



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 20, 2014

AGENDA

1. **Bremlee Estates** **7250 Coffman Road**
13-115Z/PP **Standard District Rezoning (Approved 5 – 0 – 1)**
Preliminary Plat Variance (Approved 5 – 0 – 1)
Preliminary Plat (Approved 5 – 0 – 1)

2. **Engineering Presentation: Bridge Street District – Transportation Network Overview**
(Discussion)

3. **State Bank** **Shamrock Boulevard and West Dublin-Granville Road**
14-002BPR/CU **Waivers (Approved 6 – 0)**
Conditional Use (Approved 6 – 0)
Parking Plan (Approved 6 – 0)
Basic Plan Review (Approved 6 – 0)
Require Site Plan Review by PZC (Approved 5 – 1)

Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:47 p.m. due to technical difficulties and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Warren Fishman, Amy Kramb, John Hardt, and Joe Budde. Victoria Newell was absent. City representatives present were Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Readler, Gary Gunderman, Yazan Ashrawi, Rachel Ray, Justin Goodwin, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Jeannie Willis, Andrew Crozier, Barb Cox, Alan Perkins, Dana McDaniel, Paul Hammersmith, Brad Conway, Aaron Stanford, Megan O'Callaghan, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt moved, Mr. Taylor seconded, to accept the documents into the record as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Budde, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated there were two sets of minutes to approve and asked if there were any corrections to the first set dated January 9, 2014.

Amy Kramb responded that she had a correction: Page 17, paragraph in the middle of the page attributed to her starts out with Ms. Kramb, and she requested the first sentence end after the word "version". Ms. Kramb requested a change to Page 23, 4th paragraph from the bottom attributed to her, 2nd sentence, she said the content should reflect basically how she wanted to know more about the patio space and she thought some words were missing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she had a correction on page 24, 2nd paragraph from the top attributed to her, "ponds" should be changed to "puddles".

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt moved, Mr. Taylor seconded, to accept the January 9, 2014, meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Budde, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt moved, Mr. Budde seconded, to accept the January 23, 2014, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Fishman, abstain; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; and Mr. Hardt. (Approved 5 – 0 - 1)

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted there were no cases eligible for consent agenda and already announced the Tuller Flats case was postponed. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**1. Bremlee Estates 7250 Coffman Road
13-115Z/PP Standard District Rezoning/Preliminary Plat**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for rezoning from R, Rural District to R-2, Limited Suburban Residential District for a 4.6-acre site that was recently annexed to the City of Dublin. She said this is also a proposal for a preliminary plat for four single-family lots for land located north of Forest Run Drive and east of Coffman Road to be accessed by the extension of Nature Drive. She said the Commission will need to forward this case to City Council and will need to make three motions.

Richard Taylor stated he had an interest in the case and asked to recuse himself.

Ms. Husak described the parcel that contains a single family home. She said the rear portion was annexed into the City recently, and with all annexations within the City of Dublin they are automatically designated as R, Rural District zoning. She said the south side is adjacent to the Woods of Indian Run subdivision, which will be the main access point into this small subdivision via the current stub of Nature Drive. She said there are religious institutions in the vicinity as well as the Earlington/Brandon subdivision across Coffman Road and Hemingway Village, a little bit to the south. She stated the surrounding zoning is varied, there are parcels that have also been annexed into the City more recently, which are zoned R and the Woods of Indian Run were zoned a Planned Unit Development (PUD). She said the residential portions of the Hemingway Village are R-4 and R-2, Earlington/Brandon PUD, and the City of Dublin school district has a suburban office district zoning there. She said the applicant is proposing to rezone this site to R-2 and all of the development requirements of that district are met with the proposal.

Ms. Husak said the applicant has proposed to subdivide the parcel into four lots; each lot meets the size requirement for the R-2 District, which is 20,000 square feet minimum. She said the lots range from 20,000 square feet to the largest lot at 81,000 square feet and the right-of-way for the plat is Nature Drive. She noted a 20-foot tree preservation zone along the southern boundary of Lots 1 and 3 to serve as a natural buffer adjacent to the residential homes within the Woods of Indian Run. She said the applicant proposed a temporary hammerhead turnaround in the northern portion to provide fire trucks the ability to turn around as there is no other way out of this little subdivision. She said the expectation is that if land to the north were to annex into the City and develop, Nature Drive could extend farther and provide access to those lots.

Ms. Husak explained the plat has several requirements that if you are proposing a PUD, you can waive those requirements. She said in this instance, the subdivision regulations require 60-feet of right-of-way and 32-feet of pavement for the road. She said the applicant is extending a public road that already exists that has the typical 50-feet of right-of-way and 26-feet of pavement, proposing to do the same. She said Staff recommends approval to City Council of the rezoning from the Rural District to the Limited

Suburban Residential District (R-2); recommends approval of variance to the plat for the right-of-way; and recommends approval of the preliminary plat that include conditions for the Commission to carry forward to City Council as follows:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat should be made prior to City Council submittal;
- 2) That the applicant clarify the maintenance responsibility of the stormwater basin on the final plat;
- 3) That the drainage easement shown along the northern edge of Lot 3 should be simplified in alignment so that it may be more easily interpreted by any future homeowner; and
- 4) That the applicant pays a fee in lieu of dedicating open space.

Ms. Husak said there have been some questions raised by the adjacent homeowners association regarding the maintenance of that basin. She said the applicant is here to address those but essentially, it will be the responsibility of those lot owners.

Ms. Husak said when land is subdivided, park land is dedicated or a fee is paid in lieu of as in this instance where the lot is so small, it is insignificant. She said the applicant has agreed to pay the fee in lieu of dedicating open space and is here to address any questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the applicant to step forward and state his name and address for the record.

Jack Reynolds, attorney with Smith and Hale, LLC, representing Jay Eggspuehler, the property owner, said the applicant wanted to build a new house in Dublin after residing for 10 years on Bellaire Avenue. He said he located the vacant lot that was owned by Mr. Eggspuehler, which then had to be split and annexed on January 27, 2014. He said they met with staff to discuss rezoning and confirm they met requirements. He said they talked to the Woods of Indian Run Homeowners Association who asked if they would be willing to participate in the fee structure to maintain the stormwater basin. Mr. Reynolds explained they plan to form a Homeowners Association comprised of the four owners, will have deed restrictions that will mimic the Woods deed restrictions, form alliance with their subdivision to accumulate dues, and give to HOA of the Woods of Indian Run to maintain our detention facility as well as ingress and egress features of the Woods of Indian Run. Mr. Reynolds said the applicant agrees with staff's recommendations and conditions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment.

Albert Gabel, 7190 Coffman Road, north of Mr. Eggspuehler's property, said they moved there in 1965, was a college professor and raised seven kids. He stated they were much in favor of this development as it will produce a large amount of tax because of the value of the property, now zoned with low density. He said the proposal is for large expensive homes to be built on these four lots, will generate very little traffic and will not burden the Dublin schools. Mr. Gabel urged the Commission to recommend to City Council to approve with lots of green space included since several of the residents have had horses there.

Bridget Dritz, 5174 Forest Run Drive, President of the Homeowner's Association, reported concern about Forest Run Drive being the only entrance/exit to the neighborhood. She said they have a lot of children in the neighborhood and those with special needs residing in the front part, which causes concern about construction, traffic, and the blasting out for basements for homes that back up to the river bed. She wants it on the record that the developers would pay any damages as a result of blasting.

Andrew Dendinger, 5240 Forest Run Drive that borders the proposed property. He said they moved there about 9 - 10 months ago and hate to see the horse farm go but does not have a problem with this proposal. He expressed desire to obtain more information on the houses and the orientations on the green space along with tree preservation for trees that border his property.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated she would need to refer him to someone on staff as this is not information the Commission has. She assured him there is a buildable zone of which Ms. Husak could contact him about later to provide the footprint. Ms. Husak confirmed they would have to be a minimum of 20-feet away from the lot line plus the 20-foot tree preservation.

Mr. Dendinger asked for clarification on the trees. Ms. Husak confirmed trees could not be removed and building could not be permitted in the tree preservation area.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thought that Ms. Husak could keep in touch with Mr. Dendinger as the property is developed.

Munjal Sanghavi, 5246 Forest Run Drive has resided there for 20 years. He said he would hate to see the horse farm go away. He stated he had all the same comments as Mr. Dendinger except he would like to see orientation of the proposed houses.

Ms. Husak said they do not have a requirement that the houses are fronted a certain way but maybe the applicant has more information on the progress of the home plans. Mr. Sanghavi asked if they could see the plans before they begin construction. Ms. Husak said she could email him a copy of the building permit when it comes in. Ms. Amorose Groomes said it would not be a public meeting such as this but when they go in for permits, Ms. Husak can assemble a list and as permits come in, can further supply information.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if anyone else would like to make public comment with respect to this application. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any discussion points from Ms. Husak to which she responded there were not.

Amy Krumb said she was glad to see only four houses being fit on this parcel. She said she envisions great homes on very nice lots and agreed with the suggestions and conditions.

John Hardt said he was pleasantly relieved by the proposal. He inquired about the stormwater plans; the western half of the site for lots 1 & 2, appear to tie into the existing stormwater system and the right half relies on a bio-retention basin. He asked why the differing approaches.

Aaron Stanford explained it was being broken drainage-wise by the roadway and utilizing the infrastructure already in place. He said from a stormwater management perspective, this is a pretty minor site, considering how much will be undeveloped land.

Mr. Hardt asked if it was possible for the whole site to be tied into the existing stormwater system. Mr. Stanford responded affirmatively that it would be possible. Mr. Stanford said there was a larger area to the right of the roadway, so they want to treat as much of that as they can on that side and said he was in favor of this setup. He said there will be some EPA requirements to meet with their disturbance.

Mr. Hardt explained the reason for his question was that he was concerned with the current set up, expecting a public street, and the rain water will go in the catch basins and ultimately end up in the yard of a single family home. Mr. Stanford said there is storm pipe that would route the water to that catch basin. Mr. Hardt said the catch basin itself is on a private lot, to which Mr. Stanford agreed. Mr. Hardt asked if this situation was elsewhere in the City. Mr. Stanford responded affirmatively. He said the option of putting this on City-owned land was discussed but opted not to do so, given the small size of land. Mr. Stanford explained that once this is accepted and constructed it would be inspected annually to see if it was still operational and that is why the easement is placed over that facility and storm sewer system to it.

Mr. Hardt asked if it was ultimately the responsibility of all four landowners or just the two. Mr. Stanford assumed it would be all four. Mr. Hardt said he would sleep better if he knew they were all tied into the existing sewer system and not have to rely on maintenance. Mr. Stanford thought the issue might be if tied directly to the system, there would be no treatment per se before it would enter the system, which they are trying to address. Mr. Hardt said he understood it was an issue of water quality.

Warren Fishman asked if the water is not clean before it goes into the stormwater system for the whole street existing now. Mr. Stanford said it depends on the installment age; may not have that stormwater system and he was not familiar with the area. Mr. Stanford explained that older subdivisions did not have a requirement when they were constructed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted they ran into the same thing across the street.

Mr. Hardt inquired about Indian Run, itself. He said over a period of time, the City has taken advantage of woods along our streams by adding multi-use paths parallel to the waterways. He asked if there were any plans in long-range forecasting to do anything like that along Indian Run. Ms. Husak recalled part of our greenway in the Community Plan but does not believe a path was identified.

Mr. Hardt said if an easement was needed now was the time to identify it. Ms. Husak offered to double check with our park staff but thought this could be done as part of the final plat. Mr. Hardt admitted there may not be immediate plans but asked that it be considered in this case since a very small corner of the property touches the creek. Ms. Husak confirmed she would check with Mr. Hahn and see if it could be incorporated in the final plat.

Joseph Budde agreed with what had been said so far. He said two of the lots are twice the size of the minimum lot requirement, and one of the lots is four times the minimum lot size. He inquired that after this plat is completed if any of those three lots could be split into smaller lots some day in the future or would this preclude that. Ms. Husak responded that the zoning district has requirements for lot size, the width, and frontage at the street, so they would not be able to split the lot and still meet all the requirements. Mr. Budde was satisfied with her response.

Mr. Fishman said he was confused about the association and asked for clarification. Ms. Husak suggested letting the applicant answer.

Jack Reynolds said they would have their own homeowners association with an agreement with the Woods of Indian Run to share association dues they collect to maintain the entry way features and go towards any special activities that are taking place in the Woods.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if it would be a forced association. Mr. Fishman suggested a sub association, which is a common way to handle this.

Mr. Reynolds said he would work with the folks to come up with an answer. Mr. Fishman asked if this would be established on the final.

Jennifer Readler said this is a rezoning to a straight district so the Commission will not see it again. Mr. Fishman asked that they make sure that happens. Ms. Husak said they will see a final plat.

Mr. Fishman said sometimes these agreements become problematic in the future. He said he was a little confused by the street. He asked if their extension was going to be the same as Nature Drive is now – width, easement, and so on. Ms. Husak confirmed.

Mr. Fishman said within the City of Dublin there is a history of misunderstandings with dead end streets. He said when the next subdivision comes in, and do not want it open, as it had been a stub for 10 years.

He said to make sure that it is recorded on the plat for the street to go through. He asked if this could be done and Ms. Husak answered yes. Mr. Fishman clarified that each person's lot reflects the street going thru if the site to the north is developed. Ms. Husak confirmed it would be reflected in the plat.

Mr. Fishman said it makes sense for lot owners to tie into storm sewer, whether it is filtered or not filtered. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the EPA requirements have changed and cannot do that anymore. Mr. Hardt said the water has to be filtered before it goes in.

Mr. Fishman said he did not want to put an extra burden on the lot owners if they did not have to. Ms. Amorose Groomes said it was the EPA's burden.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was pleased to see this come in with four lots. She said it is a beautiful piece of property with lovely lots. She said traffic could be the best anyone could hope for in terms of development. She explained that when Nature Drive was stubbed, the intention was that it would extend, ultimately. She wanted the residents to know that typically, when a development comes adjacent to property, the Commission asks for the adjacent lots to be a little bit bigger, building materials a little bit nicer, and increment it up so that at a minimum, you have better than what you are in, behind you. She said this was the best we could hope as a Commission. She said as we continue to develop to the north, Commission will hold them to the standard that has been set. She said this will go a long way to keeping the density very low. She believes this will be a lovely small development that will have a minimum impact on its neighbors.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were further comments or questions to be addressed. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote – Standard District Rezoning

Mr. Fishman wanted to make sure all the notes are on the plat.

MOTION #1: Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to recommend approval to City Council of the Standard District Rezoning request.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 5 – 0 - 1)

Motion and Vote – Preliminary Plat Variance

MOTION #2: Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to recommend approval to City Council of the Preliminary Plat Variance for the provision of 50 feet of right-of-way and 26 feet of pavement for the extension of Nature Drive.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 5 – 0 - 1)

Motion and Vote – Preliminary Plat

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant to step forward. She stated there were originally four conditions and a fifth has been added. She asked him if he agreed to the five conditions as written. Jack Reynolds agreed to the five conditions.

MOTION #3: Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to approve the Preliminary Plat application and recommendation to City Council with five conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat should be made prior to City Council submittal;
- 2) That the applicant clarify the maintenance responsibility of the stormwater basin on the final plat;
- 3) That the drainage easement shown along the northern edge of Lot 3 should be simplified in alignment so that it may be more easily interpreted by any future homeowner;
- 4) That the applicant pays a fee in lieu of dedicating open space; and
- 5) That the applicant include a note on the final plat stating Nature Drive may extend farther north should adjacent land develop.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Grooms, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes. (Approved 5 – 0 - 1)

Ms. Amorose Grooms said they would take a moment and would resume once Mr. Taylor was back in place.

2. Engineering Presentation: Bridge Street District – Transportation Network Overview

Chris Amorose Grooms introduced the presentation by Engineering Staff providing an overview and addressing some of the questions raised by the Commission regarding the Bridge Street District Transportation network. She stated it is being heard before the next case as it is located within the Bridge Street District.

Steve Langworthy explained this will be in three parts and tonight's presentation by Jeannie Willis is an introduction and network overview. He stated that City Council's annual retreat is next week and a main focus is the Bridge Street District. He said they will discuss the transportation network and elements of the residential development, as well as timing of public improvements that will be needed. Mr. Langworthy said Jeannie and staff are working on a response to Amy Kramb's letter to him. He said they hope to have some comments and conclusions from the discussions held at the retreat for the Commission.

Jeannie Willis thanked the Commission for allowing her the opportunity to speak and to share the history of transportation planning in the Bridge Street District (BSD). She provided the key transportation features as pertained to BSD:

1. Grid - creates multiple redundant connections, many travel paths, which is why turn lanes are not required at individual intersections. The grid will be more accommodating to pedestrians, cyclists, and transit. She said the grid will take time to be completed and early on there will be less than ideal connections as it develops.
2. Developers will not be required to submit individual Traffic Impact Studies.
3. The information is based upon multiple studies starting with the Vision for BSD in 2010, with the Goody Clancy Corridor Study. From that, the grid was developed. We as a City, were not comfortable with Goody Clancy's word for it. They decided to review the grid and determine if the number of lanes would be sufficient as written in that study and handle the density of development. They analyzed the Nelson/Nygaard Study from 2011-2012, the BSD rezoning in 2012, Community Plan update that included the Thoroughfare Plan update, and the BSD Area Plan in 2013, that lead to the LJB Transportation Plan.

Ms. Willis explained the outcomes from the studies after they were each evaluated and reviewed over a year's time. She reported the grid works using the numbers from the land use side of the Goody Clancy study for their model. She said it will support density of mixed-use development on both sides of the river, not parcel by parcel mixed-use, but with the district operating as whole, and creating a 40 percent internal trip capture, expected at build-out.

Richard Taylor asked Ms. Willis if that was her working definition for mixed use or was she using that for the basis of the transportation study. She responded yes to the latter.

Ms. Willis said this will all take time, like Emerald Parkway that has eight phases and took over 20 years to complete.

Ms. Willis said bridges are meant to connect the neighborhoods, not relieve congestion on Rt. 161. She said the bridges keep trips within the district creating a sense of place. She explained a street family classification system was created, not based on roadway hierarchy but rather to define streets based on character. She said through the Nelson/Nygaard Study they addressed the situation where urban core meets the suburban edge, which have not been dealt with up to this point these types of developments will need to work together. She said they determined that a few roadways need additional attention: Bridge Street, Riverside Drive, and Dublin Road. She said that is why they commissioned the LJB Transportation Phasing Plan.

Ms. Willis said they were getting close to wrapping up this study and is comfortable reporting the following:

- Verified the number of lanes proposed within the grid itself are sufficient
- Identified at certain intersections turn lanes are needed (Bridge Street at Corbins Mill/Schwan Falls Drive; Bridge Street at Franklin Street when it is extended to the north; Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway; Dublin Road and John Shields Parkway; Dublin Road and North High Street and Rock Cress Parkway; Post Road and Kilgour Place on OCLC property; and Post Road and Rock Cress Parkway at Schwan Falls) She said there will be roundabouts and street parking to create a vibrant street place.

Mr. Taylor asked about Rock Cress Parkway, which was a road he was not familiar with and asked if it was where Post Road was. Ms. Willis said they made up names for future streets.

Ms. Willis said a vibrant street accommodates on-street parking, fewer and narrower travel lanes, bike lanes, small intersections, and shorter crosswalks for ease and safety. She said the revised Short North area and Easton are very nice examples where the scale of streets creates a sense of a special place. She stated that all of these elements will contribute to slower vehicle speed making it safer for pedestrians exposed to traffic and will limit the amount of asphalt. She said no streets will be larger than Emerald Parkway and purposefully keeping future roundabouts smaller and constraining intersections.

Mr. Taylor apologized for interrupting the presentation again and stated this was old news for the Commission and asked if she could jump ahead to answer some of Amy Krumb's questions that were posed in a memo to staff.

Mr. Langworthy reminded the Commission that this is part of three presentations and may repeat what has been heard before but need to be reminded of from time to time. He reported that staff has discussed that they are immersed in this every single day. He asked for the Commission's patience and indulgence to step back a little bit and see them through this process to review the principles. He apologized if the information was redundant.

Ms. Willis thanked the Commission for listening and continued. She said grid lock is not acceptable; they need to strike a balance between vehicle level of service and other modes of travel.

Ms. Willis concluded that the Transportation plan analysis for BSD has been comprehensively done.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Ms. Willis for her presentation and invited questions.

Warren Fishman said he appreciated the work that was done, which gave him some confidence listening to her in what you have been saying, you understand.

Mr. Hardt said he would save his broad, general comments for the roundtable discussion.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment with respect to what was presented on transportation.

Scott Haring approached the podium but Ms. Amorose Groomes clarified that the comments she was inviting was for the Engineering presentation and not the State Bank case yet. [Hearing no request for comment from the public.]

3. State Bank Shamrock Boulevard and West Dublin-Granville Road
14-002BPR/CU Basic Plan Review/Conditional Use

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced the application for an 11,530-square-foot office building ("Loft" building type) to be constructed on a ±1.25-acre site that is currently part of an overall 2.85-acre parcel located at the northeast corner of Shamrock Boulevard and West Dublin-Granville Road that includes a retail banking and mortgage services facility and conditional use for a drive-through.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in those who intended to address the Commission in regards to this case including Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction; Mark Ford, Ford & Associates Architects; Matt Booms, State Bank; Jason Hockstock, Advanced Civil Design; Todd Faris, Faris Design & Planning; and City representatives.

Gary Gunderman presented this request for Basic Site Plan Review in anticipation of a future request for Site Plan Review. He presented an overview of the proposed site plan and explained the development is only taking place on the eastern portion of the parcel. He said the applicant plans to subdivide the development site from the overall parcel. Mr. Gunderman said that part of this is necessary to limit the front property line coverage requirement, which could not otherwise be met, but also because the applicant does not plan to develop the rest of the site themselves. Mr. Gunderman said one of the proposed conditions would require the plat to be completed before this project moves forward. He stated that a Development Plan Review is not required for this proposal.

Mr. Gunderman said as part of the Basic Site Plan Review, the Administrative Review Team (ART) recommends five actions by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC):

- 1) Basic Site Plan Review, based on the review criteria of section 153.066(F)(3);
- 2) Required reviewing body determination for the subsequent Site Plan Review;
- 3) Approval of two Waivers;
- 4) Approval of a Parking Plan; and
- 5) Approval of a Conditional Use for the bank drive-through.

Mr. Gunderman said the next step will be the submission of an application for Site Plan Review. He said that the Commission will need to determine whether the ART or the PZC will have final review authority. He said the subsequent preliminary and final plat will return to the PZC, who will then forward

recommendations on the plans to City Council. He said at that point, the applicant would be in a position to obtain a building permit.

Mr. Gunderman said the building is at the southern end of the property, and the northern edge has existing curb cuts onto Banker Drive. He pointed out the 48-space parking lot, which exceeds the maximum number of parking spaces permitted by the Zoning Code. He said the applicant will comment on their need for the additional parking.

Mr. Gunderman said comments from the City's architectural consultant for this project had been included in the Planning Report. He pointed out that the applicant had made a good deal of refinement on the architecture since the consultant's initial review, and the critical issues appear to have been addressed. He said the proposed building materials include stone, brick, glass, and in the recesses, some copper siding. He reported that the applicant brought material samples.

Mr. Gunderman presented the rear building elevation and the canopy for the drive-through. He explained that there were a few inconsistencies with the Code requirements that required action by the Commission. He stated that the ART recommends a Waiver for number of required entrances, since only one door is provided on the front (south) and rear (north) façades of the building, where two each are required by Code. Mr. Gunderman explained that the limited entrances are consistent with this type of business operation for security purposes.

Mr. Gunderman reported a drive-through is part of the proposal. He said that in the Bridge Street District, drive-throughs are permitted only for banks. He said the drive-through has been revised considerably since the ART's review to include more stacking spaces to address some of the ART's initial concerns. He said the ART had a fairly extended discussion about the drive-through configuration, but noted that this bank operates differently than many other banks, with very limited drive-through activity anticipated for this branch.

Mr. Gunderman referred to the pocket plaza in the southwest corner of the site and said that it currently exceeds the Code requirement for open space for this development.

Mr. Gunderman said the applicant had agreed to extend a pedestrianway through the block, providing a pedestrian connection between the pocket plaza on West Dublin-Granville Road to Banker Drive.

Mr. Gunderman reported the other requested Waiver is for a reduction in side yard setbacks for the drive-through speakers from 25 feet to approximately 10 feet. He asked the Commission to note the six-foot planting barrier that is incorporated along the east property line, which is required by Code to help screen the drive-through activity from the adjacent residence.

Mr. Gunderman provided a summary of the ART's comments. He pointed out that the applicant had provided a revised site plan showing the reconfigured drive-through stacking area with the number of parking spaces reduced to 45 spaces.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Gunderman for the presentation and invited the applicant to come forward.

Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction, 4790 Shuster Road, thanked the ART and Planning staff for their time and effort on this application. He said Mr. Gunderman had provided a good overview, and said his whole team was available to answer questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment.

Scott Haring, 3280 Lilly-Mar Court, said he walked past this property many times, and is in favor of the concept. He inquired about the sign on Banker Drive, at the corner of the Lowes lot, which states that Banker Drive is "Not a through street". He asked if it was going away and if it would be addressed this evening.

Barb Cox said small sections of Banker Drive that run through the Lowe's property is private, not a public right-of-way.

Amy Kramb asked if the intention was to make Banker Drive a public street to connect to the adjacent public street segments. She said at one point, the road appears to be about one foot from the Lowes building.

Ms. Cox responded in its current configuration, it could not meet the public street standards.

Ms. Kramb asked if this should be addressed in light of the desire to establish the grid network.

Ms. Cox said she was not sure whether this was something that the City would consider pursuing until the Lowes site redevelops.

Mr. Haring inquired about the trees on the site and asked if any trees would be lost as part of the development proposal.

Mr. Sanford said they had conducted a tree survey and worked with staff to evaluate the conditions. He said they determined there were 750 caliper inches of trees, most of which were invasive species and trees that were not in good condition. He said they understood there were some trees that would need to be replaced, and assured Mr. Haring they will save as much as possible.

Mr. Haring asked if the residential property to the east of the site was occupied. He said he lives in a home with a similar footprint and setback and was surprised to hear this commercial building could sit so close to an existing residence, which did not seem to fit the character of other developments in Dublin.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the requirements are specific for the Bridge Street District, which do not apply to the rest of the City of Dublin. She explained this area was rezoned and a new set of regulations apply to the Bridge Street District. She said it was her belief that there are very few areas where this condition would be present.

Ms. Kramb noted the closest point of the building is approximately 18 feet from the property line, and the line they could build to was five feet from the side property line.

Ms. Amorose Groomes clarified that in the Bridge Street District, redevelopment is expected to look significantly different from what exists today.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if anyone else from the public would like to speak with respect to this application. [There were none.]

Mr. Gunderman asked the applicant to comment on the anticipated drive-through operations.

Mr. Sanford remarked that the drive-through speakers were probably closer to 15 feet from the property line instead of 10 feet, and their plan is to have a six-foot evergreen hedge. He said the bank branch's primary business will be mortgages so they expect more customers by appointment than walk-ins. He said because State Bank is however a bank, they have to have a drive-through to appropriately serve their customers. He noted that if they were a traditional bank, he agreed they would need to provide more room for stacking in the drive-through.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant for the clarification and asked the Commission members to comment on the proposal.

Joe Budde said he was excited about the proposal and the building's position on West Dublin-Granville Road. He has had experience in the banking industry and he understands the challenges. He said he did not have a problem with the number of requested parking spaces. He said he liked the architecture and the attractive copper features.

Warren Fishman said the drive-through layout could be a problem if this was a normal bank, and although this applicant may not be concerned with having additional stacking spaces, if this bank were to turn over to a different bank, then there might be a problem. He said he wanted to make sure that the drive-through could handle the traffic of a traditional bank.

Mr. Sanford said informal surveys were done at other banks, and even other banks do not have the same drive-through volumes they did when they were built 10, 15 or 20 years ago, as the banking industry has evolved to conduct most business electronically. He reported that State Bank does not expect any more than six vehicles at a time in the drive-through, even if it did turnover at rates similar to a traditional bank. He said the building is not even large enough to hold a typical retail bank branch.

Mr. Fishman asked how the drive-through would be addressed if a new bank took the place of State Bank. He asked if the drive-through would be able to accommodate other banks with higher drive-through use rates.

Ms. Kramb said she banks close by at Fifth Third on a daily basis and has never been more than the third or fourth car in the ATM line. She said she has witnessed at most two cars in the teller line. Ms. Kramb said she supported both of the Waivers and the Conditional Use for the drive-through, as well as the parking plan request. She said in terms of the final reviewing body for the Site Plan Review, she thought the proposal needed to return to the Commission in lieu of the ART. She said the drive-through stacking and spacing seemed adequate. She said she did not think the drive-through canopy was very attractive, but she could get used to it. She said she did not care for the yellow painted bollards, and requested a more subtle color.

Ms. Kramb asked the applicant if it was their intent for customers exiting the drive-through to drive in front of the building. She thought it might cause circulation problems if these east/west drive aisles connect to the adjacent parcels. She said since the dimensions of the future buildings to the east and west are unknown, the drive aisle may need to curve north to accommodate a deeper building. She suggested an east west connection farther north on the property. She said she was concerned about potentially limiting adjacent development with this configuration.

Mr. Sanford said they had conducted capacity studies for a future building to the west to ensure that adequate parking and circulation could be provided. He pointed out that as a result of the front property line coverage requirements of the Code, a deep, narrow building was unlikely.

Ms. Kramb stated that the architecture was very plain and vertical, and questioned whether it was mischaracterized by the CAD drawings instead of the color renderings. She said she was most concerned with the amount of brick and glass with a little bit of cedar over the entrance.

Ms. Kramb asked about the street wall noted in the Planning Report but not shown in the renderings. She confirmed with Mr. Gunderman that the street wall was shown adjacent to the pocket plaza. She said she thought this area was most likely to be used as a break area for employees rather than a space intended to be used by the public.

John Hardt said his concern with the drive-through is not related to the applicant's use of the facility, but what will happen to it in the long-term.

Ms. Kramb pointed out that the conditional use for drive-throughs applies only to banks.

Mr. Hardt said his concern is what becomes of the site if the bank ever goes away. He said his fundamental issue is that this is a suburban site, with Bridge Street Code requirements. He said he did not mind the number of parking spaces, but he did want to see a parking lot designed to be shared. He said he preferred the whole block to develop cohesively. He referred to the figure on page 15 of the Bridge Street Code, showing blocks with building footprints and vehicular access and circulation.

Mr. Hardt stated that he was concerned with the dumpster positioned on Banker Drive. He commented on the location of the sanitary easement and said he was in favor of pushing the building back from the street a little bit due to the possibility of the streetscape and frontage changing over time. He asked if the building were located at the nearest portion of the required building zone.

Mr. Gunderman said the building was located within a foot or two of the nearest required building zone limit.

Mr. Hardt concluded that there is still quite a bit of work to be done with respect to this proposal. He deferred to Mr. Taylor on further comments on the architecture. He commented that the suggestions made by the City's architectural consultant should have been given more weight by the applicant and staff, since there were a number of legitimate comments, such as better expressing the parapet lines. He said the new renderings lack detail and the level of refinement that the Commission is seeking for projects in the Bridge Street District. He said he supported the Waiver requested for the number of required doors. He noted that the renderings appear to show a block at the base of the building and asked what kind of success the applicant has had with that material, particularly right up against sidewalks and whether it would be damaged by salt.

Mark Ford, Ford and Associates Architects, 1500 West First Avenue, said that salt has been a problem right up against the sidewalk but they have a space between the sidewalk and the base of the building where the majority of the salt would end up. He said the recessed portions of the building have patina copper panels.

Mr. Hardt said he was concerned with the patina copper as he has seen it used in other projects and it does not look as good after five years or so. He reiterated that the building seems very dark, and it was not clear to him whether that was a result of the renderings or the building's design.

Mr. Ford said they plan to use a modular brick, shown on the sample board. He said the intent was not to design a typical building that has been done before. He said the applicant intentionally selected simple, nice materials, working within the Code requirements for vertical elements, frontage requirements, and offsets to the facade. He explained that they used this as an opportunity to create different patterns so it did not read like a text book from end to end. He thanked the Commission for their comments and stated he believed the building could serve multiple purposes, long-term, for a variety of different users. He said the interior is set up to allow for multiple tenants. He said the comments about the east/west drive aisle make sense.

Mr. Hardt said he would rather grant numerous Waivers for a fantastic project than see architects forced into a box trying to design only to the Code regulations. He said the massing of the building and the brick work is good, but the detailing seems like it is simply an attempt to meet the letter of the Code. He said there is an opportunity to use materials that will give the building a little more character and pop.

Mr. Ford explained that he tried to accomplish this through the tan brick, off-white limestone, and cedar over both entranceways. He said they plan to use a fish scale pattern almost with the copper and by carving into the building by changing the materiality of the entranceway, certainly draws attention to the one door to make it clear where the building entrance is located.

Mr. Fishman asked where the air conditioner units would be located.

Mr. Ford responded that the condensing units would be on the ground. He noted the transformer on the ground that will need to be screened. He reported three small condensing units on the east and four on the west. He explained that their location on the ground was due to a desire for maintenance accessibility, and also due to the floor height requirements for a loft style building. He noted the parapet is less than two feet, which would not be enough to screen rooftop units.

Mr. Hardt asked if a roof screen could be used instead of raising the parapet.

Mr. Ford said they could, but it is cost prohibitive.

Mr. Fishman said he did not want to see a new building with noisy condenser units on the ground. Ms. Amorose Groomes and Mr. Hardt agreed with Mr. Fishman.

Mr. Gunderman reiterated that if the Commission is inclined to require that this project return to the Commission for Site Plan Review, these and the other site details could be addressed at that time; however, a decision on the Basic Plan Review is required this evening.

Richard Taylor said he was glad to see Mr. Haring attending tonight's meeting and wished the Commission received more public comment, especially on projects in the Bridge Street District. He stated that the building is generally an appropriate size and scale for the Bridge Street District. He asked if State Bank planned to move out of the Historic District, and if so, what the plans are for their existing building.

Matt Booms, State Bank, 109 South High Street, said there are no definitive plans for the current building, although there has been a lot of interest. Mr. Taylor said he was pleased to hear State Bank is expanding and growing.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Ford about the existing curb cuts on Banker Drive, and what impact they had on the site plan.

Mr. Ford said they had designed the parking lot to match up with them. He said the drive-through configuration was a challenge, as well as the depth of the lot.

Mr. Taylor suggested working with Engineering to move one or both of the curb cuts if it would make the site more efficient. He said that Mr. Hardt covered most of his comments on the drive-through, and agreed with concerns about future tenants.

Mr. Taylor requested clarification on the different dumpster locations. Mr. Ford said the dumpster had been moved several times as the drive-through had been reconfigured.

Mr. Taylor referred to the mid-block pedestrianway and said he believed it will be used more in the future, but not much now. He said it needs to be more than just a five-foot concrete walkway.

Mr. Taylor said the location of the building on the site is a big issue for him. He said moving away from suburban sprawl to a walkable urban model is one of the goals of the Bridge Street District, and one of the biggest ways to move in the right direction is to move buildings closer to the sidewalk to create a sense of space. He noted, however, that the uncertain future plans for West Dublin-Granville Road make

the proposed building location concerning. He said from his experience with the buildings on Bridge Street being so close to the roadway, he wanted to know about the future plans for State Route 161 before the building location is settled. He noted that, by setting the building back a bit farther it would allow future tenants to have more space to work with. He said the pocket plaza seems like an afterthought and does not envision the public using it, and was not sure if the Code required it at this time. He asked that the applicant not be so rigid in the site design to be unable to adapt to future development.

Mr. Taylor said that, upon reviewing the principles of walkable urbanism, he thought Mr. Meleca's review of the architecture was spot on, if maybe a little too far, although he acknowledged that it was a reaction to the original drawing. He commented that the building now seems to be somewhere in between, and said his only comment was that he did not need to see window sills on the windows, which he confirmed would have clear glass.

Ms. Kramb said now that better renderings had been presented, her concerns with the architecture had greatly diminished.

Mr. Taylor agreed that the condenser units should be placed on the roof, which will also make it easier for pedestrians to be able to walk around all sides of the building. He reiterated his concern that the building is too close to the street, which would make the sidewalk unsafe. He recommended landscaping around the building's foundation, instead of just turf grass.

Mr. Taylor confirmed that the applicant currently controls both development sites and suggested that the extra parking could be placed on the adjacent lot for now. Mr. Gunderman confirmed that the Code allows off-site parking to facilitate shared parking arrangements.

Mr. Taylor referenced the principles of walkable urbanism and stated that, with respect to the request for a Waiver for the number of entrances, he is okay without requiring a second entrance now because additional doors could easily be added in the future. He expressed his concern with the speaker setback as part of the second Waiver, but he did not believe that the existing adjacent residence will remain. Mr. Taylor confirmed with Mr. Gunderman that there is a noise ordinance in place to address speaker volume.

Mr. Taylor said he was fine with the conditional use for the drive-through but agreed with the other Commissioners' comments on the work still to be done on the site design. He concluded that, with this level of review and the comments discussed this evening, this is exactly what he had hoped the Commission would be doing when reviewing projects in the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that, for any building in the Bridge Street District where the façade does not directly engage the sidewalk, there needs to be foundation plantings. She appreciated the applicant's efforts in adhering to the Code requirements, but commented that applicants should not hesitate to design great buildings and bring them to the Commission to review, regardless of how well they meet the Code. She said engaging the street is the goal, regardless of how the Code is written.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she was not sure she liked the idea of the pocket plaza being built in the location it's shown right now, because it seems like a whole lot of nothing. Instead, she recommended waiting until the balance of the property comes forward for development, and planning the open spaces at that time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes reiterated the Commission's desire for well-designed buildings and sites. She said she was not sure she supported a lot split for this site, since she preferred that this block develop cohesively.

Mr. Sanford stated that the lot split was a necessity, since State Bank is not a developer and will need to be able to split the parcel to be able to sell it to someone else to develop.

Mr. Ford thanked the Commission for their comments. He acknowledged that the Code requires staff and the ART to evaluate projects generally based on a checklist, which they followed as best as they could, and said he would look at where deviations from the Code may be appropriate.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she hoped the applicant understood how challenging it is to create Code that applies to every piece of property in the Bridge Street District, and there is no way to foresee how the Code requirements will apply to every project. She said she believed the applicant might have followed the letter of the Code, while the Commission would like for them to achieve the *intent* of the Code. She said this project is not that far off from where it needs to be.

Mr. Ford said the applicant agrees with the intent of the Code, so now it is just a matter of process. He said that as part of working with the ART, they tried to be in a position of coming to the Commission with as few Waivers as possible to demonstrate their desire to meet the Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes urged the applicant to not be afraid of Waivers if the product will be better as a result.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that the intent of the Basic Plan Review is to determine if the building is generally sited on the correct part of the lot, and not necessarily to nail down all the details. He understood there may be additional Waivers as this project moves forward.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she appreciated the applicant's efforts on this project to this point.

Motion and Vote

MOTION #1: Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the following two Waivers:

- 1) Code Section 153.059(C)(4)(C)6 – A reduction in side yard setback for the drive-through speakers from 25 feet to approximately 10 feet.
- 2) Code Section 153.062(O)(4)(d)3 – Only one door on the front (south) and rear (north) facades of the building, where two each are required.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

MOTION #2: Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Budde seconded, to approve the conditional use for a bank drive-through with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant modifies the drive-through ATM stacking spaces to ensure appropriate circulation.

*Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction, agreed to the above condition.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

MOTION #3: Mr. Budde moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the Parking Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant provides a summary of their parking needs, including number of employees and anticipated customer parking needs.

*Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction, agreed to the above condition.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

MOTION #4: Mr. Taylor moved, Ms. Kramb seconded, to approve the Basic Plan Review (Site Plan Review) with six conditions:

- 1) That, as part of the Site Plan Review, the applicant address the Commission's comments and provide additional details for:
 - a. The mid-block pedestrianway;
 - b. The pocket plaza open space area;
 - c. The perimeter buffer landscaping along the east property line adjacent to the drive-through;
 - d. The street wall, showing a relationship to the principal building; and
 - e. Other architectural, landscaping, and site development details noted in this report.
- 2) That the applicant subdivides the existing 2.85-acre parcel prior to building permitting, or seeks approval of a Waiver from the Planning and Zoning Commission for the front property line coverage requirement;
- 3) That the applicant provide cross-access easements for future vehicular use areas to the east and west of the site as part of the subdivision of this lot prior to building permitting;
- 4) That the applicant provide a legal description and exhibit for a portion of the sanitary sewer easement to be vacated, and that the easement is vacated prior to building permitting;
- 5) That the stacking lanes associated with the drive-through are modified subject to Planning approval to accommodate appropriate stacking, ensuring that banking teller drive-through traffic does not block ATM traffic; and
- 6) That the applicant addresses Engineering's comments in this report.

*Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction, agreed to the six conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Motion #5: Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to require Site Plan Review by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, no; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 1)

Communications

Steve Langworthy said Riviera Club is on the schedule for March 13, 2014, and the City will be streaming it live over the web and an overflow out into the hallway as they are expecting a larger than normal crowd. He said if a media inquiry is received, to handle any way they wished but the Commission has the option to send to Sue Burness; most will know who she is and you will not need to provide contact information. He said if any written communications are received and not addressed to the City, to please forward to us to ensure they reach City Council. Mr. Langworthy said we are keeping associations informed about this and creating a webpage to include most of the application information, maps, site plan, concept plan, etc. He said we are going above and beyond for communication due to the relevant amount of attention this case is getting. He said the conference brochure for March 20, 2014, in Birmingham, Michigan was placed in the drop box late today and asked if anyone was interested, to please contact him as soon as possible.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not able to attend but was very interested in the two-day tack on to the EPA Conference in Savannah, Georgia. She said it is an opportunity to walk a very upscale urban area, hosted by the Planning Director to answer detailed questions. Mr. Langworthy suggested she inform him of things like this and he would make arrangements.

Mr. Langworthy said Libby Farley had retired and a party is planned for next Tuesday at 5800 Building from 2 pm – 4 pm.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was open to suggestions for commemorating Mr. Fishman's last meeting on March 13, 2014. She said the meeting on March 5th might be better.

Mr. Langworthy said Dan Phillabaum's last day was this past Tuesday but he requested no cake and he was probably on his way to his parent's home in Florida by now for a visit.

Commission Roundtable Discussion

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she recalled Mr. Hardt reserving comments about the Engineering Presentation for roundtable.

Mr. Hardt said he reserved his comments for roundtable because they are general in nature and not to be directed at Jeannie Willis. He said there are two fundamental aspects: we have got to figure out the traffic in BSD. He hopes to see some specifics when addressing Amy Kramb's letter. He said the sum total of applications that they have seen thus far is considerably more than the vision plan quantity. He said he is not that comfortable voting in favor of any of those proposals until we have confidence that the City's basic infrastructure can support it. He said the generalities that we studied it, it works, is not what the Commission is asking for. He said he has heard that the street grid is essential to make everything work and the connectivity of the street grid is essential to disperse the trips across the grid. He said he accepts and agrees with that reality but cannot reconcile it with the applications. He said very single proposal violates or tosses aside the street grid.

Mr. Langworthy said those were fair points and need to be discussed further.

Mr. Taylor said he will have a difficult time approving a project that in terms of its physical presence, engages the street, which would involve the buildings and green spaces when we do not know the nature of the street. He noted the green way that has been on the drawing since the Vision Plan was passed in 2010 and wondered why it was not thoroughly completed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was frustrated when she was not seeing streets labeled, A, B, C, etc. with their corresponding details. She recalled the problems incurred when evaluating the Edwards project. She stated she does not understand how we can do a traffic study when we do not know what the streets are.

Ms. Kramb said it is listed in the Nelson/Nygaard study. She said they have not heard this from Engineering but it sounds like they are moving forward with street "families". She said this is out there but the Commission has not been told this is what is accepted and this is what we are moving forward with. She said the Commission has only seen theory.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that once it leaves here, it goes to building permits which has not allowed for even City Council to weigh in on new density numbers. She said she is only comfortable with what the City has approved, not what the study show it will bear. She believes there needs to be an engaged active community dialogue and just because the studies show it will bear it, is it desirable.

Mr. Fishman said he agreed with everything that has been said so far and noted he paused when the Traffic Engineer said how important the grid system is to determine turn lanes and such when every application they have had has violated the grid system. He said he is concerned they can really go astray if they do not stick to something.

Mr. Taylor asked how transit is defined as right now it sounds like COTA and nothing else and he recalls “blue sky” discussions early on. He asked if we were looking beyond COTA and bicycles.

Mr. Langworthy stated other options are being considered.

Mr. Taylor said they are supposed to be thinking 21st century so some right-of-way somewhere should be in place, other than just the possibility of buses. He said a big part of walkable urbanism is transit. He suggests we at least just allow for it, when it is time.

Mr. Langworthy said it is a “Chicken or the Egg” discussion.

Ms. Amorose Groomes remarked there is no shortage of things to think about or work to be done.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anything further. [Hearing none.] She adjourned the meeting at 10:32 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on March 13, 2014.