BSC Indian Run Neighborhood and BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood districts, once these areas are developed and the applicable neighborhood standards are no longer needed to establish the organization and hierarchy of places. The district may be applied to areas initially zoned to the BSC Commercial District or elsewhere in the Bridge Street Corridor as may be deemed appropriate when future redevelopment to higher densities is desired. Accordingly, the district is not intended to be mapped at the time the BSC districts are initially adopted.

(11) **BSC Public**

This district applies to a variety of public spaces and facilities, including but not limited to schools, parks, open spaces, and places that accommodate more intensive recreation, such as outdoor entertainment venues, as listed in Table 153.059-A. It also applies to lands in and adjacent to rivers and creeks on which development is limited due to inclusion in a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated floodplain as regulated by this Chapter, or lands that have special cultural or environmental sensitivity.

Section 2. This ordinance shall be effective on the earliest date permitted by law.

Passed this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor - Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of Council

## § 153.057 General Purpose

- (A) The primary purpose of the Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) districts is to implement the Vision Principles for development and redevelopment of the ~~corridor~~Bridge Street District consistent with the directions articulated in the 2010 Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report, as incorporated into the Dublin Community Plan (Bridge Street District Plan). This is with the full recognition that the ~~Report~~Plan may be revised and acknowledging that the illustrations in the ~~Report~~Plan are conceptual and not regulatory. The ~~Vision Report~~Community Plan identifies the Bridge Street ~~Corridor~~District as the centerpiece of the city with a focus on historic and cultural acknowledgement, preservation and creation of outstanding open spaces, and the presence of mixed use districts. These features allow for a wider range of choices for housing and employment, create interesting places and walkable districts, and enable buildings of lasting, memorable ~~architecture~~and high quality architectural character that maintain Dublin's commitment to exemplary planning and design.
- (B) The Bridge Street Corridor districts are intended to bring to life the five Bridge Street District Vision Principles ~~of the Vision Report~~ by enhancing economic vitality; integrating the new center into community life; embracing Dublin's natural setting and celebrating a commitment to environmental sustainability; expanding the range of choices available to Dublin and the region; and creating places that embody Dublin's commitment to community.
- (C) Specific ~~Purpose~~Purposes
- (1) More specifically, the purpose of the Bridge Street Corridor districts is to promote development that creates an emerging center for urban lifestyles within a walkable, mixed use urban environment that will enhance central Dublin's image as an exceptional location for high quality business investment.
  - (2) These districts are further intended to create places that embody Dublin's commitment to community through the preservation of those areas having architectural landmarks and traditional design, creating complete neighborhoods, and providing designs that honor human scale in their details. In addition, the Bridge Street Corridor will continue to serve as a center of community for current and future Dublin residents.
  - (3) The BSC districts also provide a simplified, but thorough, development review process that provides a high degree of predictability and consistency. The process also sustains Dublin's reputation for high quality development while allowing BSC property owners to compete efficiently and effectively in the marketplace.
  - (4) Because the ~~Vision Report~~Bridge Street District Plan is a transformative redevelopment concept designed for long-term implementation, a secondary purpose of the Bridge Street Corridor districts is to allow property owners the flexibility to take advantage of new and innovative business opportunities that are consistent with the ~~Vision Report~~Plan.

## (D) Principles of Walkable Urbanism

To advance the purposes of the Bridge Street Corridor districts as described in §153.057 (A) through (C), the following principles of walkable urbanism serve as a guiding framework to be used in the review of zoning and development proposals subject to the provisions of §§153.058 through 153.066. Individual principles may not apply in all circumstances, but should be used where appropriate to ensure

the requirements and standards of these zoning districts are applied in a manner that contributes to the creation of walkable, mixed use urban environments as envisioned by the Bridge Street District Plan.

(1) General Principles

The designs of buildings, streets, and open spaces within the Bridge Street District should contribute to the creation of an urban neighborhood pattern of development, characterized by:

- (a) Quality architecture and urban design emphasizing beauty and human comfort and creating a sense of place;
- (b) Pedestrian-friendly design that places a high priority on walking, bicycling and use of public transit;
- (c) Creation of interesting and convenient destinations within walking distance for visitors as well as ordinary activities of daily living; and
- (d) Respect for the natural environment.

(2) Streets, Parking and Transit

Streets should be capable of accommodating multiple modes of transportation and should facilitate the creation of a public realm designed primarily for people, characterized by:

- (a) Streets and blocks arranged to allow for comfortable walking distances, to disperse traffic and to reduce the length of automobile trips;
- (b) A connection to and enhancement of the existing street network;
- (c) A recognition of the role of buildings and landscaping that contributes to the physical definition of streets as civic places;
- (d) On-street public parking wherever possible;
- (e) Shared parking and other strategies to reduce the size of surface parking lots and enable efficient and creative site design; and
- (f) Residential and business uses that have convenient access to existing and future transit stops.

(3) Open Space

The Bridge Street District should have a variety of functional, well-designed open spaces that enhance the quality of life for residents, businesses, and visitors. Open spaces should:

- (a) Include a wide range of characters from small intimate spaces to larger neighborhood and community uses, including small parks and playgrounds to provide gathering spaces for neighborhoods;
- (b) Be arranged and designed as part of a district-wide open space network that defines and connects neighborhoods and the larger Dublin community;
- (c) Be located within convenient walking distance of all residents and businesses,.

(4) Buildings

Buildings should have a range of high-quality residential, commercial, mixed-use and civic architectural styles to reinforce the unique identities of each part of the District. Buildings should be characterized by:

- (a) Easily convertible spaces that allow for uses to change over time;

- (b) Residential uses with a variety of housing types, sizes, and price levels;
- (c) A broad mix of shops, offices, and housing integrated within and among a variety of building types; and
- (d) Architecture that reflects Dublin’s commitment to high quality and enduring character.

## § 153.058 Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) Districts Scope and Intent

### (A) Scope

The following Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) districts are hereby created. The districts described by §153.058 are intended to be used for all land within the Bridge Street Corridor. Unless otherwise specifically noted, after the effective date of this amendment all development and redevelopment within the BSC districts shall be consistent with the general purpose of the BSC districts as specified in § 153.057 and subject to the regulations of §§ 153.058 through 153.066. Other provisions of Chapters 152 and 153 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances apply in the BSC districts to the extent those provisions are not inconsistent with the provisions of §§ 153.058 through 153.066. Nothing contained herein shall prohibit an application for rezoning to any non-BSC district provided in this Chapter.

### (B) Intent

The Bridge Street Corridor zoning districts are generally based on the District Framework of the ~~Vision Report~~. Bridge Street District Plan. The purpose of the Framework is to allow development regulations to be adapted to the unique conditions present in each area. Although each district is unique, the five Vision Principles are intended to create a cohesive area, based on the concepts of walkability and urban vitality to support the quality of life for residents of all generations. The titles of each district are intended to describe the predominant land use character and/or special geographic locations rather than a single type of use. The following further describes the intent of each BSC district.

#### (1) BSC Residential

The intent of this district is to accommodate single-family, two-family, townhouse, live-work and multiple-family uses in mid-rise development. The BSC Residential district integrates existing and new residential developments to create true neighborhoods and add to the population base needed to help support nearby retail and office development. Uses are generally limited to residential and small-scale residential support uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

#### (2) BSC Office Residential

The intent of this district is to accommodate a mix of office and multiple-family residential development at higher densities and in larger buildings. This district offers great flexibility to take advantage of visibility and access for office uses, with opportunities to create residential neighborhoods to support the adjacent BSC districts. Uses include a mix of residential, personal service, and commercial uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

#### (3) BSC Office

The intent of this district is to allow a mix of offices and retail support uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A. The BSC Office district provides significant additional development capacity and redevelopment opportunities that foster office uses with a walkable design along signature streets, and provides increased accessibility and an improved roadway network to ease traffic pressure along major roadways.

#### (4) BSC Commercial

This district applies generally to existing retail centers and other low-rise commercial uses, including single use freestanding retail buildings, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Properties initially zoned into this district may be eligible for rezoning to the BSC Vertical Mixed Use District or to other surrounding BSC districts when future redevelopment to higher densities is desired.

(5) BSC Historic Core

This district applies to the historic center of Dublin and reinforces the character of this area as the centerpiece of the Bridge Street Corridor. The district focuses on ensuring sensitive infill development and redevelopment and providing an improved environment for walking while accommodating vehicles. The district accepts building types that are consistent with the historic development pattern of Historic Dublin, subject to review by the Architectural Review Board, and permit similar uses that support a highly walkable setting, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

(6) BSC Historic Residential

The intent of this district is to permit the preservation and development of homes on existing or new lots that are comparable in size, mass, and scale, while maintaining and promoting the traditional residential character of the Historic Dublin area. The purpose of these regulations is to protect the scale and character of the original platted village by maintaining regulations consistent with the previous Historic Residential zoning in place prior to the adoption of this amendment, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

(7) BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood

This district applies to the majority of the commercial areas at the east end of the Corridor. The standards of the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood create an active, walkable destination through integration of a strong mix of uses. Development within this district relies on the provision of physical and visual connections through improved access and enhanced visibility from Sawmill Road, and links to adjacent neighborhoods and open spaces.

This district accommodates a wide variety of building types and permitted uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Redevelopment of the BSC Sawmill Center area creates a walkable, mixed use core as the east anchor of the Corridor. The district is subject to the specific neighborhood standards defined in §153.063(C), establishing open space patterns, location requirements for building types, and permitting pedestrian-oriented, mixed use shopping areas.

(8) BSC Historic Transition Neighborhood

This district complements the BSC Historic Core district by accommodating a variety of building types within a finer grained street and block network and uses consistent with that district. It accommodates uses similar to those in the BSC Historic Core district, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Development allows an extension of the walkable mixed use character of the BSC Historic Core district on the larger parcels within this district. The district is subject to the specific neighborhood standards defined in §153.063(D). These requirements establish open space patterns and location requirements for building types, provide additional residential opportunities, and extend the small scale commercial activities of the BSC Historic Core district.

(9) BSC Indian Run Neighborhood

This district applies to the larger parcels north and west of the Indian Run and south of I-270, including adjacent properties fronting the north side of Bridge Street. The BSC Indian Run Neighborhood district is intended to develop as a new walkable, mixed use district that takes

advantage of excellent highway visibility, an improved road network, and proximity to Historic Dublin and the natural areas flanking the Indian Run. Development within the district relies on a comprehensive road network providing connections within the Indian Run district and to the rest of the Corridor, as well as sensitivity of development at its edges given its proximity to Historic Dublin and the Indian Run.

This district accommodates a wide variety of building types and permitted uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Redevelopment of the area creates a walkable, mixed use core as the west anchor of the Corridor. The district is subject to specific neighborhood standards defined in §153.063(E). These regulations are intended to establish natural and man-made open space patterns; build pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular networks; provide location requirements for building types; and foster a pedestrian-oriented, neighborhood scale mixed use shopping area.

(10) BSC Vertical Mixed Use

The intent of this district is to allow a wide variety of mid-rise, mixed use development, including vertical mixed use with ground floor retail, and large format retail with liner buildings, as listed in Table 153.059-A. It is intended to be available for areas initially zoned into the BSC Indian Run Neighborhood and BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood districts, once these areas are developed and the applicable neighborhood standards are no longer needed to establish the organization and hierarchy of places. The district may be applied to areas initially zoned to the BSC Commercial District or elsewhere in the Bridge Street Corridor as may be deemed appropriate when future redevelopment to higher densities is desired. Accordingly, the district is not intended to be mapped at the time the BSC districts are initially adopted.

(11) BSC Public

This district applies to a variety of public spaces and facilities, including but not limited to schools, parks, open spaces, and places that accommodate more intensive recreation, such as outdoor entertainment venues, as listed in Table 153.059-A. It also applies to lands in and adjacent to rivers and creeks on which development is limited due to inclusion in a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated floodplain as regulated by this Chapter, or lands that have special cultural or environmental sensitivity.

**§ 153.057 General Purpose**

- (A) The primary purpose of the Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) districts is to implement the Vision Principles for development and redevelopment of the corridor consistent with the directions articulated in the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report. This is with the full recognition that the Report may be revised and acknowledging that the illustrations in the Report are conceptual and not regulatory. The Vision Report identifies the Bridge Street Corridor as the centerpiece of the city with a focus on historic and cultural acknowledgement, preservation and creation of outstanding open spaces, and the presence of mixed use districts. These features allow for a wider range of choices for housing and employment, create interesting places and walkable districts, and enable buildings of lasting, memorable architecture.
- (B) The Bridge Street Corridor districts are intended to bring to life the five Vision Principles of the Vision Report by enhancing economic vitality; integrating the new center into community life; embracing Dublin's natural setting and celebrating a commitment to environmental sustainability; expanding the range of choices available to Dublin and the region; and creating places that embody Dublin's commitment to community.
- (C) Specific Purpose
- (1) More specifically, the purpose of the Bridge Street Corridor districts is to promote development that creates an emerging center for urban lifestyles within a walkable, mixed use urban environment that will enhance central Dublin's image as an exceptional location for high quality business investment.
  - (2) These districts are further intended to create places that embody Dublin's commitment to community through the preservation of those areas having architectural landmarks and traditional design, creating complete neighborhoods, and providing designs that honor human scale in their details. In addition, the Bridge Street Corridor will continue to serve as a center of community for current and future Dublin residents.
  - (3) The BSC districts also provide a simplified, but thorough, development review process that provides a high degree of predictability and consistency. The process also sustains Dublin's reputation for high quality development while allowing BSC property owners to compete efficiently and effectively in the marketplace.
  - (4) Because the Vision Report is a transformative redevelopment concept designed for long-term implementation, a secondary purpose of the Bridge Street Corridor districts is to allow property owners the flexibility to take advantage of new and innovative business opportunities that are consistent with the Vision Report.

**§ 153.058 Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) Districts Scope and Intent**

- (A) Scope
- The following Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) districts are hereby created. The districts described by §153.058 are intended to be used for all land within the Bridge Street Corridor. Unless otherwise specifically noted, after the effective date of this amendment all development and redevelopment within the BSC districts shall be consistent with the general purpose of the BSC districts as specified in § 153.057 and subject to the regulations of §§ 153.058 through 153.066. Other provisions of Chapters 152 and 153 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances apply in the BSC districts to the extent those provisions are

not inconsistent with the provisions of §§ 153.058 through 153.066. Nothing contained herein shall prohibit an application for rezoning to any non-BSC district provided in this Chapter.

(B) Intent

The Bridge Street Corridor zoning districts are generally based on the District Framework of the Vision Report. The purpose of the Framework is to allow development regulations to be adapted to the unique conditions present in each area. Although each district is unique, the five Vision Principles are intended to create a cohesive area, based on the concepts of walkability and urban vitality to support the quality of life for residents of all generations. The titles of each district are intended to describe the predominant land use character and/or special geographic locations rather than a single type of use. The following further describes the intent of each BSC district.

(1) BSC Residential

The intent of this district is to accommodate single-family, two-family, townhouse, live-work and multiple-family uses in mid-rise development. The BSC Residential district integrates existing and new residential developments to create true neighborhoods and add to the population base needed to help support nearby retail and office development. Uses are generally limited to residential and small-scale residential support uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

(2) BSC Office Residential

The intent of this district is to accommodate a mix of office and multiple-family residential development at higher densities and in larger buildings. This district offers great flexibility to take advantage of visibility and access for office uses, with opportunities to create residential neighborhoods to support the adjacent BSC districts. Uses include a mix of residential, personal service, and commercial uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

(3) BSC Office

The intent of this district is to allow a mix of offices and retail support uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A. The BSC Office district provides significant additional development capacity and redevelopment opportunities that foster office uses with a walkable design along signature streets, and provides increased accessibility and an improved roadway network to ease traffic pressure along major roadways.

(4) BSC Commercial

This district applies generally to existing retail centers and other low-rise commercial uses, including single use freestanding retail buildings, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Properties initially zoned into this district may be eligible for rezoning to the BSC Vertical Mixed Use District or to other surrounding BSC districts when future redevelopment to higher densities is desired.

(5) BSC Historic Core

This district applies to the historic center of Dublin and reinforces the character of this area as the centerpiece of the Bridge Street Corridor. The district focuses on ensuring sensitive infill development and redevelopment and providing an improved environment for walking while accommodating vehicles. The district accepts building types that are consistent with the historic development pattern of Historic Dublin, subject to review by the Architectural Review Board, and permit similar uses that support a highly walkable setting, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

(6) BSC Historic Residential

The intent of this district is to permit the preservation and development of homes on existing or new lots that are comparable in size, mass, and scale, while maintaining and promoting the traditional residential character of the Historic Dublin area. The purpose of these regulations is to protect the scale and character of the original platted village by maintaining regulations consistent with the previous Historic Residential zoning in place prior to the adoption of this amendment, as listed in Table 153.059-A.

(7) BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood

This district applies to the majority of the commercial areas at the east end of the Corridor. The standards of the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood create an active, walkable destination through integration of a strong mix of uses. Development within this district relies on the provision of physical and visual connections through improved access and enhanced visibility from Sawmill Road, and links to adjacent neighborhoods and open spaces.

This district accommodates a wide variety of building types and permitted uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Redevelopment of the BSC Sawmill Center area creates a walkable, mixed use core as the east anchor of the Corridor. The district is subject to the specific neighborhood standards defined in §153.063(C), establishing open space patterns, location requirements for building types, and permitting pedestrian-oriented, mixed use shopping areas.

(8) BSC Historic Transition Neighborhood

This district complements the BSC Historic Core district by accommodating a variety of building types within a finer grained street and block network and uses consistent with that district. It accommodates uses similar to those in the BSC Historic Core district, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Development allows an extension of the walkable mixed use character of the BSC Historic Core district on the larger parcels within this district. The district is subject to the specific neighborhood standards defined in §153.063(D). These requirements establish open space patterns and location requirements for building types, provide additional residential opportunities, and extend the small scale commercial activities of the BSC Historic Core district.

(9) BSC Indian Run Neighborhood

This district applies to the larger parcels north and west of the Indian Run and south of I-270, including adjacent properties fronting the north side of Bridge Street. The BSC Indian Run Neighborhood district is intended to develop as a new walkable, mixed use district that takes advantage of excellent highway visibility, an improved road network, and proximity to Historic Dublin and the natural areas flanking the Indian Run. Development within the district relies on a comprehensive road network providing connections within the Indian Run district and to the rest of the Corridor, as well as sensitivity of development at its edges given its proximity to Historic Dublin and the Indian Run.

This district accommodates a wide variety of building types and permitted uses, as listed in Table 153.059-A. Redevelopment of the area creates a walkable, mixed use core as the west anchor of the Corridor. The district is subject to specific neighborhood standards defined in §153.063(E). These regulations are intended to establish natural and man-made open space patterns; build pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular networks; provide location requirements for building types; and foster a pedestrian-oriented, neighborhood scale mixed use shopping area.

(10) BSC Vertical Mixed Use

The intent of this district is to allow a wide variety of mid-rise, mixed use development, including vertical mixed use with ground floor retail, and large format retail with liner buildings, as listed in Table 153.059-A. It is intended to be available for areas initially zoned into the BSC Indian Run Neighborhood and BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood districts, once these areas are developed and the applicable neighborhood standards are no longer needed to establish the organization and hierarchy of places. The district may be applied to areas initially zoned to the BSC Commercial District or elsewhere in the Bridge Street Corridor as may be deemed appropriate when future redevelopment to higher densities is desired. Accordingly, the district is not intended to be mapped at the time the BSC districts are initially adopted.

(11) **BSC Public**

This district applies to a variety of public spaces and facilities, including but not limited to schools, parks, open spaces, and places that accommodate more intensive recreation, such as outdoor entertainment venues, as listed in Table 153.059-A. It also applies to lands in and adjacent to rivers and creeks on which development is limited due to inclusion in a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated floodplain as regulated by this Chapter, or lands that have special cultural or environmental sensitivity.

## **PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

### **DRAFT RECORD OF ACTION**

**OCTOBER 17, 2013**

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**2. Bridge Street District – Code Modification  
13-095ADM**

**Administrative Request**

Proposal: Amending Chapter 153 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances (Zoning Code) including regulations applicable to the Bridge Street District zoning districts.

Request: Review and recommendation regarding amendments to the Zoning Code under the provisions of Code Section 153.232 and 153.234.

Applicant: Marsha Grigsby, City Manager, City of Dublin.

Planning Contact: Justin Goodwin, AICP, Planner II

Contact Information: (614) 410-4677, [jgoodwin@dublin.oh.us](mailto:jgoodwin@dublin.oh.us)

**MOTION:** To recommend City Council approve this amendment to Chapter 153 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances (Zoning Code) including regulations applicable to the Bridge Street District zoning districts.

**VOTE:** 7 – 0.

**RESULT:** Approval of this amendment is recommended to City Council.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Joseph Budde	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

Justin Goodwin, AICP  
Planner II

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 17, 2013

[EXCEPT]

#### 2. Bridge Street District – Code Modification 13-095ADM

#### Administrative Request

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this Administrative Request to review the proposed Bridge Street Code Modifications.

Justin Goodwin reported that the Commission's recommendation of approval of the proposed revisions to the Review and Approval Process for the Bridge Street Code would be City Council's October 28<sup>th</sup> Agenda. He said that this was a review of § 153.057, General Purpose and § 153.058, Bridge Street Corridor Districts Scope and Intent. He said that one of the revisions to § 153.066 included new references to these two sections at the beginning of the Code that had to do with incorporating some principles of Walkable Urbanism, as suggested by Mr. Taylor who provided a recommended list for the Commission's consideration, as well as references to resource materials that they could review. Mr. Goodwin said that staff made a few revisions to that list and worked on some language that would insert those concepts into the General Purpose section of the Code distributed at this meeting. He said also, now that the Bridge Street District Plan has been adopted as part of the Community Plan, direct reference has been made to the Plan, but that references to the original Vision Report were not being removed.

Mr. Goodwin said that a general statement explaining the principles of Walkable Urbanism and how they were intended to be used as part of the Approval Process was added. He said for each topic, General Principles; Streets, Parking and Transit; and Open Space and Buildings, a general introductory statement had been added that sets up the list that followed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the Commissioners had any comments regarding § 153.057 (A). She noted that 'Bridge Street Corridor' had been replaced with 'Bridge Street District'. She said she understood that would be done at one time at the fruition of the Commission's review of the revisions.

Mr. Goodwin explained that this was the one exception. He said that staff discussed if it would be appropriate to begin now to change all references by inserting 'Bridge Street District' where 'Bridge Street Corridor' appears, but felt that it would take more thought and cause complications throughout. He said that they did not think it would create too many problems to introduce the phrase 'District', however, they understood that it is perhaps a little awkward to have both phrases used. He said that the first change from 'Corridor' to 'Bridge Street District' could be removed, although they thought the reference to the Community Plan should still be 'Bridge Street District Plan' because that is the official name of the plan within the Community Plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if staff had identified the nomenclature that they would like to use for the districts within the District.

Goodwin said that they had not settled on some of them.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that there were no other comments on regarding § 153.057 (A). She asked if there were comments or questions regarding (B). She noted the addition of 'Bridge Street District'.

Mr. Goodwin said that change was made because within the Community Plan, they were referred to as the Bridge Street District Vision Principles. He said there was no particular reason that it needed to be one or the other.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the Commission would have to go back and do a Community Plan amendment at the conclusion of this Code review.

Mr. Goodwin said that they should not need to do that. He said essentially, the Plan amendment adopted earlier this year takes the original Vision Report and folds it directly into the Community Plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were comments or questions regarding (C) Specific Purposes, (1) through (4). She noted that (4) talked about consistent with the Bridge Street District Plan and asked if Mr. Taylor was comfortable with that.

Mr. Taylor said he was not sure what the Bridge Street District Plan was.

Mr. Goodwin explained that in (A), they introduced and incorporated the Community Plan and placed in parentheses, Bridge Street District Plan, so that any reference to the Plan afterwards would be to that area plan within the Community Plan.

John Hardt noted relative to the other document, but related in the sideways document, that there was a note about revising references to the Vision Report to instead, refer to the Bridge Street District Area Plan in the Community Plan. He asked if all those references that appear in the Community Plan were changed, did that mean that the Vision Report was now retired.

Mr. Goodwin said at this point, the approach that has been taken is not to completely remove all references to the Vision Report, but that may be something that the Commission and City Council wants to consider. He said what staff attempted to do with the Community Plan was to take all the relevant material from the Vision Report and put it into the Community Plan, but the Vision Report still was somewhat of a different document. Mr. Goodwin said it serves as the founding document which began all of this, so they would want to think through if it was appropriate now to not reference it at all anymore.

Ms. Kramb said that they had moved what they wanted over, and there might be things left behind that they do not really envision any longer, so it might be good to get rid of it.

Mr. Goodwin said that was a fair point. He said as they move forward, they would like to rely as much as possible on the Community Plan because that is the thing that will be amended from time to time.

Ms. Kramb said if it was still out there, then you would think it was still valid and someone could bring it forth as an argument that it was in the Vision Plan. She suggested taking a good look at it to make sure that they have captured everything out of it that they wanted and check to see if there was anything that they did not want to move.

Mr. Goodwin said it might be less confusing if they simply begin referring to the Community Plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it seemed that there is a lot of information available in various places. She said she did not know the right path to get from Point A to Point B, but they really need to minimize confusion in the development community as they pull out different documents, trying to mesh them

together. She said she did not think they wanted them to go through that exercise if it can be avoided. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was a list available of all the living documents related to the Corridor or District.

Mr. Goodwin said there would be a number of technical studies done for transportation, utilities, and fiscal analysis as part of the overall planning initiative that they typically would not reference within a code in this way. He said that all of that is reflected in the ultimate plan that is adopted in the Community Plan. Mr. Goodwin said ultimately, he did not think there would be a particular problem with just referring to the District Plan within the Community Plan.

Mr. Hardt said he had mixed feelings about it because he agreed with Ms. Amorose Groomes. He said when you are a developer coming to Dublin to do something, you immediately pull all the documents such as the Thoroughfare Plan, Community Plan, Zoning Code, and the Bridge Street Code and try to reconcile everything. He said that reducing the quantity was beneficial, but his only hesitation was when they went through the Community Plan Update and attempted to incorporate all the important things in the Vision Plan, that he was not looking at it with the mindset that the Vision Plan document was going away.

Mr. Goodwin said that the main elements that were not pulled from the Vision Report into the Community Plan were the detailed development program numbers and the projected square footage of different types of land uses because that type of information gets outdated very quickly as detailed plans change. He said however, all of the actual principles and even the illustrative Vision Plan, the graphic that is included in the Community Plan as a reference sort of laying out the history of how the planning process has evolved.

Mr. Hardt said that answered his question.

Victoria Newell said that she thought having both the Vision Report and the Community Plan available could be interpreted as being conflicting and not knowing what source we are going to pay attention to, so she would rather see it cleaner and concise and all consolidated. She said any pertinent information should be incorporated into the Community Plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for suggestions as to when the Commission would begin the housekeeping item and if should they be doing them in conjunction with one another or individually, which would essentially have them repeating their first task.

Mr. Goodwin said it needs to be considered if the approach forward is to continue to send individual sections to City Council for adoption. He said there was an interest in getting § 153.066 to City Council as soon as possible, but if that was not the intent for the remainder of the Code, then they could lay out what the general direction was to handle these types of housekeeping items and do them as they proceed. He said they may need to then clean up § 153.066 which references the Vision Report if they got rid of it here.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that a discussion about how they want to send the sections forward was needed. She said she hoped that all the Commissioners would attend the First Reading at City Council on Monday, October 28<sup>th</sup>. She said she was hopeful that they would hear what Council was thinking about along those lines on what has been sent thus far. She said she thought if they were on the same page, they could get the rest of the body of work finished and send it to Council cumulatively and they will have to revisit and resend § 153.066 for the nomenclature issue.

Mr. Taylor asked how many more sections were there for the Commission to review.

Mr. Goodwin said that he thought if City Council made a decision in terms of how to reference the Community Plan versus the Vision Report, the minor change in § 153.066 could be made at the Second Reading as well, but that it was not that critical of an item.

Mr. Taylor said he thought they should keep going on this because there were not that many meetings left this year and since the meeting agendas have been light, there would be time to get it done.

Mr. Goodwin said there were three more Commission meetings scheduled this year. He said one of the two back to back meetings in November looked heavy.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that she would never suggest the Commission stop working on it. She said her question was how to send it forward, by Code sections or the cumulative code when they are finished. She asked if the Commission wanted to finish §§ 153.057 and 153.058 at this meeting and send them on to City Council, or finish all the sections left to do before sending them.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to send these sections now. He said regarding the additional sections, this section and § 153.066 are very different from the other sections, and there are interrelationships between Streets and Open Spaces and the others. He said the Commission should review all of those to ensure that they are tied together and send them all together as one.

Mr. Hardt said that he agreed that this and §153.066 are tightly related to each other and should go forward now, but he thought the remainder of it was technical and not as procedural and philosophical in nature and could be done later. He said as far as the Vision Report was concerned, from those they had heard from, that sun setting the Vision Report was probably the right thing to do as long as the Commission was sure that they had everything captured in the Community Plan. He said maybe all they needed to do was a quick review of the Community Plan to make sure they had it the way they wanted it, but he had no reason to suspect there was a problem.

Mr. Goodwin said that from staff's perspective, they felt that they did. He said that was their intent.

Ms. Amorose Groomes, noting that they had finished (C), confirmed that there were no comments or questions regarding (D), the introduction of the Principles of Walkable Urbanism. She referred to General Principles (1), and asked if there were any comments or questions.

Mr. Hardt said all four of the Principles were great. He thanked Mr. Taylor for planting the seed. He said he thought it went a long way toward establishing fundamental goals of the District as being the bases for reviews. He said the only comment he had was regarding (b) Pedestrian-friendly design that encouraged walking, bicycling and the use of available transit. He said that available transit included cars. He asked if that was public transit.

Mr. Goodwin confirmed that it was intended to mean public transit.

Mr. Hardt asked that 'public' be added.

Mr. Taylor suggested removing 'available'.

Mr. Hardt suggested 'alternative modes of transit' or something like that.

Mr. Goodwin agreed.

Mr. Fishman asked if there was a way to say instead of 'encourages,' that these developments had to include a pedestrian-friendly design with alternative modes of transit.

Mr. Taylor said this section included the review criteria for the Commission to use to determine if encouraging bicycling had been accomplished.

Mr. Fishman said he understood that, but the developer might say that the development did encourage it. He asked if there was a way to tighten it up a little so that it not only is encouraged, but required.

Mr. Taylor asked if the requirements for bicycling would be covered somewhere else.

Mr. Goodwin said for anything that had to do with the design of the street system that it is going to have to be in some way handled on a case by case, or at least geographic area by geographic area bases. He said it would be hard in a general criteria to say that every street had to include a certain type of facility. He said that bicycling can be handled in lots of different ways.

Mr. Fishman said he thought the huge emphases in these meetings, at City Council, and from consultants, is that this is a walking, biking community, and that is why we are getting the density, which he thought was really important. He said that the last development that did not go through (Stavroff development) said they encouraged biking, but really did not because they did not want bicycles in the complex.

Mr. Taylor said he sided with Mr. Goodwin. He said he thought when the Commission reviewed Street Types they would look at that in detail, because they never have done that. He said that was the place for them to argue that the defined Street Types are bicycle-friendly and establish where those street types are going to exist.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said that half the battle has also been achieved in the implementation of the Code itself that it will come before a body with residents of the community to determine what that looks like in a particular area.

Mr. Goodwin suggested it could say instead, 'encourages pedestrian-friendly design that places a high priority on walking, bicycling...' which was a subtle difference.

Mr. Fishman said that would be fine.

Amy Krumb pointed out the grammatical error in (a) where the comma after 'beauty' should be deleted and replaced with 'and'; and the comma after 'comfort' should also be deleted. She said if two 'ands' are not wanted, it could say 'while creating a sense of place'. Ms. Krumb said the clause does not work there with the commas.

Ms. Amorose Grooms confirmed there were no other comments regarding (1) General Principles. She asked for comments or questions regarding (2) Streets, Parking and Transit.

Mr. Hardt referred to (e), and said while he agreed to the intent, shared parking arrangements are just one way to reduce the size of parking lots. He said instead of singling that out as being a specific thing that if it should instead say 'Alternative strategies or created strategies to reduce the size of the surface of the parking lot', which could be a number of things.

Ms. Krumb suggested, 'parking arrangement'.

Mr. Goodwin explained that staff thought the original intent of it was to focus on shared parking arrangements rather than the surface parking lot, but that they were trying to add some reasons why shared parking arrangements are supported.

Mr. Hardt asked if shared parking arrangements are the end that they are after.

Mr. Goodwin said he believed that was the original intent.

Mr. Hardt asked if that was as opposed to reducing the size of parking lots the end that we are after.

Mr. Goodwin said that was a fair point. He said that shared parking arrangements are the means to that end.

Mr. Hardt said he thought they should leave the door open for any number of tools.

Mr. Taylor suggested, 'shared parking and other parking arrangements that reduce the size.'

Mr. Hardt suggested adding, 'and other strategies'.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested 'strategic parking arrangements that reduce the size, surface, lots'. She said that staff could wordsmith it.

Ms. Kramb grammatically corrected the introductory sentence in (2) Streets, Parking and Transit, to read, 'Streets, capable of accommodating multiple modes of transportation, should facilitate the creation of a public realm designed primarily for people, and characterized by the following;

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that there were no other comments or questions regarding (2) Streets, Parking and Transit. She asked for comments or questions regarding (3) Open Space.

Ms. Kramb said that grammatically, the commas in (a) could be deleted because it did not work to offset that clause.

Ms. Kramb referred to the clause '...including small parks and playgrounds to provide gathering spaces for neighborhoods' at the end of (c). She asked if it was trying to say that open spaces should be within walking distance in small parks and playgrounds.

Mr. Goodwin said that small parks and playgrounds were examples of things that happen within the open spaces that are within a convenience walking distance to residential businesses.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested it read 'Open spaces such as small parks and playgrounds shall be located within convenient walking distance of all residential businesses while providing gathering spaces for neighborhoods'.

Ms. Kramb said to keep it parallel, you had to keep one verb at the beginning.

Mr. Goodwin suggested separating 'including small parks and playgrounds', or incorporate it with (a) because there was a similarity in the concept there.

Ms. Kramb suggested, (a) 'Include a wide range of characters from small intimate spaces to large neighborhood and community uses including small parks and playgrounds'.

Mr. Hardt said that the separate requirement would be that all open spaces should be located within convenient walking distance of all residents and businesses, including small parks and playgrounds to provide gathering spaces for neighborhoods.

Ms. Kramb said if it is just being used as an example of the type of space where small intimate spaces above were mentioned, she would include it with (a).

Mr. Taylor noted the original sentence was, 'Small scale parks and playgrounds within easy walking distance of all dwellings'.

Ms. Kramb said (a) would say, 'Open spaces should include a wide range of characters from small intimate spaces to large neighborhood community uses including small parks and playgrounds'. She explained that (a) was the types of things which include playgrounds.

Mr. Taylor asked what they were ending with, because it did not sound like the second half of (c) was needed.

Ms. Kramb agreed that the second half of (c), 'including small parks and playgrounds' was no longer needed and that 'small parks and playgrounds' would be included in (a). She said Mr. Goodwin was adding to (a), 'small intimate spaces, small parks, playgrounds'.

Mr. Taylor said that sounded much closer to what he thought City Council would say.

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred to (b), where it talked about neighborhoods, and asked that whatever terminology is used for districts, is more pertinent there than 'neighborhoods'.

Mr. Hardt said that maybe 'neighborhoods' is what should be used instead of 'districts'.

Mr. Goodwin pointed out that some of the districts are already referred to as neighborhood districts.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought it was important that the Commission communicate that they do not want just a given district to connect to itself, but they want it to connect to the adjacent district or whatever name it is given.

Ms. Kramb noted that 'district-wide' was used.

Mr. Goodwin said they could add a reference to connecting to the overall community, that it was not just within the Bridge Street District, but connecting out so it could say 'that confines neighborhoods and the larger Dublin community'.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like it to be clear that the Commission wants them to be interconnected, not just well-connected within themselves.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were other comments regarding (3) Open Space. [There were none.] She asked if there were questions or comments regarding (4) Buildings.

Mr. Hardt commented that there was nothing in the Code that required mixed use buildings, but he did not know if that was by design. He said he wondered if this would be the place to strongly encourage such a thing. He pointed out that a couple of proposals that the Commission has seen actually were not mixed-uses at all.

Mr. Goodwin said that (c) came closest to that.

Mr. Hardt said that if the consensus was that it was covered there, he was okay with it.

Ms. Newell suggested adding a clause at the end, 'that this would be inclusive in encouraging mixed-use individual property'.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she did not think that would encourage any given structure to be mixed-use.

Mr. Goodwin explained that they were attempting to do that by including the words 'within and among building types'. He said perhaps it could be stronger and more clearly stated.

Mr. Taylor suggested it was the word 'neighborhood' that began the sentence that was the problem, because they were saying 'Buildings should be characterized by neighborhoods'. He suggested, 'Buildings should be characterized by a broad mix of shops, offices, and housing within and among a variety of building types'.

Mr. Goodwin agreed.

Joe Budde noted that the word 'mixed use' was included in the introductory sentence.

Ms. Kramb said she liked Mr. Taylor's suggestion to strike 'neighborhoods with'.

Ms. Amorose Grooms confirmed that there were no other comments or questions regarding (4) Buildings. She asked if there was anything missing in this section that should be included. [There were no comments.] She said that concluded the Commission's review of § 153.057.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if there were any comments or questions regarding § 153.058, Bridge Street Corridor (BSC) Scope and Intent.

Mr. Goodwin commented that no significant changes had been made.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if there were any changes that the Commissioners would like to see. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Grooms invited public comments regarding this application. [There was none.]

Mr. Goodwin said he heard a general support, as the Commission moved forward for the elimination of the direct references to the Vision Report and relying on references to the Community Plan. He asked if that was how the Commission would like to proceed.

Ms. Amorose Grooms suggested that they begin the next Commission meeting with looking at the Community Plan component.

Mr. Taylor said he was okay with that concept, but he would like to review it before then.

Ms. Amorose Grooms suggested that they proceed as though they are.

Mr. Hardt asked if Mr. Goodwin thought there was a change needed before this got was sent to City Council.

Mr. Goodwin said if the Commission would like this also to proceed to City Council as soon as possible, and there are still the references to the Vision Report, we can either resolve to come back and address that at a later time, or attempt to do it now for the version that would go to Council.

Mr. Hardt said that he would hate to see the same section twice.

Ms. Kramb said she did not know that there was anything in this section that if they strike the words, 'Vision Report' that would cause problems.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that it talks about acknowledging the illustrations in both the Vision Report and the Community Plan.

Ms. Kramb said all the illustrations are in the Community Plan.

Mr. Taylor said if they strike 'Vision Report', and solely refer to the Community Plan now, then the only homework the Commission would have is to make sure that the Community Plan is the way they want it.

Ms. Newell and Mr. Fishman agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes decided that the Commission will proceed that way, but that they will start the next meeting with a quick conversation, acknowledging that everyone was comfortable with the way that it is stated in the Community Plan and that they will move forward. She said however, from this point forward, they will go with that intention.

Mr. Goodwin pointed out that one minor adjustment that the Commission should consider making to §153.066 that could still be done since the language has not yet gone to City Council, the references to the Vision Report there would no longer be necessary, and they could strike those.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the Commission would have to come back to §153.066 anyway because they will have to rename the District or Neighborhood.

Mr. Goodwin said he was not sure that would come up in §153.066.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that it was called the Bridge Street Corridor in §153.066, so the Commission at a minimum would have to change that. She said she did not know that it was worth going back and doing the Vision Report things too. She suggested that they do the Bridge Street Corridor and Vision Plan things at the same time. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would hate to change it after it was sent to City Council.

Mr. Goodwin clarified that it had not yet been sent out to City Council. He said that the information would be sent to them next week. He said that the change could be made and this discussion could be noted in the memo sent to City Council.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said whatever Mr. Goodwin was comfortable with would be fine.

Mr. Taylor and Ms. Kramb said that they were in favor of that to make it cleaner.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were further comments or questions. [There were none.]

### **Motion and Vote**

Richard Taylor moved, Warren Fishman seconded to recommend City Council approve §§ 153.057 and 153.058 as amended.

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

Mr. Hardt requested that a copy of the final, clean version be sent to the Commissioners.

### **Communications**

Mr. Goodwin reminded the Commissioners of the Scioto River Corridor Community Forum to be held at the OCLC Conference Center on Tuesday, October 22. He said that there will be an Open House reception at 5 p.m. and a formal public presentation given from 6 - 8 p.m. where there will be stations with plans to review. He said that all the City Council, Boards, and Commission members have been invited to attend.

Mr. Hardt asked if the plans being presented had been previously seen and prepared by the City or were they developers' plans.

Mr. Goodwin said that there will be a new iteration of the plans for the Riverside Realignment and the SR 161/US 33, and the Riverfront Park space on both sides of the river, as well as a general master plan being produced by the private property owner along the east side of the river. He said there may be an inclusion of the North Riverview Area.

Mr. Taylor said he would not be able to attend. He asked if the presentation would be videotaped.

Mr. Goodwin said that the intent was to live stream the presentation, and that all of the materials will be online afterwards.

Ms. Kramb said that due to a conference, she would be unable to attend.

### **Commission Roundtable**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it was good to have Mr. Fishman back and in good health.

Mr. Fishman told the students present that he was very sad that they had to attend this meeting because it was not typical and he did not want them to be discouraged about going into planning or government. He said at the September meetings there were developers that wanted to build a multi-million dollar projects and the neighborhood did not want them. He said that staff and the Commission had to reconcile to make the project acceptable to everyone. He said there was a lot of excitement and commentary from all the parties concerned. He said they were much more exciting than editing Code. Mr. Fishman said that he did not want the students to judge what the Commission meetings were like from this meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

**Ordinance 91-13**

**For a complete history for this Ordinance, please refer to the materials included in Ordinance 84-13**