

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 7, 2013

AGENDA

Previously Tabled Case

- 1. NE Quad – Subarea 5A – Kroger Marketplace** **7625 Sawmill Road**
13-084Z/PDP/FDP/CU **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/
Final Development Plan/Conditional Use**
(Approved 5 – 2 – Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan)-
(Approved 5 – 2 – Final Development Plan)
(Approved 7 – 0 – Conditional Use)

New Cases

- 2. NE Quad – Subarea 5A - Kroger Marketplace Centre – Orange Theory Fitness** **7581 Sawmill Road**
13-105CU **Conditional Use**
(Approved 7 – 0)
- 3. Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District, Subarea I – Crown Kia – Sign** **6400 Perimeter Loop Road**
13-106AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan**
(Tabled 7 – 0)
- 4. Zoning Code Amendment – Technology Flex Zoning District**
13-104ADMC **Administrative Request -Zoning Code Amendment**
(Approved 7 – 0 - Positive Recommendation to City Council)
- 5. Bridge Street District – Code Modification**
13-095ADMC **Administrative Request -Zoning Code Amendment**
(Discussion Only)

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Krumb, John Hardt, Joe Budde, Warren Fishman, and Victoria Newell. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Rauch, Justin Goodwin, Rachel Ray, Jennifer Readler, Jordan Fromm, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Ms. Newell seconded to accept the proposed 2014 – 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting dates. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any corrections or amendments for the September 19, 2013 meeting minutes.

Ms. Kramb requested the following corrections:

Page 2, paragraph 5: They are to build up to the setback line.

Page 2, paragraph 6: Ms. Kramb commented there ~~is~~ would be no yard space.

Mr. Taylor recalled at the September 19th meeting the Commission discussed the addition of checklist as part of the application submittal and asked about the status.

Mr. Goodwin thanked Mr. Taylor for raising this topic as an item to follow up.

Ms. Newell requested the following correction:

Page 2, last paragraph: She said there appears to be only a few feet clearance.

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested the following correction:

Page 3, sixth paragraph: Ms. Amorose Groomes asked is if there anyone present that would like to speak with respect to the application.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to accept the September 19, 2013 meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested the following correction to the October 10, 2013 meeting minutes:

Page 7, in the middle of the page: Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if they would be filed concurrently, ~~but not necessarily~~ would they be handled separately.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any other comments or corrections for the October 10, 2013 meeting minutes. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Ms. Newell seconded to accept the October 10, 2013 meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, abstain; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0 – 1.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any corrections or amendments for the October 17, 2013 meeting minutes.

Mr. Taylor requested the following be corrected:

Page 10, paragraph 10: Mr. ~~Taylor~~ Hardt 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. Amorose Groomes said that the following sentence needed some wordsmithing with reversal of words:

Page 5, paragraph 1: Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for suggestions as to when the Commission would begin the housekeeping items and if should they be doing them in conjunction with one another or individually, which would essentially have them repeating their first task.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Budde seconded to accept the October 17, 2013 meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that Cases 1 and 2 were eligible for consent and asked if anyone requested that either be pulled. Ms. Kramb pulled Case 1, Kroger Marketplace. Mr. Taylor said he wanted to briefly discuss conditional uses in general, but he did not have comments regarding Case 2, Orangetheory Fitness.

Ms. Amorose Groomes determined the case order as Case 2, 1, 3, 4, and 5. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

1. NE Quad – Subarea 5A – Kroger Marketplace **7625 Sawmill Road**
13-084Z/PDP/FDP/CU **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/
Final Development Plan/Conditional Use**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting approval for an addition to the existing building, modifications to the uses within the existing development text, and an outdoor dining area for a shopping center within Subarea 5A of the NE Quad Planned Unit Development, located on the west side of Sawmill Road approximately 750-feet north of the intersection of Hard and Sawmill Roads. She said there would be separate motions for the Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan, which will be forwarded on to City Council; the Final Development Plan; and the Conditional Use, for which the latter two applications the Commission is the final authority.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in those who intended to address the Commission in regards to this case including Ben Hale, Jr., Smith and Hale, LLC [37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio], representing the applicant, Nick Vollman and Jordin Horan, 411 Executive Parkway, representing the Kroger Company, and City representatives.

Jennifer Rauch presented this application for a rezoning/preliminary development plan with a final development plan and a conditional use for the Kroger Marketplace store. She said the Commission reviewed this application in September 2013 with a similar request for additional building area located to the rear of the building in the service area and a 500-square-foot addition at the front of the building. She said previously the Commission was concerned about the overall size of the proposed building addition, and the requirements and intent of the original text. She said the Commission requested the proposed addition to the rear be limited to storage use in order to limit the retail component of the building and to address the concerns raised about keeping the shopping center at a neighborhood scale.

Ms. Rauch said Planning worked with the applicant to come up with a solution to address the Commission's concerns. She said the existing text permits 99,933 square feet for the Kroger building and with the revisions, the applicant is proposing to cap the grocery/retail component at 98,500 square feet, while permitting the building to expand to 105,067 square feet to accommodate the proposed additions.

John Hardt asked if the sales floor was 98,500 square feet. Ms. Rauch said it means the area to which the public has access.

Mr. Hardt asked how that compared to the existing sales floor of the store. Ms. Rauch referred the question to the applicant.

Ms. Rauch said the second part of the application addresses modifications to the permitted and conditional uses within the development text. She explained the original submittal proposed Education

and Tutoring, Health and Allied Services, Outdoor Dining and Service, and Real Estate Office proposed as Permitted Uses, but the Commission wanted to keep Health and Allied Services, Outdoor Dining and Service, and Real Estate Office use as Conditional Uses, which the proposal has done. She said to address Mr. Taylor's questions the maximum class size is limited to 35 students within the development text.

Ms. Rauch said the proposed Final Development Plan includes modifications to the architecture which are compatible with the existing building design and materials. She presented the plan showing the area where the building additions will be located. She said the existing trees located along the front elevation will be removed with the construction and have been conditioned to be replaced on site per Code. Ms. Rauch said the rear addition will require the removal of existing parking spaces. She said the previous proposal included the replacement of these spaces on site; however, the Commission determined these spaces would not need to be replaced because of the over-parked nature of this site. She said to address this comment the applicant has reduced the required parking number within the development text.

Ms. Rauch said the final part of this application is a conditional use request for a 680-square-foot outdoor dining patio for Starbucks which will be associated with the new front addition.

Ms. Rauch said Planning proposes a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan with no conditions. She said Planning recommends approval of the Final Development Plan with one condition requiring the replacement of the trees for the expansion area on-site, and the Conditional Use with one condition regarding the storage of patio furniture during inclement weather.

Ben Hale, Jr., Smith and Hale, representing The Kroger Company, said they are very anxious to remodel the interior of this store to be competitive with the new Walmart across the street. He said Starbucks is currently located in the middle of the store and will be relocated in the proposed additional along the front of the store with a seating area and a door accessible from the store. Mr. Hale said the proposed storage area is needed for efficiency so panel delivery trucks will not have to continually deliver merchandise to the store. He said the applicant agreed to reduce the retail permitted in the store by approximately 1,000 square feet. Mr. Hale said they rent several thousand square feet of storage area in the rear of the shopping center which is treated like part of their retail area.

Mr. Hale said he contacted Mack Parkhill of the Northeast Civic Association, who expressed no concerns about the proposal and understood the revisions were compatible with the existing building. Mr. Hale said the Starbucks wall sign was removed, as requested by the Commission. He said the sign was not part of this application, and if they decide they want a sign, they will have to come back to the Commission for approval.

Mr. Hale said four Kroger representatives were present to answer any Commission questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this application. [There were none.]

Amy Kramb said she supported the changes to the Kroger store, but she would like to see the additional square footage subtracted from the future 24,000 to maintain the intent of the maximum square footage on the site. Ms. Kramb said it seemed awkward to limit or base it the need for a conditional use on a maximum class size of 35 persons. She asked if it should be based on either maximum occupancy of the building or a square footage to stick to the intent of small businesses and limit a larger health club.

Claudia Husak said the existing development text currently limits the square footage of a single tenant and that would by default limit the tenant space. Ms. Rauch said the text stated that no individual tenant space may exceed 10,000 square feet.

Ms. Kramb suggested the class size requirement text be removed. Ms. Rauch said the text could be modified to remove the class size.

Mr. Hardt said he was in favor of keeping the class size limitation for these types of facilities, because the clientele trickles in and out one at a time. He said a large mass of people show up at the same time for one event which has a significant impact on parking. He said he understood the two things proposed layered on top of each other limit the size of a fitness facility to 10,000 square feet, but the requirement limiting the class size to no more than 35 persons was appropriate. He said anything larger than that size would have an impact on adjacent businesses. He said he was supportive of the class size limit as written.

Mr. Hardt said he appreciated the change to the parking in the rear. Mr. Hardt said the proposed modification to limit the retail could seem like a minor concession, but he did not think it was. He said the concern from residents to limit the grocery store to 100,000 square feet to ensure the scale and character of the store and the retail center focused on the neighborhood would be maintained. He said the retail floor space will be held steady, meaning the character and the scale of the store is not changing. He said we are indeed only adding storage and for him that was a significant difference that went a long way toward making him feel comfortable with this proposal.

Mr. Hardt said during the previous review the rear elevations and the floor plan did not match and wanted to confirm these discrepancies had been addressed. Mr. Hale said it had been and there was only one round window.

Warren Fishman said Mr. Hardt's comment about the parking situation with the health club was a good point. He said he thought limiting the size of the class was valid because people showed up at all times.

Mr. Fishman said regarding the proposed Kroger additional square footage, he was in favor because it was a hardship in doing business. He said however, he was a Commissioner at the time of the original rezoning, and he recalled the neighbors were adamant about keeping the store small and the shopping center never growing in square footage. He agreed with Ms. Kramb and could not support this proposal unless the additional square footage was taken from the future 24,000 square feet building.

Joe Budde complimented Kroger for responding to the Commission's discussion last time and returning with the revised proposal. He agreed with size limitations and the class size limitations for the fitness uses. He said he agreed the future square footage should be reduced by the proposed addition with this application.

Victoria Newell said she appreciated the application and the limitation on the retail sales space. She said she thought it was a fair proposal; however, she also said last time she thought the expansion area needed to be balance with the overall size of the development. She agreed with Ms. Kramb the additional area should come out of the entire development area.

Richard Taylor said he had no problem with the additional space because it was being designated as storage and office space and does not increase the retail floor size. He thanked the applicant for removing the Starbucks sign. Mr. Taylor recalled on the previous proposal a pharmacy window was being moved and he did not see any reference to that on the plan. He said the floor plan showed the existing window blocked up.

Jordin Horan, 411 Executive Parkway, representing the Kroger Company, said the pharmacy window will be closed, because the pneumatic tube is located on the passenger side of a car, and therefore it does not serve its purpose. She explained with the remodeling the pharmacy will shift back into the store to enlarge their space and the window will not be near the pharmacy. She said the window is located under a canopy and only visible for the person driving up for prescriptions and the pneumatic tube faces the

other side. She said the drive-thru will still be active with a video screen on the driver's side instead a window.

Mr. Taylor asked if that would be handled as a minor modification. Ms. Rauch confirmed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes she was struggling with idea for reducing the future building along Emerald Parkway because of the amount of public and private investment made along this roadway and she was looking forward to this space being filled to ensure we are not looking at the back of a shopping center. She said she was struggling with removing what would be a much nicer façade along Emerald Parkway to accommodate the small addition on the back of the building and the coffee shop along the front.

Warren Fishman said this could be dealt with by landscaping and mounding and the reduction would be 6,000 square feet less. He said he would rather see mounding and landscaping to cover the back of the building. Mr. Fishman said he was sure when the applicant returned to the Commission with the future phase they would ensure the back of the building would not be seen from Emerald Parkway.

Victoria Newell said the 6,000 square feet would not have to be removed off right at the end of the building and could be taken off in the niches of the building as part of the architecture and still fill the entire length.

Mr. Fishman said any building area removed could be replaced with green space. He said the building did not have to be long and skinny. He said the architecture could be dealt with when the future building comes before the Commission and it would be ensured the back of the building would not be seen from Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Taylor said Kroger had made a good case they need this space to stay competitive. He said that this was approved in 2004, and the neighborhood now is a lot bigger, and so he did not have a problem with the neighborhood center being a little larger than it was when it was first approved.

Mr. Fishman said he thought the people who lived there had a problem with it. He said in 2004, the neighborhood was very vocal about this being a neighborhood center, not a regional center. He recalled the neighborhood wanted it smaller than it is. He said it was compromised again and again. He said they did not want Kroger to be as big as it was because they did not want giant big box stores. Mr. Fishman said he thought it was a hardship with Walmart going across the street and Dublin needed to keep Kroger in business. He said if a future Commission sees fit to go back to 24,000 square feet, that would be fine, but he thought it was only fair to have them give up the 6,000 square feet at this time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the only thing she could be convinced was to remove the square-footage of the footprint and not the second story. Mr. Fishman said he respectively disagreed and said regardless of where the square footage is people in it. He said the spirit of this center when they limited the square footage was to reduce the number of people, cars, traffic, because this was to be a neighborhood development. He said it should be limited now and could be addressed later when the future building comes forward and if it is determined to be needed at that time then it could be changed.

Ms. Kramb agreed with Mr. Fishman. She said the shopping center should be taken as a whole and if Kroger wanted to be there then the square footage should be taken away from the remaining amount of square footage for the center.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for the square footage of the addition on the ground. Ms. Rauch said it is 3,419 square feet, with the first floor is added at the rear and the 500 square feet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any further comments from the Commissioners about the other aspects of this proposal, the Final Development Plan or the Conditional Use. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes reiterated she was in favor of reducing the future building by 3,419 square feet.

Jennifer Readler said if the Commissioners could come to a consensus on the square footage, they could ask the applicant to agree.

Mr. Fishman reiterated he thought any square footage added should be deducted.

Joe Budde said after hearing all the discussion, he agreed the amount of square footage of the footprint only should be deducted from the future development area.

Ms. Newell said she appreciated the compromise and appreciated Kroger limiting the square footage of the retail area because she thought it would have the biggest impact. She said however, she could not help but think about the future development if someone wanted to add storage elsewhere and it kept increasing the size of the center. She said she knew the future section may never be built, but it is currently in the text and in the proposal to be built and she thought the Commission had to consider that. She said she was thinking in terms of the whole development and that was why she said she was on the fence.

Ms. Kramb said she was in favor of reducing the entire amount from the future building, the 6,000 square feet.

Mr. Hardt said because of the nature of the proposed addition, he was supportive of this proposal as it was submitted with no deductions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for Mr. Hale's thoughts on this.

Mr. Hale clarified Kroger did not own the center and was paying rent on the additions. He said Kroger said they would be willing to have 500 square feet of additional retail taken off the 24,000 square feet building and pay the landlord for it. He said he was present during the rezoning approval and he recalled the future development was a big deal. He said they wanted the landlord to build it with the rest of the center because they wanted it to hide the back of the center, and they reached a compromise where they put up a fence and landscaped it to try to make it look as good as they did. Mr. Hale said the purpose was to create a service court that was invisible with store fronts along Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Hale in order to do what Ms. Kramb has suggested was asking Kroger to pay rent twice because they will have to pay for the space they have and the space they lose. He said he did not think Kroger felt that was fair to them nor should they have to do that. Mr. Hale said from an aesthetic point of view the entire future space needed to stay there. Mr. Hale said they will agree to take 500 square feet from that and pay the rent on both of them for what they are really using as additional retail because truly the rest is an office space and a warehouse space and the applicant has agreed they will not use that space for anything else. He said Kroger was trying to do everything they can to make sure they can compete with Walmart and Target. Mr. Hale said this proposal is important to the Kroger business and to Dublin and he hoped the Commission will support them.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she could be talked down to the 500 square feet because that is sale-able space for them and she was sure they would be collecting rent from the coffee shop. She asked if the Commission had a general consensus of support for the reduction of the overall development size.

Mr. Taylor said he could go for the 500 square feet.

Mr. Hardt said he did not think it was necessary and supported the proposal as is. He confirmed they had a consensus on the 35-person limitation.

Motion #1 and Vote – Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan

Richard Taylor moved, Joseph Budde seconded, to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council this Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan because it is complies with the preliminary development plan and the applicable review criteria with one condition:

- 1) To modify the text to reduce the future expansion square footage to by 500 square feet to 23,500 square feet.

Mr. Hale agreed to the condition.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Fishman, no; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, no; Mr. Budde, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 2)

Motion #2 and Vote – Final Development Plan

Richard Taylor moved, Joseph Budde seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan because it complies with the review criteria with one condition:

- 1) The applicant replace any trees removed as part of the proposed expansion in accordance with the tree replacement provisions of the Code, subject to approval by Planning.

Mr. Hale agreed to the condition.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, no; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, no; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 2.)

Motion #3 and Vote – Conditional Use

Amy Kramb moved, Victoria Newell seconded, to approve this Conditional Use application because it complies with the applicable review criteria, with one condition:

- 1) The proposed patio amenities be stored in a location that is not visible to the public when not in regular use unless the patio furniture is all-weather material, set up for use and not covered in any way, and weather conditions make the use of furniture possible.

Mr. Hale agreed the condition.

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

2. NE Quad – Subarea 5A - Kroger Marketplace Centre – Orange Theory Fitness

13-105CU

**7581 Sawmill Road
Conditional Use**

Chair Amorose Groomes introduced this Conditional Use application requesting a 3,170-square-foot exercise facility within the existing Kroger Marketplace Centre within Subarea 5A of the NE Quad Planned Unit Development, located on the west side of Sawmill Road approximately 750-feet north of the intersection of Hard and Sawmill Roads.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in those who intended to address the Commission in regards to the case including Jackson Reynolds, Smith and Hale, [37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio], representing the applicant, Plaza Properties, and City representatives.

Richard Taylor said a staff presentation was not necessary. He asked why this particular use was a conditional use.

Claudia Husak explained when the development text was approved in 2004, Health and Allied Services was placed in the category.

Mr. Taylor asked if Health and Allied Services was typically considered a Conditional Use, or was it just specific to this use. Ms. Husak said the Code was changed to add Fitness as a Permitted Use because it had not been included at all. She said in this particular development, staff is considering fitness types of uses to fit into the Health and Allied Service category. She said the Code allows fitness uses fewer than 15,000 square feet in area to be permitted in the Community Commercial District, which this district would probably fit the shopping center the closest. She explained there is a size limitation to the Permitted and Conditional Uses.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said moving forward it might be appropriate to limit the 15,000 square feet to have this sort of use so applicants such as this do not have to return so frequently and try to get a Conditional Use on this store thing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments in regards to this application. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved, Warren Fishman seconded, to approve the Conditional Use application because it complies with the applicable review criteria.

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

3. Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District, Subarea I – Crown Kia – Sign 13-106AFDP 6400 Perimeter Loop Road Amended Final Development Plan

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this Amended Final Development Plan application requesting to replace a 15-foot tall, 50 square-foot ground sign with a new 15-foot, 2-inch tall, 50-square-foot ground sign for an existing car dealership in Subarea I of the Perimeter Center PCD, located on the north side of Perimeter Loop Drive, approximately 370 feet west of the intersection with Mercedes Drive.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in those who intended to address the Commission in regards to the case, including Tom Hart, [2 Miranova Place, Columbus, Ohio] representing The Crown Automotive Group and City representatives.

Rachel Ray presented an overview of the Crown KIA Dealership centrally located between the Crown Mercedes Benz dealership to the west and Crown Chrysler/Dodge/Jeep to the east, just south of the Market District shopping center. She presented a photograph of the existing ground sign which was 15 feet tall with a 50 square-foot internally illuminated sign cabinet. She described the existing sign cabinet's blue background and white lettering with a red circle circumscribing the KIA logo. She reported the Commission added a condition to a previous Final Development Plan to require a subdued shade of red.

Ms. Ray said in August of this year, the Commission reviewed an informal request to modify this sign to be consistent with KIA's new corporate branding. She said at that time, the Commission stated they did not support the proposed sign concept, but they would potentially support a comprehensive update to the sign package for the entire Crown car dealership campus.

Ms. Ray said as part of this application, the applicant is proposing a modification to the existing Crown KIA sign cabinet. She noted the sign cabinet was proposed to be 15 feet, 2 inches tall, which exceeds the maximum Code permitted height of 15 feet, and includes a 7 ½-foot tall aluminum sign cabinet which is 50 square feet. She said the KIA logo is too large at 24 percent of the total area of the sign face, when Code limits secondary graphics to 20 percent of the maximum permitted sign area. Ms. Ray said the shade of red proposed was not considered to be "subdued" or consistent with the earlier condition of approval.

Ms. Ray presented photographs of the existing Crown campus signs for Mercedes, KIA, and the Crown Chrysler/Jeep/Dodge dealerships, and the proposed KIA sign. She said the development text requires signs be architecturally integrated with the dealership buildings and each other. She said while the proposed sign maintains the existing brick base, it loses the blue background, making it no longer consistent with the other campus signs.

Ms. Ray said the proposed sign, in Planning's opinion, is clearly out of place and even though it maintains the brick base, it fails to meet the requirements of the development text. She said for those reasons as well as those areas that exceed what Code allows for signs, Planning recommends disapproval of this application as submitted.

Tom Hart, representing The Crown Automotive Group, said it was the applicant's opinion the proposed sign maintained consistency with the other signs since it used the existing masonry base, and compared to the previous oval-shaped sign cabinet reviewed informally by the Commission, the proposed sign cabinet is rectangular, in keeping with the Code and consistent with the other signs. He acknowledged the sign exceed the Code-permitted height by two inches, and the other inconsistencies with the sign regulations, which needed to be addressed.

Mr. Hart explained the red color is a specific KIA corporate branding color which was important to the manufacturer. He believed it to be a comparable shade of red to other approved signs in the area. He pointed out the Commission's request for a subdued color was now 12 years old, and color standards and expectations in the marketplace have changed since then. He said the white sign cabinet background would disappear into the background.

Mr. Hart said the reality for the applicant is the other two Crown auto brands, Mercedes and Chrysler, are not asking for changes to their signs, making it is difficult to comprehensively modify all of the campus' signs. He requested the Commission's feedback on the proposed sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments with respect to this application. [There were none.]

Victoria Newell stated although she had not represented Crown in over ten years, she had represented them for the very same site currently before the Commission. She said she could not support the sign unless it was part of a comprehensive update applied to all of the dealership's signs.

Joe Budde agreed with Ms. Newell.

Warren Fishman said he agreed with Planning. He said although it had been 12 years, the Commission still wanted the campus to remain beautiful with consistent signs. He reiterated a desire for muted colors and did not want this to look like some roads in other cities. Mr. Fishman said he was totally against the

proposed sign. He suggested the applicant come up with a design that uses muted, natural colors and would be consistent among all of the signs.

Amy Kramb said the applicant had already noted they would address the inconsistencies with the Zoning Code requirements, which was one of her concerns. She said she did not know the background had to be the same exact as the other existing signs, and she was willing to accept a slight difference, using the same base, size, and shape. Ms. Kramb said she could be convinced if there was not such a stark contrast between the very bright white and the red. She said she was fine with the color of red they needed to use to meet their branding, but she did not know what shade of white it should be. She said if it was a very high quality cabinet and at night, just the red part would be illuminated and not the white, she may be able to find the design acceptable.

John Hardt agreed with the other Commissioners that he could not support this application as proposed, with the outstanding Code requirements for height and logo size. He agreed with Ms. Kramb that he was not opposed to KIA using their corporate red color, but what he had trouble with is the stark contrast between the KIA logo and the background. He said at a minimum, he would like to see some kind of alternative, muted background that coordinated with the buildings, and was something that the other dealerships could at least agree to move towards when they decide to change their signs. He said he did not want to prescribe any solutions, but when he looked at this sign, anodized aluminum came to mind.

Ms. Kramb and Ms. Newell said they agreed with Mr. Hardt.

Mr. Hardt said it was a neutral color that could coordinate with the buildings and he thought that the other dealerships could work with that type of background in applying their logos. He said he thought there was a solution, but it was not in front of the Commission tonight and he could not support what had been submitted.

Richard Taylor stated attention to the little details was something he thought was unique about Dublin, and he thought if they started letting these little details drift away, eventually the impact would be noticeable. He said whatever the final solution is, he was in favor of coordinating all three signs and buildings. He recalled not long ago the Commission dealt with the Mercedes dealership that did some rebranding and added blue to the outside of their building. He said all of the signs on the site including the directional signs all use the same blue color across the whole site, which establishes a consistent theme. Mr. Taylor commented the brick on the buildings also provides a high degree of coordination between the dealerships and the signs. Mr. Taylor said he was in favor of, whenever possible, bringing elements of the architecture out to the street and that had been done in a couple of different ways.

Mr. Taylor said a much bigger issue than the color of red which he did not think was that important was the contrast. He said there was not a great deal of contrast between the colors used on the three signs on the campus now, and they were still able to effectively identify the brands. Mr. Taylor said he would be in favor of anodized aluminum because it was also used on the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Taylor said there needed to be a coordinated effort between the three signs and a degree of coordination with the architecture of the buildings. He said another unique detail about Dublin is that whenever we can, we try to make architectural elements a part of signs and other site details. He said in some areas the effect is more garish, but here it is subdued and very tastefully and attractively done.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said previously the Commission commented the building elements should be incorporated into the signs. She agreed some metallic elements would be appropriate to pull into the sign. She agreed with the other Commissioners' comments with respect to the sign height, logo size, and color contrast.

Mr. Hart said he appreciated the Commission's comments. He requested a tabling.

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved, Warren Fishman seconded, to table this Amended Final Development Plan application at the request of the applicant. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Tabled 7 – 0.)

4. Zoning Code Amendment – Technology Flex Zoning District 13-104ADMC Administrative Request -Zoning Code Amendment

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this administrative request to amend Chapters 153.002 and 153.044, Technology Flex (TF) District of the Dublin Code of Ordinances (Zoning Code) to permit commercial vehicle rental as a Conditional Use within the district. She said City Council is the final authority of this application.

Steve Langworthy said this is an applicant-submitted request for a Code amendment to the new Technology Flex District to allow truck and van rental establishments as a Conditional Use within the District. He summarized the provisions of the proposed amendment giving the specific use standards that would be included, and a definition for Truck and Van Rental establishment. He said previously, when the Commission began with the Innovation and Technology and the Bridge Street Districts, they broke the definitions out into Use Definitions and Non-Use Definitions. He said this is an addition to the Use area definitions for Truck and Van Rental Establishment. He said this applicant originally submitted for the Truck and Van Rental to also include Automobiles, and Planning is proposing a modification to eliminate the Automobile Rental portion of it, as they felt this being in an industrial district, and having automobiles rented would be more of a commercial retail establishment than would a be truck rental.

Mr. Langworthy said the use specific standards included a minimum basic lot size of 20,000 square feet. He said the applicant originally requested 40 maximum vehicles to be parked on the property at any one time. He said Planning was supportive, but thought it would be necessary to add for every truck over ten, an additional 1,500 square feet of lot area to accommodate those 40 vehicles. He said this use, as proposed would not be permitted on lots bordering freeway or arterial streets. He said the rental vehicles would have a designated parking area, unless they were being staged for rental pickup. Mr. Langworthy said a 26-foot maximum length vehicle would be permitted to prevent tractor trailers rental. Mr. Langworthy said any servicing done on the vehicles is to be done indoors, except washing and cleaning which can be done in the designated parking area.

Mr. Langworthy said the Technology Flex District has an effective outdoor storage screening requirement that refers back to the landscaping provisions of the Zoning Code regarding Service Structure Screening. He said in the Service Structure Screening it is to be screened one-foot above the highest portion of the equipment stored, but Planning thought given the height of the trucks that could be fairly tall, and determined it was not. Mr. Langworthy said the maximum screen height being proposed is six feet, rather than one-foot above the total height.

Mr. Langworthy presented a map showing the three locations of the Technology Flex District, by Post Road and the Interchange, on Avery Road by Woerner-Temple Road, and the majority, along Shier-Rings Road between the highway and the property south to Innovation Drive. He pointed out no property bordering the freeway or arterial are permitted to have this use on it, even with the Conditional Use provision. He offered to present a map showing which of the properties within the three major areas would qualify for this use. [No one requested to see the map.]

Mr. Langworthy said the small commercial trucks and vans would be ten to twenty-six feet in length. He presented photographs to demonstrate what the different truck sizes would look like to provide a sense of scale.

Mr. Langworthy said the Zoning Code does not have a text provision with set of criteria like there is normally for review criteria, so Planning developed Technology Flex District criteria for review considerations for a text:

1. Whether the amendment is consistent with the intent and purpose of this Chapter and the Community Plan;
2. Whether the change is the result of an error or omission in the original text;
3. The potential effects on areas that are most likely to be directly affected by the change;
4. Any changes or enhancements in physical or economic conditions or development practices that justify the proposed change; and
5. Whether the change might result in the creation of significant nonconformities on properties in the city.

Mr. Langworthy said the first three guidelines were applicable and the other two did not seem applicable in this case. He said Planning recommends the Commission recommend approval of this amendment to City Council.

John Hardt asked if this Conditional Use application was for an existing or proposed business.

Ben Hale, Jr., Smith and Hale, LLC, (37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio); said he represented the applicant/owner, the Bates Property, who owns Stanley Steemer and Enterprise Rental is the company that wants to rent the building owned by the Bates Property. He said the existing building has been used in the past to store trucks and for light repair of the trucks. He said Enterprise Rental is a client of Stanley Steemer who rents trucks to them. He said most of the trucks will be rented to businesses, but they will also rent trucks to individuals. Mr. Hale said when the Code was originally created for Tech Flex there was not a provision for truck rental. He said he understood this was considered a Conditional Use and the applicant will have to return to discuss the fencing, where exactly the trucks will be stored on the site, and the other issues.

Mr. Hardt said one of his concerns was that typically when a business owner identifies a property they want to do something on and the Code does not directly permit it, they come in for a variance or rezoning, but in this case they are talking about the whole district. He asked why that approach was used in this case. He said he thought there were one or two existing businesses in this area that already rented trucks, which he suspected are covered as non-conforming uses under the Code. He said he was concerned the provisions that prohibit these businesses from being along arterials for freeways might create a problem for the existing businesses.

Mr. Langworthy said that was true, but although they would become non-conforming, they would not be required to be removed. He said it also happens that those uses mentioned in these areas were probably going to be part of the highway interchange at some point. He said one of them was near Avery Road.

Mr. Hardt said the other existing truck rental he thought of was located on SR 161. He said he just wanted to be cautious they were not creating a problem while solving one, and he was also curious why they were addressing this as an entire district instead of one parcel.

Mr. Langworthy said that provision was added because there had been complaints about parked trucks being visible from those major roadways. He said they could have created a PUD for a single property to include this use, however it seems as though the use itself is legitimate to be placed in the Technology Flex District, and there are not that many sites that are going to qualify in the long run. He said the Code

would also include the provision requiring a conditional use would also limit the locations where these might be located in the future.

Mr. Langworthy explained a use variance would have been another potential method, but meeting the review standards for a use variance would be unlikely because one of the main use variance standards is that there is no other use available for the property. He said it seemed to him they would have a hard time meeting that standard.

Mr. Hardt said the Technology Flex District has approval procedures in place that mirror what previously was in place in the Bridge Street Corridor, in the sense the Administrative Review Team reviews applications as a default.

Mr. Langworthy said that was incorrect and explained Technology Flex was a standard district.

Mr. Hardt asked who was the reviewing body. Ms. Husak said it was a standard district where there was no reviewing body. She said an applicant would file for a building permit.

Mr. Taylor referred to the restrictions on location and asked to see the Technology Flex District map. He asked if they were also adjacent to residential and stated he would like 'This cannot be adjacent to residential' be added to the proposed language. He said across the street would be okay.

Mr. Langworthy agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would not want to live across the street from a truck rental facility.

Mr. Fishman suggested it say, 'Adjacent to and across the street.'

Mr. Taylor said the map showing the areas of the Technology Flex Districts were existing parcels and said someone could create a parcel that did not abut an arterial.

Mr. Langworthy said they still would have to meet the 20,000-square-foot minimum, and the extra area needed for parking, so there are size limitations to be met.

Mr. Taylor said he agreed this use should not be adjacent to or across the street from residential. He said if this were approved it would still be a Conditional Use. He said if someone wanted to do something across the street from residential, it still could be considered under the Conditional Use guidelines.

Mr. Langworthy said if the prohibition was put in, then they would have to meet the provision. He said there is the ability in the Conditional Use provisions to modify those provisions on their individual bases.

Mr. Taylor said he thought that would give the Commission the most flexibility. He asked if they should have a minimum screen height instead of a maximum screen height.

Mr. Langworthy said the maximum as currently written identifies the height not having to be the entire six feet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said a 6-foot screening height was not high enough to hide the top of a truck cab where there may be advertisement lettering seen.

Mr. Taylor said that was why he suggested a minimum screening height, and depending upon the size of the truck, it could be adjusted.

Ms. Krumb said as originally written, the screen height was to be 5 to 12 feet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if it said ‘... as it relates to the building’.

Mr. Taylor referred to an old discussion when they created the Technology Flex District and discussed the U-Haul facility and rentals being an accessory use to something else. He asked if this would fall into that category if someone had another type of business and could have an accessory use renting trucks. Mr. Langworthy said yes, it could be treated that way, as long as it was not a primary use.

Mr. Taylor asked if it was an Accessory Use, would it still be a Conditional Use. Mr. Langworthy said yes, it would still be part of the Conditional Use application.

Ms. Krumb referred to 14(C), It shall meet the requirements of E(2), the section that talks about up to 12 feet.

Mr. Langworthy said what he was trying to do was to not exclude them from the interior parking. He said they have the designated parking areas, but not excluding them from having interior landscaping in the parking areas.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she could not imagine parking lot islands in a truck rental storage lot.

Ms. Husak said all parking areas there would require interior landscaping per the Landscape Code. Ms. Husak quoted E(2): *Outdoor storage- Exterior storage shall be screened in accordance with Section 153.133. Storage must be located to the side or rear of all buildings and shall not be visible from adjacent properties or from the public right-of-way.*

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not in favor of excluding this from that provision. Ms. Husak said it was not excluded.

Ms. Krumb said that it was saying that ‘it shall mean that’ and then it went on to say ‘provided that the required screening shall be six feet, and provided that the interior parking lot landscaping requirements.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not want it to be seen from the adjacent property.

Ms. Krumb said she was not sure that the ‘provided that’ is getting across what is wanted. She suggested it was trying to say ‘except that the required screening is six feet’ or ‘also.’

Mr. Langworthy said Section 153.044(E)(2) requires a screen to the height of the one-foot above the building. He said that you do not have to meet that requirement.

Ms. Husak said that Section 153.133 was for screening of service structures. She said that proposed Section C says ‘It shall provide’ meaning it shall be applicable here.

Mr. Langworthy said without accepting that, there would be conflicting provisions.

Mr. Hardt said that Section 153.044(E)2 should say ‘except that’ instead of ‘provided that’.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would apply the ‘cannot be visible from adjacent property’ for the screening. She said those were the two things she wanted.

Ms. Husak confirmed Ms. Amorose Groomes did not have an issue with the six-foot tall screening.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was confused about what was being said. She said to her, it meant that they are limiting the screening to be six feet tall, and she did not agree with that. She said she would like it to be not visible from the adjacent property.

Ms. Kramb said the thing is that they are saying that applies only to the structure, not moving vehicles.

Mr. Hardt said he almost agreed. He said his issue was with the phrase 'adjacent property'. He said he did not think the trucks should be visible from the public right-of-way and roads, but if they are visible from a warehouse next door, he did not care.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she expected a lot of businesses in the Technology Flex District to be very interested in the appearance of their buildings and they would not want to see rental trucks next door.

Mr. Fishman said it should be written they cannot be adjacent to street thoroughfares or residential uses, and they are going to be screened from adjacent properties. He said if he had a beautiful building like Hidaka's, he would not want to look at rental trucks all day. He said they had to be screened above which was a lot of screening.

Mr. Hale suggested it be 'at least six-feet' without a maximum, and then when they return for a Conditional Use, those individual situations could be dealt with based on what is located next to it.

Mr. Taylor said he thought it should be a minimum of six feet, and if it needs to be taller, it could be a condition for the Conditional Use.

Mr. Fishman said he would like the minimum screening to be higher than six feet because the trucks are higher.

Ms. Newell said this was the perfect reason why there is a Conditional Use. She said it is because it can be discussed with the Commission. She said the surrounding properties and what is being built against is going to have an impact on the decision made.

Mr. Hardt said if someone came in with a fence over six feet high, the Commission would be unhappy with it. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was expecting it to be landscaping. Mr. Fishman said 'screening' could be many things.

Mr. Taylor said he thought it was fine to say, 'Screening, minimum six feet.' Ms. Kramb added, '...shall be a minimum of six feet in height'.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said then the Conditional Use will have to come in for approval, although we are giving them the assumption that they could put up a fence before they come to the Commission. She said she would say 'landscaping' instead of 'screening'.

Mr. Fishman suggested it say 'mounding and landscaping'.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said to say, 'a minimum of six-feet', and then they would be handled by the Commission on a case-by-case through the Conditional Use.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments in regards to this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Husak confirmed the reference to Section 153.044 would remain and then it should state, '...provided the required screening shall be a minimum of six feet in height'.

Ms. Husak said there was a typo in the last section in that Section 153.042(B) is supposed to be Section 153.133 (C)(1) which is the Interior Landscaping requirement and it also is under the Screening for Service Structures, which includes continuous wall, planting, hedge, fence, earth mound; any of those things are allowed to be used to screen and the height of the screening material shall be one-foot above, but not higher than twelve feet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes and Mr. Fishman said that they could live with that.

Ms. Kramb said that did not apply to truck storage.

Mr. Fishman suggested adding the word 'trucks'.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it could say that this section applies to Truck Storage.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that section should be referenced and state that it applies to the storage facility.

Ms. Husak suggested, 'Shall be the minimum height of six feet, and for the provided screening for service structures as required by Section 153.133 (C)(1), this also does satisfy'.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that language was okay. She asked if 'adjacent and across the street' was there.

Ms. Newell said it should be 'abutting and across the street.'

Mr. Taylor asked if 'across the street' was a technical zoning term.

Ms. Newell said it was written in the text, and it generally is 'adjoining property and directly across the street'.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were additional comments. [There was none.]

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved, Victoria Newell seconded, to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council for this Administrative Request-Zoning Code Amendment as modified.

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

Mr. Hale said he had been coming to Board and Commission meetings for almost 45 years. He said that next year, he was not going to attend any meetings after six o'clock.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Hale if he would like the meetings to be earlier.

Mr. Hale said if they were at one o'clock in the afternoon, he would come to the meetings. He said it had been a pleasure, and he thanked the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission would miss Mr. Hale. She said he had been a delight to work with in the past.

[The Commissioners all thanked Mr. Hale.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes called a five-minute recess at 8:37 p.m.

**5. Bridge Street District – Code Modification
13-095ADMC Administrative Request -Zoning Code Amendment**

Chair Amorose Groomes introduced this Administrative Request to begin the discussion of Amending Chapter 153.065 Site Development Standards of the Dublin Code of Ordinances (Zoning Code) including regulations applicable to the Bridge Street District zoning districts. City Council is the final authority of this application.

Justin Goodwin said the Commissioners had been provided a copy of the Parking and Loading Section of the Site Development Standards from the Bridge Street Code with Planning's notes to review. He said Planning will provide an annotated copy of the remaining portions of this Code section as the Commission continues its review at upcoming meetings.

Mr. Goodwin said originally, the Applicant's Guide was going to be created in house, but after assessing the workload, a consultant will be needed. He said diagrams or additional information as part of that would be helpful. He said Planning has found a few things that needed technical revisions and a few items that need clarification where the language may be unclear of how to implement the Code requirement or deal with unique circumstances.

Mr. Goodwin said at the previous review of Sections 153.057 and 153.058, the Commission talked about the principals of Urbanism and also how to deal with the reference to the Vision Report in the Code, and ultimately decided to switch those two references to the Community Plan. He said it was suggested there could be a quick review of what from the Vision Report ended up in the Community Plan and how to do that. He offered to do that if the Commission wanted, but he said all the relevant information from the Vision Report was included in the Community Plan. He said City Council adopted the proposed amendment to Section 153.066 which will become effective on December 4, 2013. He said the related amendments to Sections 153.057 and 153.058 are expected to be adopted on November 18th.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she attended the City Council meetings where Mr. Goodwin had presented the amendments. She said Mr. Goodwin did an outstanding job representing the Commission's thoughts to City Council, and she really appreciated it. Amy Kramb said she had watched Mr. Goodwin's presentation online and she thought he had done a great job. John Hardt agreed.

Mr. Hardt said he had a brief opportunity to go online to refresh his memory on what is in the Community Plan now and on what the Commission had voted. He said he was comfortable with it and did not need to see a presentation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the architects on the Commission make comments about parking.

Richard Taylor said he was woefully unprepared to discuss parking this evening because he had not had a chance to review it.

Mr. Hardt said he had not reviewed it in detail, but he had a couple of general comments. He said he did not disagree with any of the comments and notes that staff has included. He referred to the first page, near the bottom of the second column, the staff comment about allowing parking areas to extend across contiguous lots and unified developments. He said they had to define what that meant. He said they have seen examples in Dublin and elsewhere where developers have been required to connect their parking lots, and they begrudgingly agree and put convoluted driveways in that give a cross access easement, but they are disjointed and dysfunctional. Mr. Hardt said if we are going to allow that, which he thought we should encourage, it has to be done so that parking is as seamless across property lines as in a unified parking lot. He said he did not know how to say that in text.

Victoria Newell said when there are the inter-relations between parking areas, you intentionally do not line up the drives so that you do not get excessive cross border traffic through where there are people barreling through a parking lot.

Mr. Hardt said he understood what Ms. Newell was saying, however in spite of that intention he thought when they were not aligned, it creates a mess. He said he suspected, if things are done correctly that whatever parking fields we have in the Bridge Street District are going to be small enough that it is not an issue. He said he did not expect a giant 400-foot row of parking where somebody can build up enough speed to cruise along at 35 mph where they should not be. He said he envisioned more pockets of parking similar to what is seen behind Starbucks. Mr. Hardt said he argued the smaller the parking lot, the more seamless matters because otherwise there is a maze that you are trying to snake through.

Mr. Hardt said there was a lot of context or conversation in the Code about shared parking agreements, which he supported, but he thought we should be cautious about putting all the focus on specifically shared parking agreements when there is a litany of other strategies that developers could use to reduce surface parking. He said he was in favor of wordsmithing to encourage a broader adoption of different strategies.

Mr. Goodwin said there was a section included on parking adjustments generally. He asked if Mr. Hardt felt that beyond shared parking that also was not sufficient. He said on Pages 81 and 82, it dealt with transportation, demand management strategies, transit proximity and it allows someone to come in and make a case for why they need a different parking ratio. He said he could certainly take another look at additional strategies.

Mr. Hardt said he was fundamentally comfortable with that. He said his concern was that all of that was built toward the assumption that a developer is going to come in and try to make the argument that they should be allowed to build less parking than they normally would be allowed.

Mr. Goodwin said they could argue for more above the maximum as well, but many of them are reductions.

Mr. Hardt said they wanted to put that on its ear and make people prove the need for large parking lots which he thought was consistent with what little he read in the books that he had been reviewing.

Mr. Hardt said he thought the consensus among the experts in the area is that walkable urbanism in these kinds of developments should trend towards standards of maximum parking requirements rather than minimum, and he was not sure we want to leave the minimum entirely up to people, because otherwise we would end up with parking problems like we have in Historic Dublin. He said he would like to find a way to bracket that conversation and keep people from going too far off the rails in either direction. He said this is an area in a context that he did not think any of them have a lot of experience with and they do not really know what they are going to get yet.

Mr. Goodwin said the City's transportation consultants did not want there to be any parking minimum. He said they did not think we were ready for that yet.

Mr. Hardt said an argument could be made that anybody who builds a development and under parks it, they do so at their own peril. He said it was unlikely that anybody is really going to make their situation worse by attempting to put in zero parking spaces.

Mr. Goodwin said they talked about that they did not do when they wrote the Code was whether or not to require the use of on-street parking to count toward the parking requirement. He said the Code allows somebody to count it, but they are not required to include it. He said for smaller lots, it is somewhat negligible. He said there are things like that to explore.

Mr. Hardt said he thought those were worthy conversations to have about when the parking is there, why not use it.

Warren Fishman said he thought it was the peril of everybody in the area. He said if they under park their area, people will park somewhere else in other people's parking, and it will affect the entire area.

Mr. Hardt said that was where it gets complicated. He said he did not want to focus on one solution to the parking problems when there were a lot of other strategies.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if the City had identified areas where they would like to see structured parking happen.

Mr. Goodwin said specifically in the Historic District, some potential locations have been identified, but the options are limited. He said outside of the District, it has been more of a discussion with property owners as they have looked at long term development plans where they think a structured parking garage may go, but not really what they have identified as serving a larger City need.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said it would be nice that, she knew the City did not want to pay for the structured parking right out the gate, if in lieu of them parking, which we really do not want them to, necessarily on the street frontage, primarily, a participation in, you require 50 parking spaces for your development, and the City would like half of those in this parking garage at \$10,000 a space. She said what has been done in the Historic District is to wait until there is big problem and then come in with a mediocre solution. She said she would like to see us get out in front and put all the cost estimates together so as these developments come in and do not have the capacity to provide parking, that the City give them an option to participate in it, in close proximity.

Mr. Taylor said a strategy that he read addresses parking arrangements globally to be taken care of by a developer contributing the money that would have been used to build a parking space towards a structured garage, and while the initial outlay cash is the same, in the long run it will be a building instead of parking.

Mr. Goodwin said it could be similar to the Open Space in Lieu that is built into the Code. He said that was a strategy originally discussed, but it did not wind up in the Code, but it could be explored again.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she would like to see something like that and she would like to see us to start to identify areas where the City would like to spend those dollars when they start collecting the fees.

Mr. Hardt said his argument was rather than sitting and trying to think of every possible strategy to write into the Code, they should wordsmith the Code to say 'hey, if you have an idea about parking, bring it.'

Mr. Goodwin said he thought the Code did that, but Planning could check it again. He said they tried to build enough flexibility in, but they would take another look.

Mr. Fishman said if the developer has a parking solution, they would not be under parking.

Ms. Amorose Grooms confirmed there were no other Commissioner comments or public comments with respect to this application.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the Commission wanted to finish the Code and send it all to City Council at once.

Mr. Goodwin said even in terms of when Planning would bring back actual revised language, whether they would do that after each section, or as Planning would recommend, actually go through a review, at

least initially of all of the remaining sections so that they can understand how a change in one section might impact a change in another, and then bring back a consolidated draft.

Ms. Amorose Groomes and Mr. Taylor agreed.

Commission Roundtable Discussion

Richard Taylor shared a funny photograph of a suspension bridge across the Ohio River in Southern Ohio that carried a pipeline and noted that the pylon was familiar looking. He said no airplanes would crash into it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes welcomed Planning's new staff assistant, Laurie Wright.

Ms. Husak said both Libby Farley and Diane Madden had announced their retirements at the end of the year. She said Ms. Wright would be helping Flora Rogers with the night meetings next year. Ms. Husak said the Commissioners would be informed when the retirement party would be held for Ms. Farley and Ms. Madden.

Mr. Taylor referred to the apartment building reviewed by the Administrative Review Team earlier today and asked if it was close to the Vrable facility where the old farmhouse was located.

Mr. Goodwin explained that will become a Basic Plan application that will come to the Commission.

Mr. Fishman asked if the Administrative Review Board would have the final on that.

Mr. Goodwin said that would be up to the Commission on December 5th. He said it was a fairly large development with significant structure improvements.

Mr. Hardt referred to the Perimeter Center shopping center dormers on the roof with fluorescent lights inside where you can see the attic. He recalled one of the conditions of approval was to turn off the lights.

Ms. Husak said she also recalled the condition and would look into the issue.

Ms. Kramb asked if all the dead trees on Banker Drive on the side by Boston Market down to Toys R Us could be removed.

Mr. Langworthy said there was a program for the tree replacement.

Ms. Kramb asked if they could be cut down in the meantime.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 9:08 p.m.

As approved by the Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission on December 5, 2013.