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

OCTOBER 29, 2014

AGENDA

1. Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District
13-095ADMC **Zoning Code Amendment**
(Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair, Chris Amorose Groomes, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were, Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, John Hardt, Victoria Newell, Todd Zimmerman, and City Council Representative Amy Salay. City representatives present were Philip Hartmann, Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Rachel Ray, Joanne Shelly, Dana McDaniel, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

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

Motion and Vote
Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve the September 18, 2014, meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote
Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve the 2015 – 2016 meeting dates as amended. The July 16, 2015, meeting was removed from the list of proposed meeting dates. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said there was only one case on the agenda this evening. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] The Chair provided a brief overview of the meeting for the benefit of the high school students in attendance. She explained the Commission has been in the process over the last several months of revising the Bridge Street District zoning regulations that guide the development of an urban, walkable district, which we have a vision for in the core of our city. She described the location of the Bridge Street District, which is generally located around the riverfront, extending from I-270 to Sawmill Road. She said the Commission is going to be talking about the rules, or Zoning Code requirements, that will govern development in that area; addressing the Zoning Code issues that they have seen come up; and some changes the Commission felt were important to address while revising the Code.

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

The Chair, Ms. Amorose Groomes, introduced this application for review and recommendation to City Council regarding proposed Zoning Code Amendments to the Bridge Street District (BSD) Zoning Code focusing on Code Sections 153.057 through 153.066.

Rachel Ray indicated she had prepared a brief presentation. She stated that Planning requests a recommendation to City Council this evening. Ms. Ray summarized the request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for their first reading on November 17, 2014, for the proposed BSD Code amendments. She reported City Council had requested that the BSD Code amendments be ready for Council's review prior to the end of the year.

Ms. Ray provided the process background:

- BSD Zoning Code amendment process began in September, 2013
- PZC reviewed on July 10 and September 11, 2014
- ARB reviewed on September 24, 2014
- Revised draft includes staff, ARB, and PZC comments as well as a consultant's recommendations
- ARB reviewed and provided a recommendation on October 22, 2014
- ART reviewed and provided a recommendation on October 23, 2014

Ms. Ray said the reviews have covered Code Sections 153.057 through 153.066, and she would highlight some of the recommendations. She stated she would not go into great detail with her presentation, and pointed out that a more detailed summary was included in the report.

153.057 – 058: General Purpose & BSD Districts Scope and Intent

Ms. Ray stated that the majority of the modifications made in this section were technical.

153.059: Uses

Ms. Ray explained that this section needed more discussion and clarification, including the Existing Uses provisions. Ms. Ray said the Commission had requested that "Dwelling, Multiple-Family" Uses be restricted to "U", upper stories only, in the BSD Office and BSD Office Residential zoning districts. She reported that upon Planning's review, the proposed limitation of multiple-family dwellings to upper stories in the BSD Office and BSD Office Residential districts is not recommended as this is inconsistent with the intent of these districts as described in Section 153.058, to "accommodate a mix of office and multiple-family residential development at higher densities and in larger buildings." Ms. Ray noted the two zoning districts in question on the zoning map. She stated that Planning recommended modifying the provision slightly to require that "multiple-family uses are not permitted on ground floor elevations fronting Principal Frontage Streets in the BSD Office Residential and Office districts." She explained buildings could have a clubhouse, fitness facilities, and coffee shops, etc. on ground floor elevations facing the principal frontage streets instead.

Amy Kramb asked why only those two districts were specified. Ms. Ray stated that "Dwelling, Multiple-Family Uses" are permitted on both upper stories and ground floors in the other districts.

153.060: Lots and Blocks

Ms. Ray stated that the majority of the modifications made in this section were technical.

153.061: Street Types

Ms. Ray stated that minor clarifications, new references, and the BSD Street Network Map were revised in this section. She presented the amended map and highlighted the changes:

- Reconfigured street network east of Riverside Drive based on the general street network of the Bridge Park East Basic Development Plan;

- Created a "T" intersection at Tuller Road and (existing) Village Parkway;
- Removed the "Tuller Ridge Drive" label form the north/south portion of that roadway (renamed Dale Drive);
- Eliminated Dale Drive as a principal frontage street south of SR 161;
- Eliminated the second vehicular bridge across the Scioto River where the pedestrian bridge is planned, consistent with the Thoroughfare Plan; and
- Clarified the street network north of Bridge Street at Franklin Street in the Historic District.

Ms. Ray said the ART had some additional recommendations at their meeting on October 23:

- Provided a little arrow to the north to indicate the future vehicular connection extension of North Riverview Street (not terminating anywhere); and
- Changed the label of John Shields Parkway to Dale Drive since that change has been approved as the Dale Drive connector is currently under construction.

Ms. Ray pointed out that a note had been added to the map referencing the future Post Road extension where it crosses the South Fork Indian Run. She explained the Director of Parks and Open Space requested that a note be made that the approximate location was intended to be at the location of the overhead sewer line that passes through that area. She said the actual improvements will be designed and determined through the Capital Improvements Programming process.

153.062: Building Types

Ms. Ray summarized the following amendments to the general building type requirements section:

- Enhanced conditions for modifications to Existing Structures;
- Minor clarifications; and
- Last week the ARB referred to the roof materials and suggested that the term "pitched" be added to indicate where asphalt composite shingles should be applied.

163.062(O): Individual Building Type Tables

Ms. Ray summarized the following amendments to the individual building type requirement table section:

- Clarified requirements for single-family detached units in the ARB district;
- Added notes regarding the approval process for buildings with parking structures;
- Increased transparency requirements for Loft building types from 30 percent to 60 percent on street facing facades, as recommended by the outside consultant; and
- The ARB requested that the word "rectangular" be replaced with "open" in the fifth footnote on parking structure opacity requirements.

153.063: Neighborhood District Standards

Ms. Ray stated that the majority of the modifications made in this section were technical. She noted that amendments to the BSD Sawmill Center Neighborhood District graphic were also made to coincide with the zoning district boundaries and clarify the (limited) locations where the Commercial Center building type is permitted (only on the north side of the east/west portion of Village Parkway -future "Bridge Park Avenue" and along Sawmill Road).

153.064: Open Space Types

Ms. Ray provided an overview of the amendments to the Open Space Types section:

- Added review criteria for requests to pay a fee in lieu of dedicating open space;
- Allowing an applicant to pay a fee in lieu of dedicating open space if the required amount of open space is less than the smallest open space type permitted in that zoning district, with approval of the Director of Parks and Open Space; and
- Clarifications to public art and site furnishings.

153.065(A)-(I): Site Development Standards (Purpose & Applicability; Parking & Loading; Stormwater Management; Landscaping & Tree Preservation; Fences, Walls, & Screening; Exterior Lighting; Utility Undergrounding & Screening; Signs; and Walkability Standards)
Ms. Ray stated that she grouped all of the Site Development Standards subsections together on this slide. She highlighted the following amendments:

- Added intent statements;
- Parking amendments include new shopping center calculation;
- Structural soil involves two sections in the landscape provisions: 1) Street Trees; and 2) Parking Lot Landscaping. She said there were extensive discussions with the City Forester and the Director of Parks and Open Space to make sure the language proposed is exactly how trees should be planted and maintained, and the ART recommended the Director of Parks and Open Space could also review the proposed planting medium;
- Exterior lighting and Master Sign Plan clarifications; and
- New Walkability Standards subsection was added to emphasize pedestrians should be at the center of site designs.

153.066: Review and Approval Procedures and Criteria
Ms. Ray stated that this section had been previously amended in December 2013, so very few amendments were proposed. She noted that there were a few modifications to the procedure table, and a few clarifications to the Development Plan Review criteria.

Ms. Ray concluded that a recommendation of approval to City Council for first reading on November 17 of this request for an amendment to the Zoning Code for the Bridge Street District zoning regulations was requested, including the amendments to the regulations as recommended by the ARB and the ART, and the amendments to the Street Network Map as recommended by the ART.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed with the Commissioners that they would continue with their page-by-page review process.

153.057-058: General Purpose & BSD Districts Scope and Intent
John Hardt inquired about the BSD Area Plan noted on page 1. Ms. Ray confirmed the document was part of the Community Plan.

Richard Taylor, Mr. Hardt, and Ms. Kramb suggested grammatical changes.

153.059: Uses
Ms. Kramb questioned the intent and what was meant by “neighborhood districts. Ms. Ray said it was to set the neighborhood zoning districts apart as areas with concentrated activity nodes.

Mr. Hardt, Mr. Taylor, and Ms. Kramb requested grammatical changes.

Mr. Hardt inquired about the provisions for an Abandonment of an Existing Use. Ms. Ray clarified it referred to the land and not the individual buildings.

Mr. Hardt questioned the Permitted and Conditional Uses Table. He said as it is written, the BSD Residential District forbids a lot of neighborhood commercial uses. He asked if it made sense to create another category of uses, such as those permitted in the district, but only if it resides within a mixed-use building and not in a free-standing building.

Ms. Ray said the table could be revised to allow additional uses. She confirmed the Commission agreed on the intent for smaller scale uses, and the uses on the table they thought would be appropriate.

Mr. Taylor and Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed it was a good idea.

Mr. Hardt suggested *Daycare*, potentially *Educational Facility* (depending on how it is defined*), Religious Facilities, Animal Care, Banks, Exercise and Fitness, Office (general and medical), Eating and Drinking Establishments, Farmers Market*, *Retail* and *Personal Services*.

Ms. Newell suggested that the uses be permitted as Conditional Uses.

Ms. Ray noted that Planning would need to take a look at the building types as well to ensure that building types allowing for commercial uses are also permitted in the BSD Residential District.

Ms. Amorose Groomes emphasized the need for religious facilities being included in these districts for public assembly, as they add a lot of activity all through the week and often serve as architectural as well as community focal points.

Ms. Kramb inquired about the text being deleted on page 14 under "*Dwelling, Townhouses*" as it was still in the table on page 57. Ms. Ray said the provision for townhomes was deleted as it is no longer a use-specific standard.

Ms. Kramb questioned the Building Types footnote that read "no more than eight single-family units" still on page 57. She asked if we were getting rid of that requirement as well, since they seemed to be referring to the same thing. Ms. Ray said the intent was to delete it from both the Uses and the Building Type Table; therefore, the third footnote on page 57 should be deleted.

Mr. Hardt asked if there was no longer a limit and if so, why. Ms. Ray said she remembered the Commission's discussion at the September meeting and would check back to the intent.

Mr. Taylor asked if the goal was to prevent someone from building a large building of residential units across the street from detached single-family units. Everyone agreed that was the original intent. Ms. Ray stated that the provision would be maintained as written.

Mr. Hardt referenced the use specific standards for **(c) Eating and Drinking** on page 16 of 190. He pointed out that the two subparagraphs taken together seem to indicate that if someone were to build a multi-use building, they could build up to a 10,000-square-foot restaurant. He said if they were to build a single-tenant building, they could also build up to 10,000 square feet, which seems to discourage mixed-use buildings.

Ms. Ray said previously, Eating and Drinking uses had been prohibited across the board in the BSD Office, BSD Office Residential, and BSD Residential District. She explained that given the Commission's more recent discussions on allowing more commercial uses in these districts, Planning had recommended allowing greater square footages by conditional use if the Commission determined that the use, location, and site arrangement were appropriate.

Mr. Hardt asked about the intent, and if they were trying to limit the size of the eating/drinking establishments.

Ms. Ray agreed the intent was to limit commercial uses in those districts in particular. She said when the Code was first written they wanted to concentrate the larger commercial uses in the Neighborhood Districts where they expected a lot more activity, while still recognizing you could have small neighborhood-scale restaurants and offices, etc. elsewhere in the Bridge Street District.

Mr. Hardt said there are very few restaurants at 10,000 square feet. He suggested that a lower number would be more appropriate and suggested re-evaluating these paragraphs so there does not appear to be an advantage for a single-use building in these districts.

Ms. Newell said she contacted someone she knew that designs restaurants, and determined that the typical square footage of a restaurant is between 3,500 and 5,000 square feet. She stated that while some could reach 7,000 square feet, very few are any larger than that.

Ms. Ray stated Planning would take another look at this section.

Mr. Taylor inquired about **Retail, General**. He asked for clarification on the intent. The Commissioners recommended that it be re-written for clarity.

Mr. Hardt asked about the **Outdoor Dining and Seating** requirement of five feet and asked if that was clear enough. The Commissioners determined that a six-foot clear area was more appropriate to allow for two-way pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Taylor asked how clearance to the street trees was measured and suggested further research as some have mulched beds while others have tree grates, etc.

Mr. Langworthy agreed the six-foot standard allows for justification, because it is also the ADA standard.

153.060: Lots and Blocks

Block Access Configurations

Mr. Hardt asked if the block access configuration requirements referencing driveways should specifically include parking garages.

Ms. Ray said the entrance to a parking garage is considered to be a “driveway” and is therefore already covered by the text as written.

153.061: Street Types

Street Network – Street Types

Mr. Taylor said he thought the City should determine the street types for development projects, and not the developers. Ms. Ray agreed to clarify the references in this section to clarify that the City Engineer shall make the determination and not the developer.

Street Network Map

Mr. Hardt questioned the need for the descriptions of each of the different street types within the text of the Street Types requirements once all the red text is deleted. Ms. Ray explained these were just definitions of the different street types, and the deleted text had been relocated to the beginning of the section instead of repeated with each of the individual street types.

153.062: Building Types

Reconstruction or Movement

Mr. Zimmerman referred to the provisions for Existing Structures and pointed out that it did not seem like there was a period of time indicated by which an Existing Structure should be reconstructed and completed if damaged or destroyed by an act of God.

Ms. Ray explained that the abandonment provisions under Code Section 153.066 would apply if work was not completed or continued.

Determination of Building Types
Mr. Hardt asked if the determination of building type for an Existing Structure required a vote by the required reviewing body. Ms. Ray said it's not clear in the Code, however we would want the determination on record.

153.062-A Permitted Building Types
Ms. Kramb asked that Mixed-Use Building be included under Residential, as discussed earlier when talking about allowing commercial uses in the BSD Residential and BSD Office Residential districts.

Shopping Corridors
Mr. Hardt asked that "may" be changed to "encourage" and all agreed.

Pitched Roof
Ms. Kramb asked that a redundant sentence be removed. Mr. Hardt suggested that "ground level" be changed to "all directions" in terms of the visibility of pitched roofs without close ridges.

Materials – Façade Materials
Mr. Taylor questioned the use of lap siding on the upper stories of buildings. The Commission determined that lap siding should be limited to the first and second story of a building, unless determined to be architecturally appropriate.

Mr. Hardt asked about the point at which there is enough glass on a building for it to be considered a primary material. He recommended that the Code be modified to reference generic, industry-accepted terms for consistency when speaking of primary and secondary materials.

Roof Materials
The Commissioners agreed that all roof and wall penetrations shall be concealed from principal frontage streets.

Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies
Mr. Taylor asked that "Windows in masonry <u>buildings</u>..." be changed to masonry <u>walls</u>.

Balconies, Porches, Stoops, and Chimneys
Mr. Taylor stated that with respect to Stoops, the word "may" should be added to indicate that stoops may be located on the front "and/or" corner side facades of the building. He referenced Chimneys and Vents and suggested adding Chimneys "on exterior walls" shall extend..." and adding "Vents shall be finished to match the color of the exterior wall" and "must be treated as architectural elements".

Signs
Mr. Taylor requested the word "location" be added to "...in terms of design, color scheme, and lighting."

Individual Building Type Requirements – Building Siting General Requirements – Buildable Area
Mr. Hardt and Ms. Kramb requested clarification for side and rear setbacks applicable to open spaces.

Façade Transparency
Ms. Ray clarified the intent of the statement noting that "blank windowless walls are prohibited" means they would encourage ornamentation and not a blank wall, but not necessarily just "windowless."

Building Types Tables – Size-Limited Uses
Ms. Kramb suggested there be size limitations in general added to the building types. She explained her concern is that there is enough space left on a development site for outdoor spaces such as patios, seating areas, and other gathering spaces.

Mr. Hardt said restaurants do not want their patios in the public right-of-way because of liquor licensing.

Mr. Hardt raised a general question about restricting the *size* of residential buildings because some have been proposed that are take up an entire city block. He indicated he was also concerned with the quantity of residential units in each building

Ms. Amorose Groomes said a size limit was definitely needed.

Ms. Ray said there are some strategies to address these concerns. She explained the midblock pedestrianway requirement, which requires blocks to be broken down to a pedestrian scale, which eliminates the problem of buildings that take up an entire city block, unless there have publicly accessible interior passages.

Ms. Kramb said she had a similar concern with achieving a significant level of *diversity* of buildings. She asked if there could be a matrix that shows a developer that they cannot just build the same building over and over, just like what is expected for housing developments.

Ms. Ray said that is why there are building types and building diversity requirements.

Ms. Kramb emphasized the Commission is not getting variety and stated something is missing in the Code that is not suggesting enough variety.

Ms. Newell said "variety" can be difficult to judge. She said if a designer is creating whole blocks of buildings, as a designer you have a style and tend to carry that from building to building. She said the amount of buildings sometimes does not allow for that level of individuality.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission has been seeing proposals involving masses of land that are larger than the Commission ever thought possible. She added the Commission is also getting buildings with too many residential units in them. She asked if there were ways to solve that problem.

Ms. Ray said she thought she was hearing a lot of the concerns relating *concentrations of particular uses*, which are very difficult to regulate.

Mr. Langworthy said that is why there is the architectural diversity in the Code. He explained this is a separate requirement as part of the Site Plan Review. Ms. Ray directed the Commissioners to page 47 of 190, provision K, which is **Building Variety.**

Ms. Amorose Groomes again asked what can be done about the amount of residential development, because the Code as it is written is not getting what we want.

Ms. Ray said Staff has taken the Commission's concerns about lack of variety and have been working with applicants to incorporate more of these elements requiring architectural diversity.

Ms. Kramb thanked Ms. Ray for pointing out provision K on page 47.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the other issue is the density of the use. She asked if there was consensus among the Commission to figure out a way to fix the problem of concentrated uses.

Ms. Kramb stated that the Code limits the height of buildings, and limits the length of the buildings until a mid-block or mid-building pedestrianway is required, but since that could be an internal walkway, she was not sure that would address her concerns.

Mr. Langworthy clarified the developments are limited in size in three ways: block size, building height, and what parking they can provide. He stated that density regulations are effectively self-imposed based on those three criteria.

Ms. Kramb indicated most of the blocks have a maximum of 500 feet, which could still result in a large building on a large site.

Mr. Hardt said he was concerned with both the scale of the buildings and the number of units. He explained when the number of units reaches a certain point, the variety is reduced – including the variety of families, market segments, and uses that all get watered down because 400 identical residents are attracted.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not very willing to move ahead with the review of the Code or a recommendation until the Commission comes to some consensus on this topic. She referenced the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report, which indicates that the number of units in the district is limited.

Ms. Ray stated that was not quite correct; she explained there was an initial market analysis in the "Planning Foundations" document that indicated a demand for 1,500 units over the short-term, about the first five to seven years of Bridge Street development, but a long-term demand and build out shows quite a bit more demand than that.

Ms. Salay said she remembered that there was much more housing demand described in the Vision Report. She reported the 1,500 – 1,700 number was the initial market analysis thought to be absorbed in the first five to seven years of the Bridge Street District. She explained she did the math for the Gateway, the OCLC Neighborhood area, the Historic District, the Riverside District, SR161, Tuller area, and Sawmill area and there were two ways the numbers were broken out. She said the first was near term (20 years) and the back half is years 20 – 30. She said if you add all the near term numbers up, it equates to 4,100 units across the whole district, and if you add in the over 30 years demand for an additional 2,300, it equates to 6,500 total units. She indicated that no one is suggesting that this number of housing units will be constructed immediately, but over the coming decades, the world is going to change a lot. She stated that the future demand is what is being planned for and addressed in the Vision Report. Ms. Salay said this report was adopted in 2010 and the Community Plan was updated in 2012 with this information.

Mr. Hardt said, regardless of whether the number is 1,700 or 17,000, he thinks it is contrary to the overall intent of the district if 500 units are placed on a single block.

Ms. Salay said the intent is to get away from the apartment complex feel. She said we have residential neighborhoods where one developer is proposing the residential area earmarked on the plan to be residential, and so if you want to introduce mixed-use, then that is a different animal. She asked if it is *architectural* diversity or is it *use* diversity the Commission desires.

Mr. Hardt and Ms. Kramb agreed it was both, including a diversity of people within the buildings.

Ms. Kramb said she expected to see high-end condominiums that people can buy; some places that people can rent and live there for a year and move on; and people who might rent for many years. She said if we get 450 units in a 500-foot-long building, they are all probably going to be the same types of residences all rented at the same dollar value.

Mr. Hardt asked how many units were proposed in the original iteration of the Edwards project. Ms. Ray answered 325. Mr. Hardt reported that a very similar building is currently being constructed a couple of miles to the south along I-270. He indicated that building is not what he envisioned when he thought of the Bridge Street Corridor four years ago, and as a result, his comments are to some degree a reaction to that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said you lose a sense of community in those kinds of buildings. She said all the things we are trying to build in the Bridge Street District are lost when you get buildings at that scale. She reiterated she would like to see the Commission solve that problem.

[The Chair called for a short break. The meeting resumed four minutes later.]

Mr. Hardt asked if the footnote on page 57 referencing open and unenclosed landscape courtyards could specify being "publically accessible," to which Ms. Ray agreed.

153.063: Neighborhood District Standards

BSD Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Placemaking Elements – Shopping Corridor – Master Sign Plans
Mr. Taylor suggested adding "buildings within" the shopping corridors as a requirement for Master Sign Plans. Ms. Ray agreed that covered the intent and that language would apply to the other sections of this Code Section referencing Master Sign Plans as well.

153.065: Site Development Standards
Mr. Hardt and Ms. Kramb suggested various grammatical changes throughout this section.

153.065(B): Site Development Standards – Parking and Loading
Required Vehicle Parking
Ms. Kramb noted that accessory and temporary uses are not required to provide parking, with the exception of the four use categories included on the table. She asked why.

Ms. Ray clarified that if there is an accessory to an office building, such as an exercise facility for example, the facility is not required to provide parking *separately* from the office parking, since the same users are using both the office and the exercise facility. She added as long as the principal use has adequate parking, the accessory use does not require additional parking. She offered to reword the statement for clarity.

153.065(D): Site Development Standards – Landscaping and Tree Preservation
Landscaping and Tree Preservation, General
Mr. Taylor recalled past discussions on diversity in tree selection and if there is too much variety of street trees, there will be an oddly shaped canopy.

Ms. Ray said this requirement is a general requirement, so it is not just for street trees but landscape plans overall. She said Staff added "where practical" to the diversity requirement, with the intent to strive for diversity.

Mr. Taylor said for much of the BSD, we are going to be talking about street trees and few other trees on a site, and he said a consistent species should be encouraged for a consistent canopy.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said her intent was that street trees should at least be consistent by street and then there would be a great diversity in the district overall, but Staff did not agree with her at the time. She emphasized when different trees are planted on one street, a uniform canopy is never achieved.

Ms. Ray said the desire is to have different species, but maybe there is a consistent character or type of trees that can achieve the effect of a uniform canopy.

Ms. Newell said she had worked in some communities where trees were alternated and staggered, but ultimately provided a consistent line to achieve a canopy.

Ms. Salay asked if the City Forester could be asked to weigh in on this topic. She said the intent and the hope is that we would always have a canopy on any given street. She indicated there have been instances where the City Forester had requested that the same type of tree could be used, but to diversify the types. She pointed out that it is not always an insect infestation that might be the problem, but how trees are planted could be an issue (she cited an example of Llewellyn Farms where all the trees were planted from same nursery and were planted poorly). She indicated maybe better inspection of street trees could help.

Joanne Shelly said she had spoken extensively with Paula Chope, City Forester; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; and Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space about this topic. She reported there are some streets within Dublin that have a single species, and when they die off, they are replaced with a variety of tree species. She added when tree species are removed for whatever reason, the City will not replace it with the same tree. She stated the City policy will be followed and asked why the BSD should be different from the rest of the community.

Mr. Taylor said the primary reason is to create a canopy in the BSD.

Ms. Newell stated she lives on a street that had ash trees and they lost all of them in one season, so since then, the City has replanted trees on the street and aesthetically, it does look hodgepodge. She said her street tree had to be replanted twice before it got planted properly, so the trees are very intermittent and she has been trying to figure out what the planting scheme was on their particular street. She said as a resident, it looks like they got all the bargain trees in mass that season. She stated there is some merit to this issue. She indicated she had the greatest respect for the City Forester, but wondered if there was a way to achieve the desire for a consistent canopy.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the alternatives are that you might have a street that has lost its canopy due to disease, etc., or you end up with a street that has missing teeth if one of those has to be picked, and an inconsistent canopy. She said there is a calculated risk with a one-species street, but those in the field already know of issues on the horizon and the trees most susceptible through the next wave of infestation and what they attack.

Mr. Taylor said he votes for the hopes of a canopy.

Mr. Hardt said since this topic has come up, he has been more aware of other districts around the region, including the Arena District. He said what seems to be a fairly common approach is to plant a single type of street tree for a block, and what he has seen as most successful was a section in Cincinnati where they planted a consistent street tree from visual node to visual node. He said you might go around the corner and it is something different, and the next block over it is different, but there is a sensible beginning and end.

Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed that was diversity on the *whole* rather than on the micro scale.

Claudia Husak said it sounds like Staff has made a determination on the City's street tree policy, and the Commission is leaning towards something else.

Ms. Newell indicated she did not know if there was a real right or wrong answer to this particular issue.

Ms. Husak said the decision was not made to not have a canopy.

Ms. Shelly said the conversation has gone from a canopy on a single street when the Code requires a Landscape Plan, which may be a street, an entire community, 5 or 12 streets, etc. She said Code is talking about a percentage of the trees in an application, which everyone agreed could be one block, one building, or one street.

Mr. Taylor suggested language be changed whereas diversity on the whole is important but creating a canopy is more important.

Ms. Ray suggested the language include the desire for consistent canopy, where practical in getting diversity.

Ms. Amorose Groomes concluded the Commission wants macro diversity, not a micro diversity.

Street Trees

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she believes it is short-sighted of us to not put structural soil around the trees, and not in planting beds. She said she hopes the BSD is successful, and people are trying to jam really cool things in everywhere because it has been so successful.

Ms. Shelly said one of the problems we are having is the definition of structural soils. She reported the way Ms. Chope and Ms. Ball have defined it is with the Cornell University's Standard for Structural Soils, which is 80 percent rock, 15 percent stone, and no more than 5 percent of a gel solution when necessary, so when Staff speaks of structural soils in the Code, we are speaking of rock. She said perhaps there are other definitions of structural soils. She said the one on Wikipedia is more of a topsoil that has structure in it. She said Staff has said for the next iteration of the Code updates, where definitions come in, we will actually define the difference between what a structural soil is by the City's definition. She said specifically, we want trees in topsoil, with room for the roots to grow; however, what we are defining as structural soil is really a rock blend of a 57 type stone that has gaps in it. Ms. Shelly concluded it is the definition we are stumbling over, rather than the theory of what we want the tree to be planted in. She said she believed Staff and the Commission are on the same page in that respect.

Ms. Newell said she had looked up the Cornell University research and said when Ms. Shelly is referring to #57, she asked if she was talking about actual stone or structural soil. Ms. Shelly clarified 57 is just a type of stone. She said when whatever stone Ms. Newell is using as an architect is compacted to 95 or 100 percent, when it is done compacting, it is a solid mass.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it is unable to be further compacted, which is the point.

Ms. Shelly said structural soils as defined by Cornell University is that there is nothing in between the stone pieces so they are still compactible to 95 or 100 percent, but that there are gaps in between that the roots can go through. Again, she said we are stumbling on whether it is soil or whether it is actually a structured rock material that has gaps in it.

Mr. Taylor read from the Cornell University site. "Structural soil is a designed medium which can meet or exceed pavement design and insulation requirements, while remaining root penetrable in support of tree growth." He asked if that was the goal and both Ms. Amorose Groomes and Ms. Shelly were in agreement. He added as opposed to having the typical impacted base or pavement that does not allow that and only allowing root growth in the hole that was dug to stick the tree in the topsoil in.

Ms. Shelly summarized we want the tree in the topsoil and the pavement to have the structural soil that has the gaps in it, not to have the tree planted in the structural soil that is just rock.

Ms. Newell asked if the City is going to develop an actual planting detail.

Ms. Shelly said Staff discussed that in conjunction with the streetscape guide as it develops further. She said Staff is finding a need for streetscape details that define how we want various elements, including the planter curbs and the curbs themselves.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the medium that is on top of the tree roots is important. She indicated if there are tree grates on them, you might be able to get away with topsoil immediately under the tree grate and structural soil past that, but if there is not a tree grate, you cannot go with topsoil because the reason behind structural soil is for compaction issues, floor space, and availability of nutrients. She said if there is foot traffic immediately on top of the tree, i.e. in a lawn panel, then there are compaction issues and that needs to be resolved.

Ms. Shelly reiterated she thought this was a definition issue.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested bringing back a definition and seeing if that resolves the issue.

Foundation Planting
Ms. Kramb inquired about the term "creative clusters."

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this was confusing because it requires one shrub for 10 linear feet. She said by definition, Foundation Planting is a constant planting at the foundation and a Planter is an accent of some section of the building.

Ms. Ray said the foundation has to be predominantly covered with living materials.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated where appropriate, shrubs should be planted every three feet, not 10 feet.

Ms. Ray suggested the language read 1) the area has to be predominantly covered by living materials; 2) the calculation for the number of shrubs required is one for each 10 linear feet of a building façade, and 3) the shrubs must be planted no more than 3 feet on center.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it does not matter how long the building is, it's the length of the plant bed that matters.

Ms. Kramb said she questioned how something can be both continuous and clustered.

Ms. Ray said "continuous" was intended so it was not just shrub, shrub, shrub, but a continuous planting of different plant clusters.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the point of foundation plantings is to hide the union between the earth and the building, running the distance of it. She added if it is "clustered" then there are spaces where the union could be visible.

Ms. Ray stated she understood the Commission's intent and would work on clarifying the text.

153.065(G): Site Development Standards – Utility Underground and Screening
Ms. Kramb asked about the new text added to this section regarding utility structures.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that this would indicate to an applicant that they cannot just let AEP put the transformer where they want to; the applicant would be required to engage with AEP to have them place it where appropriate.

153.065(H): Site Development Standards – Signs
Master Sign Plans
Mr. Taylor said he thought all the additional language regarding Master Sign Plans was on the right track but was concerned that it implies that once a Master Sign Plan is approved, that when the actual signs come in, that it is Staff approval after that. He said that is fine but that is kind of a function of the level of quality of a Master Sign Plan and the amount of detail that is in it from the start. He said a Master Sign

Plan that says all of our signs are going to be in these locations, great; all of our signs are going to be from this color family, fine; and this material, etc. but asked how far we go when someone takes those elements and makes a bad design. He asked if there was anything in here that would trigger any other kind of public review of the actual sign itself when it comes in.

Mr. Taylor said at a minimum, a Master Sign Plan should include the proposed location types, number, heights, and sizes of signs but thought there should be an indication of needing enough detail about fabrication details as well. He said the Commission has seen a number of signs that look good as renderings, but the cabinets were poorly constructed, there were exposed fasteners, bad lapping of metal, etc. when they were built and as a result, do not look very good.

Mr. Taylor said he noticed the Nationwide sign on their facility on US 33 with butterflies on it and questioned if it is a temporary sign. He said every single screw around that sign appears to be rusted and put up with a nail gun. He said it was that kind of example he was talking about with concern to quality details.

Mr. Taylor asked about the concept of a Master Sign Plan and a Building Sign Plan and when that would come into effect. He said he sees where it is required in Shopping Corridors but asked where it was required elsewhere.

Mr. Langworthy acknowledged that he had not attended the September 11th meeting when the Commission discussed this topic, but the way the discussion was explained to him is that the Commission is looking for three different types: 1) the way it is now, where a sign departs from a requirement; 2) Shopping Corridors; and 3) a sign package for a larger building and that would be approved as a single entity that as signs came in they would have to comply with that. He said from the public's view after that, the assumption was that when the Master Sign Plan was initially approved, *that* is intended to be the public review.

Mr. Taylor said he was okay with that as long as we somehow make sure the Master Sign Plan has enough detail whereas the actual signs meet the Master Sign Plan requirements when they are submitted. He said if the Master Sign Plan is too general then there is the possibility of too much bad variety. He said it is not a question of whether it needs additional public reviews, he questioned if enough detail is required. He said we have enough information in the Code of what we want to see in a Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Langworthy asked if this was affected at all by the provisions we added for later on for the sign materials on page 155.

Mr. Taylor said he had a positive checkmark next to all of that. He said we are going to see the Master Sign Plans here as the required reviewing body. He said they will have the opportunity to discuss whether there is enough information to get comfortable with the Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Langworthy said we have a general provision, which states that for any applications submitted the required reviewing body has the right to ask for additional information.

Mr. Taylor said other than in a Shopping Corridor, when does that come into play.

Mr. Langworthy indicated they got this from some of the other places they had visited that had these Master Sign Packages and the requests we would make is if someone has buildings or sites or longer properties on the Shopping Corridor or thought they would develop and comply with that particular guideline then that would constitute at least one element of the Master Sign Plan. He said the question would be if a subsequent building came in under a different owner and they did not want to follow those guidelines that were adopted for the Shopping Corridor - what could they do at that point.

Mr. Taylor said he was comfortable where they were going on the Shopping Corridor.

Ms. Kramb referred to the Master Sign Plan scenarios A, B, & C on page 151.

A. They just want a bigger sign in a different spot;
B. It is a single building but it is going to have lots of different signs; or
C. There are multiple buildings with lots of different sign options.

Ms. Kramb said this is not just referring to Shopping Corridors. She said the second sentence says that you are required to have them in the Shopping Corridor.

Mr. Taylor said the informal heard the week before included eight buildings. He said each one of those buildings should have a Master Sign Plan of its own.

Ms. Ray said when the buildings first come in, the applicant may not know all the tenants or all the details and may not have all the details figured out, so there is a requirement in the Building Types Section of the Code that states an applicant must show *how* signs are intended to be accommodated on the buildings. She said Staff has a hesitation of requiring that level of detail that Mr. Taylor is requesting on day one when the building first comes in, but certainly later.

Mr. Taylor said he did not know about day one, but before a building is processed completely through the Commission, they need to see a Master Sign Plan. He said when the Commission discussed this initially, they talked about fish signs and bicycle signs and all that cool stuff. He said the goal for me is to hopefully allow the applicants to do bigger, better, more interesting signs then the Code would ordinarily allow, as long as they meet a certain level of quality and the signs are well organized around the building. He added if someone decides they want to put a theater in a building, and they want a great big marquee sign, if that is submitted as part of the sign package that is balanced around the rest of the building, it is going to be way outside of the bounds of the Code, but that might be something the Commission would seriously consider. He indicated he also wanted to prevent identical suburban strip center sign panels, eight feet off the ground, on each one of the storefronts. He said he wanted to make sure the Commission has the opportunity to say "no" to that stuff, too. Mr. Taylor said the Master Sign Plan should show where the signs are going to go and what the sign theme is for the whole building.

Mr. Langworthy said that can be done as part of the Site Plan and a Master Sign Plan is not needed.

Mr. Taylor asked if that was required. He said he is looking at the number of occasions where the location of the signs was not thought of until later, much too late.

Ms. Ray said that is what is addressed in the Building Types section, where an applicant is required to show how signs can be provided on a building, if not the exact signs themselves.

Ms. Kramb said *where* the sign will be, not necessarily what it will look like, should be requested.

Ms. Ray referred the Commission back to page 48 of 190, 153.062(M): "Locations of all signs intended to be affixed to the principal structure and/or on the attached awning, or canopy initially, or at any time in the future by subsequent tenants, shall be identified on the architectural elevations submitted with the Minor Project or Site Plan."

Mr. Taylor said if the rest of the Commission is comfortable with the way it is, at least tell let applicants know that if they choose to do a Master Sign Plan, there will be greater options available than what Code allows.

Ms. Ray said it would serve to the applicants' advantage in some ways because if the Commission got comfortable with what they provided, then they could go right to the permitting process much faster and easier.

Mr. Taylor said the goal is to have signs integrated into the designs of the buildings on day one rather than signs that are just attached where they can be fit.

Mr. Hardt asked for clarification on **Logos, Registered Corporate Trademarks and/or Symbols**.

Mr. Taylor asked that the **Table for Ground Sign Requirements** be worded differently to ensure the meaning is that structural foundations are not to be exposed.

153.066: Review and Approval Procedures and Criteria

Basic Plan Review

Mr. Hardt questioned the process. He said he recalled that the process might have originated as one of his ideas, but he was not sure that as implemented, it was quite what he had in mind. He said he was not sure that Basic Plans were not necessary or a good idea for both Development Plans and Site Plans.

Ms. Kramb said the Basic Plan Review was intended to be an informal review but now actual "Informal Reviews" seem to have been added back into the process.

Mr. Hardt said in the process of trying to make it easier on the applicants, we have made it harder by adding an extra step. He asked if there was a legal reason behind it.

Mr. Langworthy said the principle behind it was that Staff thought there could be circumstances where someone would come in and say they wanted to see how their streets, lots and blocks, lay out, but they might not really know what the building(s) would look like, or how they would lay out on the site, but they at least want to get the framework established. He said they could come back at a later time and bring back one of those blocks or a series of blocks, not including the entire development, for the Site Plan and move forward from there. He said we may or may not see very many of those circumstances, but wanted to give people at least the ability to do that.

Mr. Hardt asked what drove this to become such a formal event as opposed to just feedback.

Mr. Langworthy said if you read what the Basic Development Plan and the Basic Site Plan say, that once you get through the Site Plan and the Development Plan, they have to be consistent with the Basic Development Plan and the Basic Site Plan so that has a little more meat on its bones, as opposed to an Informal Review where the applicant just comes in and gets comments on whatever they would like feedback on. He said at the Informal Review the applicant might not even have plans in mind but maybe just some ideas.

Mr. Taylor said it makes sense, but he is not sure he likes it as much as the original intent.

Mr. Langworthy said it became more important when the City started to set up a grid.

Mr. Hardt said the current process we are seeing unfold is not at all what our intent was.

Ms. Newell said it is complicated and Ms. Kramb said it is very cumbersome.

Mr. Hardt asked if there was a way to simplify this.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said Mr. Langworthy had experienced frustration and difficulty with applicants and the cumbersome nature of navigating the process. She asked him if he could develop a strategy to streamline those issues.

Mr. Langworthy stated that one of the things Planning is looking at as the overall Zoning Code is being rewritten is how all of the processes can be simplified. He said one of the options could be to say as part of the preliminary site plan submission, the preliminary street layout must also be submitted along with that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed there were no further questions or comments on the remaining pages of the draft Code. She said her sense was that the Commission was not going to be in a position to vote tonight as there are enough sensitive issues that were discussed and the Commission would like another look at after being drafted by Staff.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to at least see a clean copy of the Code first.

Ms. Husak said Staff has been asked by City Council to provide them with a recommended draft by the end of the year. She added with the deadlines of the Council meetings the way they are scheduled, we are not going to be able to get a draft to Council any later unless the Commission makes a recommendation for approval tonight. She said she believed Planning was well aware of the Commission's concerns on most of the items discussed and believed they could be incorporated into the document.

Ms. Kramb said there were at least two areas that should not get advanced yet: 1) clarification with the structural soils; 2) the new commercial uses added to the Table for the residential districts; and 3) size limitations.

Ms. Salay suggested that Staff write a report detailing the discussion that took place tonight because the structural soil issue comes down to the definition, and Council can understand that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes added the tree canopy issue.

Ms. Salay said we need to consider our desire for the tree canopy. She said it is safe to say there is not anyone that does *not* want a tree canopy, including Staff. She indicated she did not see that as a deal breaker in getting this advanced to Council. She said there is more work to do on the Code.

Ms. Kramb said she would like to see it moved forward except for the core areas such as breaking up the massing/the size of the buildings.

Mr. Taylor asked if there was some way to pull a few of the sections out and advance everything else.

Ms. Salay said if we are able to have a synopsis of the discussion that we can discuss and accept the recommendations that would be preferable. She said it is pretty clear the direction this Commission wants to go and it is a matter of fine tuning, particularly with the blocks.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there has not been a decision on size limitations; that is all new material we have nothing thus far on.

Mr. Taylor asked Staff what the options were.

Ms. Ray said the Commission could make a recommendation with the comments heard tonight, and if following Council's discussion, there is desire to work on those one or two sections on which we did not achieve resolution tonight, we could forward another Code amendment on the heels of this one. She said

that would give the Commission more time to work on the language to get it to the point where the Commission is comfortable, since it is fairly limited overall. Ms. Ray said she is hesitant to pull out sections right now because with size limitation, it impacts more than just the uses, the building types, or both and she did not have a good sense of which sections specifically are impacted right now.

Ms. Kramb agreed it was more topics than actual numbers of sections to be reviewed and revised further.

Ms. Ray suggested forwarding the amendment with the majority of the comments made by the Commission this evening, and if we wanted to continue to work on those four sections mentioned, we could forward another four sections whenever the Commission is ready to do so.

Philip Hartmann said some of the issues discussed by the Commission are policy issues that Council will probably want to take up as well. He said he likes the idea of moving it forward with Staff trying to put in the interpretation of the Commission's comments tonight, but also giving the Commission the opportunity to go back and revisit the issues. He said a memo written by Staff outlining those issues would also help Council to understand the Commission got through the policy issues thoroughly and these are sticking point issues that are left. He recommended keeping it moving.

The Chair asked if anyone from the public would like to speak. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there are some significant outstanding issues: some being the Code does not address as of yet; one being balanced land uses; and trip capture objectives, all the things that will make the district work. She said if Ms. Salay is talking about 7,000 units in the district and at the end of the day, we put a grid network in place but primary streets do not necessarily change that consistently, we have added 50 percent again of the population or 50 percent again of the residential units into our City. She emphasized if trips are not captured, the whole plan breaks down. She said another thing that is missing is the number of units that are appropriate in a building.

Ms. Kramb referred to page 179, the Site Plan Review criteria states "If the development is to be implemented in phases, each phase is able to be considered independently without the need for further phase improvements." She said that can be tied into roadway improvements, or anything else. She read further "The scale and design of the proposed development allows for adequate provisions of services currently furnished or that may be required." She said we can say it does not meet the criteria when we are reviewing an application.

Mr. Hardt said if the Chair is asking for feedback on her comments, he agrees with her that it is an issue and something we collectively have questions about and need to continue to focus attention on, but he is not sure the Code is the right place to have that discussion - he thought that comes out in the form of traffic studies for individual developments or global traffic studies for the district that need to be presented to the Commission so they can be used in basing their decisions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not sure where this information should go but it is important. She asked how the Commission can get what they really want, as they were willing to give up residential, but *all* we are getting is residential and not the stuff they really wanted.

Ms. Newell suggested maybe this was a question for City Council. She noted that Ms. Salay had said she had seen traffic studies, including background information not presented to the Commission. She said one of the things she learned about City Council members is that most of the time, residents would often make the same decisions you as a Council member would, but the public is not provided with all the fact finding information. She said Ms. Salay made comments about that in regards to some of the things the Commission discussed, so she said she does not know if there is additional information the Commission should have, or if there is an overall threshold that within this area, if it is supposed to be a mixed development district but at some point you have reached so much residential in that district, you max it

out and completely lose the opportunity for it to be a mixed-use district. She asked if the district should have an overall threshold.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what is left of the balance of the property if it is the land that is difficult to develop, because apartments are just really easy to do right now. She asked how the applicants can do the hard stuff if they just do the easy stuff.

Ms. Newell said truthfully, there is nothing regulating how the BSD can be a mixed-use district. She said we are hoping the applicants are going to build what we would like to see, but there is nothing over top of the district that says the applicant has to have all of those things.

Ms. Amorose Groomes added limiting the number of units in a residential building would encourage other things to happen but she did not know how to govern it.

Ms. Salay indicated Council has struggled with this, and acknowledged that it is a completely different area with a different type of development than they had ever contemplated previously. She reflected back to six years ago when they first began talking about this area. She said if Council was told then that they were going to be doing this kind of development, they would have said "no way, this is Dublin." She said she has since bought into this idea that this is a huge economic development tool, the idea of having a different place for people to live, adapted to a different generation. She said you can search online about all the research that has been done. She said we started with our speaker series, and just waded through all the information that says our demographics are changing so radically, and as the boomers age, we are going to want different things, and the people coming up behind us are going to want different things too, and there is not going to be the same market for single-family suburban housing. She said there are two tracks that we are thinking about: 1) keeping our community relevant into the next century; and 2) keeping our existing housing stock valuable. She explained if you have too much of what we have done traditionally, then we are going to get another kind of imbalance. She said for her, and she believes the rest of Council, they have decided they want to take this small portion of the City in a completely different direction that will be different to accommodate the anticipated changes in demographics. She said there is going to be a lot of people here; but they will be singles or couples, not families with two parents, a couple of kids, two dogs and a cat on fewer than two units to the acre.

Ms. Kramb noted it is still two or three cars per household.

Ms. Salay said she was not sure that was the case. She explained the goal of this district is for a couple to have one car and bikes instead having two cars, for example.

Ms. Kramb said if it is all residential, what is the couple to do; they will still have to drive somewhere if there are no other commercial uses in the area.

Mr. Hardt said Ms. Kramb's comment is exactly his concern. He thought Commission feels like if they put all the residential in one place, with no other supporting services, then we will never achieve the walkable urban environment we all want.

Ms. Salay said Council is confident in the ideas and information behind the Bridge Street District vision, and she is confident the mix of uses will come. She said we have all thought that apartments are very easy right now, as the low hanging fruit, that is what we are seeing, but there are a lot of other things that are percolating. She said this is a philosophical discussion and she understands the Commission's concerns and she does not necessarily disagree, but she does not know if it can be resolved through a discussion like this. She said a lot of this is policy direction for the City. She said Council has decided these are the things we want for our community and we believe very strongly that this is what needs to happen; a dense, urban, walkable, downtown area. She said it is a lot more people than we are used to having in any given area but it is also completely different types of households, and that is the point. She

said if we continue on our path of neighborhoods in the periphery and whatever we have in the middle of our City, that is not a viable way to keep our suburb successful.

Ms. Newell indicated we keep seeing residential and do not see the commercial development, which is her only concern.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the charge to this Commission is to make the district urban and vibrant.

Mr. Hardt said there was truth to what Ms. Amorose Groomes was saying. He said the number of housing units and the type of housing units are policy decisions in some cases that have been made and in some cases, have yet to be made. He said a lot of what the Commission talked about tonight, for instance his desire to limit the size of a building, he would disagree that is a policy decision; he thinks it is an environmental decision. He said it is a planning decision; how big of a building do we want to see and what is comfortable. Mr. Hardt concluded it is absolutely about planning, and asked how to resolve the conversation tonight to pass along the issues to Council.

Mr. Taylor suggested forwarding their recommendation with a condition that the Commission intends to come back and review issues that are in the notes from this evening.

Ms. Amorose Groomes indicated if the Commission does that, it normally does not happen for a long time.

Mr. Taylor stated we know exactly what the issues are; we do not need to wait for a whole lot of research from Planning to get there. He said the Commission could put it on their agenda on our own and bring it up whenever the Commissioners are ready.

Ms. Newell said this Code is like a working document, different than any other Zoning Code that she has really dealt with within the community and said there is always something we are not going to be happy with and will always continue to discuss.

Ms. Ray presented the proposed conditions on the screen for the Commission to review.

Ms. Salay agreed that perhaps Council *should* look at these issues twice, for important topics like this. She reported that Council has expressed a lot of the same concerns that were said this evening, in particular about large housing projects and diversity. She thought Council did not disagree on fundamentals like that.

Ms. Kramb asked if anything could be added to help their cause with parking garages not looking like parking garages. She said nowhere in the Code does it state their intent parking garage designs.

Ms. Ray said she hesitated to dictate architectural design requirements for parking structures, as it goes back to the philosophy of architectural requirements in a form-based code. She reiterated it is hard to dictate a style in a code.

Ms. Newell said there are going to be open air passageways into those garages and not constructed with solid walls.

Ms. Kramb pointed out that an applicant could comply with all the requirements but still not be what the Commission had envisioned. She wanted to know if a provision could be added to imply what the Commission prefers.

Ms. Salay referred back to a comment she made at the last Commission meeting that yes, they could have a parking garage but it cannot look like any other parking garage. She said there are many examples of parking garages online that function like public art.

Mr. Hardt indicated that is one of the things the Commission has to review. He said he parks in a parking garage every day built out of all brick, stair towers and elevator towers are glass, but the garage has openings to allow free air flow. He said there is no mistaking it is a parking garage. He said it is really not that spectacular, but it works, not because of the architecture but because of the environment it is sitting in, the stuff that is going on around it, the fact that it has other buildings up close to it.

Ms. Kramb said it does not take up the whole block, either. Mr. Hardt said it is actually a pretty sizable parking garage.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said hopefully the buildings right next to that parking garage are really good so you look less at the parking garage and more to the other buildings.

Mr. Hardt said there is more to it than just saying we need 90 percent brick instead of 80 percent, and venting regulations are not going to get us there. He said parking garages need to be assessed when seen in the context with everything else.

Mr. Taylor said we have not yet seen developers coming in who are highly motivated to show us really great architectural designs for parking garages.

The Chair called for a motion for application 13-095ADMC, Zoning Code Amendment.

Ms. Ray, representing the applicant, agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote
Ms. Kramb moved, Ms. Newell seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the request for Zoning Code amendments for the Bridge Street District zoning regulations and modifications to the Bridge Street District network map with two conditions:

1) That the comments of the Planning and Zoning Commission be incorporated in the draft version to be reviewed by City Council; and
2) That the comments of the Planning and Zoning Commission related to size-limited uses, housing diversity, structural soil and tree canopies be forwarded to City Council for future consideration as part of an additional Code amendment.

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

Communications
Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any communications to be relayed and discussed. [Hearing none.]

Commission Roundtable Discussion
Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any roundtable issues to be discussed. [Hearing none.]

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 11, 2014.