



**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

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 23, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; and Laura Ball, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer, Landscape Architect; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: None were present.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the October 16, 2014, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATION

**1. Zoning Code Amendment – Bridge Street District
13-095ADMC**

Zoning Code Amendment

Rachel Ray said this is a request for amendments to the Bridge Street District (BSD) Zoning Code regulations focusing on Code Sections 153.057 through 153.066. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council regarding proposed Zoning Code amendments under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232 and 153.234.

Ms. Ray provided an overview of the timeline for this Zoning Code amendment, which began last September with amendments to Section 153.066, Review and Approval Procedures and Criteria for the BSD. She explained that the Planning and Zoning Commission had completed a comprehensive review of the entire BSD Code on July 10th and September 11th, and the Architectural Review Board had also reviewed the Code on September 24th and made a recommendation of approval at their meeting the previous evening (October 22nd). Ms. Ray stated that a recommendation from the Administrative Review Team was requested at today's meeting, which would be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their final recommendation to City Council at their special meeting scheduled for October 29, 2014.

Ms. Ray stated that in addition to the Board and Commission reviews of the proposed BSD Zoning Code amendment, Planning had a consultant, Justin Goodwin with MKSK Studios, also review the Code. She explained that Mr. Goodwin was asked to review the Code for both technical aspects as well as to ensure the original intent of the form-based regulations is maintained with the proposed modifications. She noted that she had also coordinated with Mr. Perkins on any potential changes recommended to the fire access provisions in the Street Types section, for example, and had met with Mr. Hahn and Ms. Ball on the Open Space Types and Landscaping & Tree Preservation sections to discuss some of the proposed amendments for which individual ART members might have a specific interest.

Ms. Ray summarized that most of the recent updates have been more on the technical side, in terms of clarifying language, changing "BSC" to "BSD," etc. She highlighted some of the more substantive changes that were made, in addition to a few changes requested by the Commission on which Planning did not recommend that the Code be changed. She stated that two of the graphics in the Code were being modified; she presented the Street Network map and highlighted the proposed modifications, as well as the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District graphics, which was modified slightly to be consistent with the zoning district boundaries.

Mr. Langworthy stated that he would like the ART to discuss the proposed Code amendments recommended by the Commission, and others on which the ART members would like to comment. He asked Ms. Ray to provide a more detailed overview of each of the proposed amendments recommended by the Commission that Planning suggested should not be changed.

Table 153.059-A: Permitted and Conditional Uses in BSD Zoning Districts

Ms. Ray stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission requested that "Dwelling, Multiple-Family" be changed from "P, Permitted" to "U, Permitted on Upper Floor Only" in the BSD Office and BSD Office Residential Districts. She said the amendment as proposed is not recommended because limiting the use to upper stories only throughout the entire zoning district appears to be inconsistent with the intent of the BSD Office Residential District to "accommodate a mix of office and multiple-family residential development at higher densities and in larger buildings." Ms. Ray stated that with respect to the BSD Office District, there are several larger parcels with this zoning district that may subdivide in the future, and there may be acceptable configurations of ground-floor residential uses.

Ms. Ray stated that in lieu of amending the use table, Planning proposed a use-specific standard (Code Section 153.059(C)(1)(c)) that prohibits ground-story multiple-family dwelling units when the dwelling units directly front a Principal Frontage Street in these zoning districts.

Steve Langworthy questioned the Commission's intent with proposing the amendment to the use table that restricts ground-floor multiple-family dwelling units in these districts. He suggested that on Principal Frontage Streets, residential developments could provide leasing offices, fitness facilities, clubhouses, coffee shops, etc. instead of dwelling units.

The ART members discussed the locations of the BSD Office and BSD Office Residential zoning districts and agreed that the proposed amendment, as recommended by Planning, was appropriate.

Code Section 153.065(D)(3)(c), Street Trees and Structural Soil; and Section 153.065(D)(5)(c)2A, Interior Landscaping and Structural Soil

Ms. Ray reported the Commission discussed the proposed amendments to the requirements in the Site Development Standards Section 153.065(D), Landscaping and Tree Preservation for structural soils for street trees and around parking lot islands. She said the proposed language has been reviewed and the following changes have been requested by the City Forester and the Director of Parks & Open Space to reflect the appropriate application for street trees and interior landscaping conditions:

- That topsoil or other planting medium approved by the City Forester be used for street trees and parking lot landscaping trees;
- For street trees, structural soil or an equivalent material approved by the City Forester shall be placed under paved areas adjacent to tree wells or planting beds parallel to and behind the curb, and connecting planting beds or tree wells to one another beneath the paved surface within the streetscape planting zone;

- The City Forester may require additional structural soil to extend horizontally beyond the planting zone beneath sidewalks or other paved surfaces, as necessary to ensure the long-term health of street trees, depending on the planting and paving conditions within individual street types;
- Similarly, trees in parking lot islands shall be planted in topsoil approved by the City Forester. The City Forester may require structural soil to be placed beneath paved areas surrounding the peninsula or island, as necessary to ensure the long-term health of trees, depending on the planting and paving conditions; and
- Structural soil shall not be used in planting beds.

Laura Ball said supplemental literature she and the City Forester gathered is available to support the above proposals, as well as information about topsoil that are appropriate for urban environments.

Fred Hahn asked if there is a composition make-up or formula for structural soil and where the argument is for legitimacy of heavily amended soil in severe conditions where perhaps there is clay that is not conducive for anything to thrive.

Barb Cox asked for clarification on the use of structural soils in parking lots.

Ms. Ball reported an expert on this topic she had recently heard speak about structural soils advocated their use to connect linear planting areas, or provide a route to connect to natural, non-paved areas.

Ms. Shelly asked if an entire parking lot should be all structural soil or should each tree have a buffer zone. She pointed out that there is already a requirement of a minimum of 10 feet for interior landscape islands, which gives trees planted in landscape islands quite a bit of space.

Ms. Ball explained that if a planting area is tied into a lawn, structural soil is not needed for that planting area. She said landscaping in a large parking lot needs a water system corridor for the roots.

Mr. Hahn referred to a previous case that the ART had reviewed for which this topic was discussed. He asked if a true island not connected to an adjacent lawn needs a corridor that leads to green open space somewhere.

Ms. Ball said there are some islands that are large enough that would not need the extra connection through structural soils.

Ms. Shelly asked if a large island with a minimum width of 10 feet and a total area of 300 square feet was enough for the trees to thrive. She pointed out that large consolidated landscape islands are required to be a minimum of 36 feet wide and 1,300 square feet total.

Ms. Ball said that the space requirements in the Code for interior parking lot landscaping are sufficient without requiring the use of structural soils.

Ms. Ray confirmed that the proposed language regarding these two sections of the landscape requirements are acceptable as proposed.

Ms. Shelly suggested that the "Director of Parks and Open Space" be added to the "City Forester" in terms of who may require structural soils, depending on planting and paving conditions.

Mr. Hahn said education on this topic is needed, recognizing that what exists today may not be good in the future.

Ray Harpham asked if there was a definition for structural soil or if it was a generic reference.

Ms. Ball said she believed that there is something we may be able to use.

Ms. Ray stated that the definitions are being updated separately, so Planning could work with Ms. Ball to develop an appropriate definition.

Mr. Langworthy suggested that rather than having to amend the Definitions section separate, something like, "Structural soils, for the purposes of this section, are defined as..." could be added to this particular Code section.

Figure 153.061-A, Bridge Street Corridor Street Network

Ms. Ray stated there was a revised street network map for Section 153.061-A reflecting more recent construction and decisions by Council, and made note of the following:

- The second vehicular bridge across the Scioto River where the pedestrian bridge is planned, was eliminated consistent with the Thoroughfare Plan;
- The street network east of Riverside Drive was reconfigured based on the general street network of the Bridge Park East Basic Development Plan;
- A "T" intersection at Tuller Road and (existing) Village Parkway was created;
- The "Tuller Ridge Drive" label was removed from the north/south portion of that roadway (renamed to Dale Drive);
- Dale Drive was eliminated as a principal frontage street south of SR 161;
- The street network north of Bridge Street at Franklin Street in the Historic District was clarified; and
- The boundaries of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District were changed.

Mr. Hahn referred to the travel path of Post Road/future "Rock Cress Parkway" and requested that the location of the roadway be adjusted slightly to reflect the location of the overhead sewer line crossing of the Indian Run.

Mr. Langworthy referred to North Riverview Street and its future extension north to serve development at 94 & 100 North High Street and provide park access.

Ms. Ray pointed out that the street network map does not include alleys and service streets, which is how the North Riverview Street extension would function, but she could show a green arrow pointing north, suggesting a future road connection of some type.

The ART members discussed whether to show this roadway extension and agreed that the arrow extension was the best solution.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended to forward these amendments to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.

Alan Perkins said in general, he was satisfied with the plan and reported he was in the process of reviewing the Fire Code for outside the BSD and said there may be some conflicts. He said he is concerned with buildings being pushed too far back from the street, since it is their proximity to the right-of-way and the number of street connections that gives significant benefit in terms of fire accessibility. He explained the farther back from the street access, the harder it is for fire apparatus to reach. He said a 40-foot setback is pushing the limit of the Fire Department's ability to reach buildings.

Ms. Ray said under the Open Space Section 153.064, criteria were added for when fee in lieu is appropriate.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the calculations for evaluating requests for payment of fee in lieu of dedicating open space may need to be adjusted. Mr. Hahn said it is a challenge to anticipate the use of a particular open space, and that the fee should be appropriate to its future use once the land is developed.

Ms. Shelly suggested another way to calculate the fee (based on open space studies) to be based on the footprint and then when a certain density level is reached, the fee requirement is increased.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this request for amendments to the Bridge Street District Zoning Code [There were none.] Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval for Zoning Code Amendments to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council, with the modifications noted to the Street Network Map and structural soil provisions of 153.065(D)(3)(c) and 153.065(D)(5)(c).

ADMINISTRATIVE

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. Ms. Ray provided an overview of the special Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to informally discuss the Bridge Park East project.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.