

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 5, 2014

AGENDA

1. **Riverside PCD North, Subarea 3 – The Perimeter Starbucks** **Informal Review**
14-045INF **6510-6570 Perimeter Drive**
(Informal Discussion)
2. **MAG PUD, Subarea A, Land Rover/Jaguar/Lamborghini** **Informal Review**
14-046AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan**
(Informal Discussion) **6325 Perimeter Loop Road**
3. **U-Haul** **6419 Old Avery Road**
14-038CU **Conditional Use**
(Tabled 7 – 0)
4. **Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District-Riverside Neighborhood District**
14-039ADMC **Zoning Code Amendment**
(Tabled 7 – 0)
5. **Zoning Map Amendment/Area Rezoning-Bridge Street District - Riverside**
Neighborhood District **Zoning Map Amendment**
14-040Z
(Tabled 7 – 0)

Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Amy Kramb, Richard Taylor, Victoria Newell, Amy Salay, John Hardt, and Joe Budde. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Readler, Kristin Yorke, Alan Perkins, Katie Ashbaugh, Dana McDaniel, Logan Stang, Jonathan Staker, Yazan Ashrawi, Nicki Martin, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Chris Amorose Groomes moved to table the May 1, 2014 meeting minutes. Amy Salay seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, abstain; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes. (Tabled 6 – 0 – 1.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there was one eligible consent item that had been removed from the consent agenda by Mr. Hardt and the first case on the agenda requested to be the second case and determined the order of the cases would be heard in order of case 2, 1, 3, 4, and 5 of the published agenda and briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

1. Riverside PCD North, Subarea 3 – The Perimeter Starbucks Informal Review
14-045INF 6510-6570 Perimeter Drive

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following application is a request for an informal request for review and feedback for a Starbucks Coffee Shop with a drive-thru for an existing shopping center on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections of Avery Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.

Ms. Husak presented this informal application and said that the site is to the north of Perimeter Drive where they received zoning approval in January 2013 to build the existing 14,000-square-foot retail building. She said the site required that zoning to allow the size of the restaurants and the combination of everything in one building.

Ms. Husak said the proposed site originally included restaurant spaces at either end of the retail center with patio spaces on both ends and one of the major restaurant tenants elected to go into the center of the building which is Dewey's Pizza now open for business. She said Starbucks is asking to use a tenant space on this site for their coffee shop and include a drive-thru and the applicant would like some feedback on a use stand point and could this use be accommodated on this site particularly because the development text does not permit a drive-thru within the subarea and would require another rezoning.

Ms. Husak said they looked through different issues that could be presented and they came up with a plan to accommodate the stacking and the impacts to the site. She said they propose to eliminate the internal access point along the private drive from Perimeter Drive that loops around the entire site and connects the tenant spaces and the building within the development. She said the drive-thru is intended to be in the area along the eastern portion of the site providing 12 stacking spaces which is required by Code and loops around the southern portion and the area that was intended to be the patio with an awning overhang is now the drive-thru window. She said there is concern with the escape lane circulation with the parking spaces potentially backing out into the stacking lane as well as the exiting the drive-thru with the entrance of the center which the applicant provided a alternate design which provides a landscaped island that would separate the drive-thru from the parking spaces and still provide a drive isle and increase the landscape island to the north to separate the drive-thru exit more from the parking at the front of the shopping center and includes heavy landscape screening along the side to hide the drive-thru activity from Perimeter Drive.

Ms. Husak said there are two discussion questions for the commission on whether or not the Starbucks with a drive-thru is appropriate to the site and are there any other circulation considerations the applicant could make to eliminate some of the conflicts highlighted.

Paul Ghidotti, 6840 McNeil Drive, Dublin, Ohio, working with the Daimler Group, the owner and managing member of this center, shared a little history important to this site regarding the rezoning and previous plans because it is unusual to be talking about a specific tenant by name. He said usually there is a building design and the tenants come and they figure out how they will fit into a space and if there are changes they come back for approval. He said they have a nice mix of uses with 10 year leases and there is a very strong lunch oriented users, with one dinner user, and a tenant for bunt cakes which closes at 6 pm. He said if they are able to get a coffee shop like Starbucks they will be open all day with drive-thru peaks during morning hours. He said Starbucks has tried for eleven years to find a location in this area.

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

Mr. Budde said he appreciates the summary of the history and likes the alternative plan with the use peak hours being morning when the other spaces are closed and supports the proposal.

Ms. Kramb said when she read through the minutes there was discussion to not have fast food or drive-thrus with the considerations being for the residents to the north and to avoid high volumes throughout the day. She said in this instance with a drive-thru busy in the mornings she could support and be comfortable because it is a Starbucks and would like to approve as a conditional use and restrict the drive-thru use only as long it is a Starbucks. She liked the alternative design and said there should be more striping for a walkway to the restaurant crossing the drive-thru lane and at the top of the drive-thru lane at the northeast corner to keep stacking from the access to the parking spaces. She said the original approval was for a certain number of patio square footage and wanted to make sure the text reflects the changes to allowable patio space. She said they needed to indicate where the ordering boards would be located and provide the other details related to speakers and lighting.

Mr. Taylor said this proposal seems shoe horned and jammed into this site and he is concerned with losing the access to the parking from the east. He said it seems like an awkward placement and forced on the site and does not like losing the parking with how much would be required on this site.

Mr. Ghidotti said they were able to secure a parking easement with Champaign to the east and that they exceed Code even with losing the 14 spaces by 12 or 14 spaces and they will have the ability to park 20 cars after banking hours to the east. He said there are discussions with the dental office being built to the northwest to allow parking on that site as well. He said with having complimentary uses with the various hours that each restaurant operates will allow them to minimize pavement and support the uses.

Mr. Taylor said they could talk about parking numbers and he could probably get happy with it but his biggest concern is the overall circulation of the site.

Mr. Ghidotti said the proposed access will match the neighboring center with two access points.

Mr. Hardt complimented the applicant on the building and was glad they went the extra mile on the building. He said it's exiting getting two larger sit down restaurants in this location with outdoor seating space which is lacking in this part of the community. He said what causes him pause is with losing a viable restaurant space and outdoor patio and is a shame. He said if there is going to be a drive-thru on this site they have made it work about as well as it can. He likes the new plan presented better than the older one.

Mr. Hardt said the traffic for Starbucks is all morning traffic and the pizza place is evening traffic and potentially the other restaurant is lunch traffic and that would work, but if the other restaurant was a breakfast place the traffic does not work.

Mr. Hardt said he lives in a condo on Post Road and if he is outside the only thing he hears is SR 33 and the prospect of hearing a drive-thru is an impossibility and is not anything he would be concerned about.

Ms. Salay complimented the applicant on the building. She visited Dewey's on Sunday and was disappointed they are only open till 4:00, but they are very busy and expected they will be at lunch time. She recommended they get in touch with the neighbors at Lowell Trace and Indian Run Meadows knowing that they would be interested in this project. She said if the speaker is done properly they will not be able to hear, but she has heard that residents in Lowell Trace can hear party's at BW3s patio with outdoor speakers and music.

Ms. Salay said she likes the alternative design and seeing that there are 12 spaces for stacking but the real world events shows that there is a need for more and a solution needs to be prepared prior to bringing this back as a formal application. She said knowing that Starbucks now sells food this will be a business that will have business through the noon hour and wanted them to be prepared for the

increase. She said this is a better location for Starbucks and is glad to hear about the parking agreements with surrounding businesses.

Ms. Newell said she has reservations for using this site with a drive-thru and the layout proposed in response to staff's comments is the best arrangement that they could accommodate. She said she would like to see screening using low stone wall features or a combination of landscaping nicely integrated with the building. She said she is concerned with stacking and that they will not just busy during morning hours they serve lunch fare and expects this location to be used frequently especially with students after school hours. She is concerned with changing the text to allow a drive-thru to certain uses and asked for operational details for a Starbucks drive-thru as well as stacking data and peak time use data.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said losing the entrance to the east is not a hurdle, but it would be interesting to see how traffic patterns would circulate through the parking lot and would not want access to the drive-thru lane from the adjacent parking area. She requested operational details for comparable Starbucks for busy times of the day. She said the building is well done. She said she thought it would be nice if this location would have outdoor seating.

Mr. Ghidotti said it will have some outdoor seating with two or three café type tables but they have not shown it and would welcome feedback on where it could be located.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is not opposed to the drive-thru concept, but felt it had to be the right user and should be a conditional use type of application and limited to a coffee shop type use and not an ice cream or fast food type user and with the university coming there might be some opportunities in the area.

Mr. Ghidotti said they have good feedback and hoped to be back in the next 60 days with a formal application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant and said they will look forward to seeing the application.

**2. MAG PUD, Subarea A, Land Rover/Range Rover/Jaguar/Lamborghini
14-046AFDP Amended Final Development Plan - Informal Review
6325 Perimeter Loop Road**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following application is a request for an informal request for review and feedback for a proposal for the a proposal for demolition of the existing Land Rover showroom and the construction of a new 30,000-square-foot showroom for the Land Rover, Range Rover and Jaguar franchises, a sky bridge for the Lamborghini franchise connecting the proposed building to the main MAG building and all associated site improvements.

Claudia Husak said the applicant has filed an amended final development plan application and wanted to get some informal feedback from the Commission first on a couple of issues. She said this application is focusing on Subarea A of the MAG PUD, which was created in 2009 to accommodate the expansion of the main building to accommodate Volvo on this site and there was a subsequent rezoning to create Subarea B to allow for the BMW/Mini building and the Audi building to be constructed.

Ms. Husak said the Land Rover building to the north of the site is 7,335-square-feet and includes a test track and display area along the Perimeter Road frontage. She said main dealership building which accommodates a majority of the franchises for the MAG campus is about 111,000-square-feet. She said there are approximately 96,000 square feet of display area on the campus within Subarea A which is generally located in the fingers in the northwest and southwest corners of the site. She said the site also has 472 parking spaces for employees and visitors. She said the evergreen screening to the east of the

pond that has grown substantially since the inception of the campus. She said there is a detention basin in the northwest corner of the site with mature landscaping all around the pond, street trees, as well as vehicular screening trees and landscaping along US 33.

Ms. Husak said the proposed site plan calls for the demolition of the existing Land Rover building and in its place the construction of a new building that is approximately 30,000 square feet and to connect the new building to the existing building with a 6,000-square-foot sky bridge. She said a similar proposal was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission in 2005 and actually went through building permitting as well but was never constructed. She said with the rezoning of the site, the creation of the MAG PUD specifically, those approvals have become invalid. She said the development text does not have a limit on square footage for buildings for this site and the intensity is regulated by setbacks, lot coverage, and parking and landscaping requirements.

Ms. Husak said the display area is proposed at 82,000 square feet with this plan and provides 405 parking spaces which is less spaces than currently on site. She said the approval of this plan would require the Planning and Zoning Commission to make a minor modification to the development text to decrease required parking for the site. She said the owner wrote a statement regarding inventory requirements and customer behavior as far as how many people are really shopping on site. She said they have discussed with the applicant is the amount of parking spaces required for the amount of displays spaces on-site which is 83 parking spaces. She said the existing pond will be shortened in the area where the Land Rover building will be with increasing depth of the basin as part of the stormwater management which will require some removal of substantial trees.

Ms. Husak said the proposed building is to accommodate the Land Rover, Range Rover, and Jaguar franchises with the sky bridge as a connection between the two buildings on the second floor of the main building which will go to grade at the new building and include a showroom for the Lamborghini brand that will hover over the pond. She said the building materials are EIFS and glass with stone proposed at the bottom of the building that is beige or natural color tone. She said the portico for Jaguar is beige EIFS and she would like feedback if the proposed architecture of the mass and scale of the building as well as the materials are complementary to what exists on the campus and also meets the development text which calls for modern striking and innovative architecture.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is proposing four wall signs for this portion of the site. She said the development text was written with the existing Land Rover building in mind so it permits one wall sign, which is essentially the existing wall sign, a 35-square-foot wall sign at a height at 24 feet. She said the front elevation of the building that faces north proposes two wall signs for the Land Rover/Range Rover portion of the building located on the green metal accent panel and the Jaguar entrance on the portico shows a sign with the Jaguar copy and the logo which is three-dimensional and affixed to the entrance at a height of 24 feet. She said there is a fourth sign proposed which is the sign for Lamborghini on the sky bridge which is also exceeding the size and height requirements. She said the signs as proposed would require a few development text modifications from the Planning and Zoning Commission, one for the number of signs, height, and size of proposed signs.

Ms. Husak reviewed the discussion items as follows:

- 1) Are the proposed architectural elevations consistent with the rest of the MAG campus?
- 2) Are the proposed building materials complementary to the campus?
- 3) Does the Commission support the proposed signs for the franchises and the required text modifications?
- 4) Would the Commission support a reduction in the required amount of parking spaces for this site?
- 5) Other considerations by the Commission?

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, 165 North 5th Street, said he is joined with Andy English from Plan-It Studio to expand upon some of the landscape question that they have. He said they are proposing a 33,000-square-foot multi-brand facility that will include Land Rover, Range Rover, and recently acquired Jaguar franchise. He said the new brand will bring about 20 million dollars annual revenue to the City and create 10 additional employees. He said in 2005 they presented an 18,000-square-foot addition to the existing facility plus the connector bridge from the main building, they received approval, pushed through construction documents, received a permit and they were one week away from putting a shovel in the ground and they has internal problems with the Ford Company and the project stopped. He said in 2008 Jaguar and Land Rover were sold. He said MAG signed an LOI at the beginning of 2014 with Jaguar and Land Rover and they have committed to open a show room before the fall of 2015 and hoped to break ground early fall of this year and hopefully open 12 months later.

Mr. Parish said his goals are to present the project, identify concerns, and focus on the sky bridge and he said he is looking for some feedback. He said since they are not adding to the existing facility, it allowed him to adjust where the building is located in relationship to the site and he centered on the display fingers which allowed them reduce the length of the bridge and create a shorter connection between the two and allowed for some additional parking on the northeast corner of the site. He said the Jaguar/Land Rover building design continues the curb service area. He said the front of the building depicts elements that are important to the multi-brand facility which are the Jaguar portico, the multi-brand entry at the center part, and the Land Rover landmark tower and sloped roof.

Mr. Parish said the sky bridge is planned to be the Lamborghini showroom on the campus and the design was intended to create a glass showroom elevated over the current pond. He said behind the showroom the floor drops down toward the grade and is designed to slowly reveal a glass box showroom where cars would be displayed as it went down toward the Jaguar/Land Rover facility. He said the sky bridge is really a collaboration of all the materials found across the campus. He said his goal is create one last signature piece for the MAG to set them off from other dealers in town.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Mr. Hardt said he is thrilled that MAG continues to grow and congratulated the architect for being able to create another example of dynamic contemporary architecture. He said the landscaping replacement of trees should be per Code. He said the only concern is design in landscaping for underneath the sky bridge. He said he does not have an issue with parking as proposed and as a customer of the business he has never had a hard time finding a place to park. He said this is a unique business with a unique need that does not fit into a Code box and would refer to the owner on that issue.

Mr. Hardt said as the campus has evolved they have reached the proliferation of signs significantly and they need to pay some attention to signs. He said he cannot support the new wall signs on the elevations as proposed although there are signs along US33, which is different in character and of a much different nature than the side facing Perimeter Drive. He said there was no information about the proposed height of the signs and it was mentioned heights of 24 to 25 feet but in the text is limited to 15 feet.

Ms. Husak said in Subarea A there is an allowance for a wall sign to be at 24 feet, which is what exists and was written specifically for the existing sign.

Mr. Hardt said the Jaguar sign does not appear to be measured per Code in the proposal. He said the text limits it to 40 inches in height and he would not be supportive of the ground sign.

Ms. Husak said that was written for the brand identification signs that they have at the entrances.

Mr. Hardt said the quantity of signs that are providing wayfinding guidance to doors and entrances, and the main building has four showrooms that house different brands that do not have this kind of identification that is being proposed. He said it causes significant concern with the quantity and the location of those signs.

Mr. Hardt said the architecture is generally pretty good and they have done a nice job on the campus with the recent buildings and the original building. He said there is concerns with the underside of the roof overhang, EIFS is a material proposed but the original building was completed with stucco which is a better material of higher quality with more character, he said he will reserve judgment of the block being used under the sky bridge along with the landscaping choices for the underside, and the broader architectural themes with the two entry porticos for Land Rover and Jaguar although he is sure of the brand standards and prototypes, they are the weakest part of this proposal and the whole campus. He said branding the entrances based on what is on the inside is a foreign approach to the campus and feels not cohesive with the other buildings. He said he agreed with the concerns of staff comment in the planning report of the beige Jaguar entry while the rest of the campus is grey which contributes to the concern.

Mr. Hardt said he would be very cautious of the materials on the campus, with an eloquent existing building with simple clean lines and contemporary materials and expanded nicely which is running the risk of adding more materials to the campus and encouraged them to simplify the palette.

Mr. Taylor agreed with Mr. Hardt's critique. He said he appreciates the 3D elevations in the packet. He said the two existing signs have room for additional branding and would like focus on those areas and not on signs on the building.

Mr. Taylor said he likes the sky bridge and the two towers of the building are the weakest part of the building. He felt the Jaguar tower could be resolved with the colors but the Land Rover is out of place and is a traditional architecture stuck on a modern building. He said the stone base does not exist anywhere else on the campus and is out of place.

Mr. Taylor said the signs of the Jaguar and Land Rover work against the building and for the existing buildings the architecture speaks louder than the signs do and it reminds him too much of the Porsche addition that no one liked that was proposed a few years ago which seemed stuck on as entrance pieces.

Mr. Taylor said that the building on the Perimeter side needs to be a signature building at a different scale and the end of the building falls apart and he would be thrilled to make a stronger statement with the building that does not need the signage.

Mr. Budde said he agrees with the comments as stated and complimented Mr. Parish on the great work and quality of the proposal. He said he thought the parking plan made sense and would agree with the proposal.

Ms. Krumb said she agrees with the parking plan with fewer spaces but would like to determine a ratio rather than stating in the text a number of spaces. She said she likes the sky bridge and is concerned with the footing and landing near the pond and the landscaping on the underside. She is supportive of not replacing the pine trees because of the bridge and the reason they were planted in that location but would want others replaced by Code.

Ms. Krumb said she would like to see the placement of the bridge and the building so as not to reduce the existing pond size because she would rather see the wet pond over a dry detention.

Ms. Krumb said she is okay with adding new brand signs but not the way they are being added and would not exceed the height code.

Ms. Kramb thought the entrances would be more appropriate if they mimicked the main building.

Ms. Kramb agreed with the architectural comments already stated and thought the rear was boring and she would like to break out with texture and colors matching the other buildings.

Ms. Salay said the sky bridge needs to have something better than the black block and could be more interesting. She said to stay consistent with the rest of the campus architecture this proposal needs to be brought up into the existing standards of the existing campus. She disagreed with the proposed stone. She said the signage that will be on the inside of the Lamborghini showroom is still a sign and should be regulated with a more creative way for all the branding.

Ms. Salay agreed with the parking proposal and felt it was a business decision but agreed with a ratio requirement.

Ms. Newell said the sky bridge is unique and she said she loves this campus and the design of the existing buildings. She said she would like to know more about the retention pond and the design of the edges related to the building.

Mr. Parish said there will be a more natural edge with the use of stone with an interesting modern look and would be bringing back renderings at the next review.

Ms. Newell said the colors of the building should stay within the grey scheme and the features for the Jaguar and Land Rover are used for signage and are not integrated well within the overall building as proposed with the width and proportions being very thin and the ends should be wider across the end of the building and not used as signage elements.

Ms. Newell understands dealerships desire to brand their buildings and have their names on them but this wall signage is not appropriate along Perimeter because other existing buildings have been held to monument signs. She said the heights of the signs are limited to 15 feet height elevation and the 24 foot height is only remaining because of an existing sign and should be consistent with the other areas.

Ms. Newell said she is concerned with the back areas because the landscaping provides screening and asked that the back of the buildings look great and not use landscaping as a screen for a weaker part of the building structures. She said the CMU on the sky bridge should be considered in lieu of the split face or sand blasted or polished face to add some interests like the rain screen.

Ms. Newell said she supports the reduction of parking and asked for available visitor spaces and that every vehicle is parked in a designated parking space and not on the test track which should not be used to display vehicles.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thought that the water abutting the building such as done at the Sutphen building could be an appropriate way to treat this pond with the building and that there is a number of ways to regulate the height of the pond with spill ways and make up wells.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said architecture should be simple and consistent with the existing campus.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they should spade the existing trees out and store close by this site and spade them back in because it is difficult to plant trees with the needed size of the ones being removed and bring them back, they are beautiful trees and you cannot buy them like they are currently on site.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the existing entry feature needs to be improved as part of this package and the existing plants are past their useful life span and the entry feature needs to be brought up to speed

because there are really nice landscape displays on the balance of the new buildings. She agreed with the comments regarding the back of the building should not be just screened with landscaping and the stone water table is not appropriate. She said the signs to be well done and meet Code. She said to explore with the staff the tree replacements and looked forward to a tree survey and suggestions of their horticulturist for the plants that are required reach maturity. She suggested that there is no limit to the informal review and if he would like to return with material options or proposals that the applicant was welcome to return for further comments.

**3. U-Haul
14-038CU**

**6419 Old Avery Road
Conditional Use**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the "The following application is a request for the use of an existing building as a retail space, warehouse and storage space for U-Haul, located on the south side of US 33, west of Avery Road.

Gary Gunderman presented this application for a conditional use for U-Haul and proposed to utilize the Hilliard's Furniture store with their current location to the west along Old Avery Road. He said the plan divides the building and is looking to provide a showroom area with a nicer entrance with support facilities at the northern end with individual storage type units in a climate controlled area indicated for medical records. He said the last space will be general warehouse left as an open area.

Mr. Gunderman said the site was revised when the building was expanded in 2003 when the site improvements were brought up to Code at that time and there are few changes proposed to the site. He said the addition is a drive way connection relocating the dumpster and removing a few parking spaces to provide the second access. He said the proposed elevations of the building are unchanged except for re-painting the building.

Mr. Gunderman said the ditch line is not in good shape and the applicant will restore it to what it was intended and re-grade, they will be landscaping and replacing the existing signs and will meet Code. He said this site is within the Western Innovation District and does not anticipate the use of these types of storage facilities but does provide for uses previously permitted to be considered but as it was permitted and in this case it would have been permitted as a conditional use and therefore it is a conditional use within this district.

Mr. Gunderman said they recommend approval with no conditions.

Ms. Krumb asked if the signs shown on the renderings were to the height and size. Mr. Gunderman said they are not included because they had provided a draft that does not comply with Code. Ms. Krumb asked if the applicant has agreed to install the signs according to Code. Mr. Gunderman confirmed they will comply with Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in the applicant.

Dean Haske, President of the U-Haul Company of Ohio, 2980 Morse Road, Columbus, Ohio, said they are willing to go along with the regulations regarding sign height and size and he agrees to do whatever it takes.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Mr. Taylor said the paint colors as indicated are beige and the doors facing the north elevation looks to be bright orange doors causes him concern because they are facing Avery Road. He asked if that color of orange was essential to this application or can they be changed to match the rest of the building.

Mr. Haske said the door color is essential to their business and could not change the color of the doors.

Mr. Taylor said that would be a sticking point for him and asked if the dumpster location is existing in front of the door or would there be a better location on site.

Mr. Gunderman said most of the other locations would get to be somewhat of an interference with the parking pattern, but thought they would be able to relocate it more appropriately.

Mr. Taylor said the dumpster should be pushed behind the front face of the building. He asked if the empty parking area to the right of the building was being used for a specific use of the operation of the business.

Mr. Gunderman said they need a few of the parking spaces to make the parking requirement, but the area to the right is excess and was part of the original main parking area of the previous business.

Mr. Taylor asked if the goal was to incorporate the color of U-Haul into the building or was the intent to paint the doors orange.

Mr. Haske said it is a U-Haul color.

Mr. Taylor asked if the color could be incorporated into the building a way that is more integrated into the architecture other than the doors, since there is going to be a new sign location if they could coordinate the location of the sign and the color to work together better with the logo.

Mr. Haske said at many of their locations they do a horizontal wave that would be breaking line of the gabled roof.

Ms. Salay said the garage doors are going to be facing SR33 and that would be a modification to the building.

Mr. Haske said the garage doors are placed on the façade as nonfunctional garage doors for display only as a feature of storage doors toward the road and would act as a sign identifying the U-Haul business.

Ms. Salay said she would like to see that element of the building eliminated as it is not an attractive part of the building and would not make any sense to have non-functional garage doors in a grassy area of the site. Ms. Krumb agreed.

Ms. Salay confirmed the proposed sign locations to be on the north and east elevations of the building. Mr. Gunderman agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is not supportive of anything presented with this application.

Ms. Krumb suggested removing the garage doors.

Mr. Taylor said he supports the conditional use aspect, but the fake garage doors makes that side of the building look worst and thought there is a way to get the sign on the building, but take the garage doors off creating a blank pallet to get the sign installed and get the orange color incorporated and will make the side of the building look better.

Ms. Newell said she could not support the garage doors facing SR33 and understands the desire to brand and orange is a U-Haul color if used on the building it needs to be integrated aesthetically and the proposal regarding signage does not pictorially comply with Code and she has several issues and is uncomfortable with this application.

Mr. Hardt said he agrees on the garage door issue and the orange color is not helping the applicant but the issue is that this community has gone through great lengths to minimize and hide garage doors, so putting them on to just show them off is something that he will not ever support. He said the signage providing it is brought into compliance with Code and trusts that staff can take care of that and he said he pulled it off the consent agenda that has nothing to do with what has been discussed. He said they had a previous application recently that was to rent more commercial trucks and in that case they had a lot of discussion and the applicant went through great lengths at their request to screen the trucks while being parked. He asked where they plan to park the trucks because existing conditions are that they are scattered throughout their existing facility to the west are they going to be left at that site or are they being moved to the new facility.

Mr. Haske said they are not going to the new facility at all, there will be cargo vans and pickup trucks parked there but the larger box trucks will stay on the storage facility.

Mr. Hardt said he is supportive of the use.

Ms. Readler said the review criteria is focused on the use and the architecture is something that is discussed.

Mr. Hardt said the use brings with it the parked trucks which they have held another applicant to a high standard and it is his preference to hold this site to the same standard in terms of screening trucks that have logos on the side of them.

Ms. Newell agreed and said the site sits lower than the grade of the road, so it is very difficult to see with some natural screening at the location and would like to see the spaces being used with stripping to indicate how it will be handled and the limitations.

Mr. Hardt said the other business was to designate specific parking spot of where their trucks would be parked versus customer parking with the truck parking areas being screened with landscaping.

Mr. Haske said he would be happy to do that as well.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if he wanted to vote on the application as presented or if he would like to table the request and return with a revision.

Mr. Haske asked to be tabled to work out a plan that meets what the Commission is looking for.

Mr. Gunderman asked what type of screening they would compare to the last application. Ms. Amorose Groomes said there could be a landscape island which to create a drive entry with trees to soften the view and not use shrubs.

Mr. Gunderman asked for feedback regarding the orange wave incorporated to the building. Mr. Taylor and Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed that the applicant should incorporate the orange tastefully and appropriately into the building.

Motion and Vote

Amy Salay move to table this Conditional Use application at the request of the applicant to revise the plans to reflect existing conditions correctly. John Hardt seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor,

yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Tabled 7 – 0.)

**4. Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District-Riverside Neighborhood District
14-039ADMC Zoning Code Amendment
and**

**5. Zoning Map Amendment/Area Rezoning-Bridge Street District - Riverside
Neighborhood District Zoning Map Amendment
14-040Z**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following two cases will be heard together as they are related to one another but will require separate actions. She said the following applications are requests for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for modifications to the Zoning Code to establish a new Bridge Street District zoning district and related Code amendments for the Riverside Neighborhood District and for an area rezoning of 20 parcels for the BSD Riverside Neighborhood and BSC Public Districts in the Bridge Street District.

Rachel Ray said wanted to begin her presentation by briefly explaining how the zoning districts for the entire Bridge Street district were established. She said that Planning originally used the character districts included in the Vision Report for the Bridge Street District to generalize the land use character envisioned in different portions of the district. She said they envisioned from a form perspective the different types of building heights, massing and types of uses, which informed the proposed zoning districts. She explained once the zoning districts were created, Planning assigned zoning district designations to individual parcels throughout the entire Bridge Street District achieve the intent and overall objectives of the Bridge Street District Vision.

Ms. Ray said some of the zoning districts are special, such as the neighborhood districts. She referred to the Historic Residential Neighborhood, which was intended to carry over the existing zoning standards in effect prior to the Bridge Street District zoning, because there was no need to make any changes to the zoning regulations applicable to the residential properties in the Historic District. She pointed out the Historic Transition Neighborhood, which has some degree of consolidated property ownership. She stated that this area is important because of the transition into the Historic District.

Ms. Ray referred to the two neighborhood districts at each end of the District, which have the most significant opportunities for transformational placemaking for the Bridge Street District as the major mixed use centers of activity. She said the Neighborhood District graphics were created to guide the placemaking elements for each of these special zoning districts because there was an expectation that these properties would develop over time.

Ms. Ray said after the Area Rezoning and the Zoning Code Amendment was approved in 2012, the City began to focus at City Council's direction on the Scioto River Corridor toward the end of 2012. She said it began with the acquisition of key properties for the implementation of some key public improvements such as the planned roundabout at SR161 and Riverside Drive, and the relocation of Riverside Drive to create the riverfront park. She explained that around the same time, a development entity came forward that began to consolidate many of the properties within the Scioto River Corridor area which was a significant change from the property ownership pattern at the time of the area rezoning. She said that when the Area Rezoning initially went forward the property ownership was highly fragmented. She said the owners at the time were less interested in the significant mixed use development opportunities along the riverfront and that is why the existing zoning of BSC Office Residential and BSC Commercial was recommended at that time.

Ms. Ray summarized that clearly, circumstances have changed and given the new property owners for a lot of the land in this area and the opportunities to open up and expand access to and engage the riverfront, there is an opportunity to take another look at the zoning for this area.

Ms. Ray said creating the new Riverside Neighborhood District allows the Bridge Street Zoning Regulations to better fit the intent of the larger unified development anticipated for the Scioto River Corridor area. She said the new zoning is largely a combination of the regulations that apply across the other neighborhood districts in addition to the provisions for placemaking elements including the "shopping corridor," which is a highly mixed use node within each Neighborhood District. She outlined the requirements for building types, comprehensive sign plans, and lot and block requirements. She said this also facilitates the review process by allowing these elements to be addressed more comprehensively and in a coordinated fashion rather than based on the separate zoning districts that apply to the individual parcels in this area.

Ms. Ray said the related Code amendments involve a series of technical amendments as well as a few more substantive amendments. She said the Riverside District is structured nearly identical to the structures of the other Neighborhood Districts. She said the graphic is intended to show conceptual alignments for the street network, as well as open space corridors, gateways, and the location of the shopping corridor.

Ms. Ray said this Neighborhood District does include a few differences intended to mitigate the need for future waivers or Code amendments when developments come forward based on unique site conditions. She said the first of which is block length, given the unique frontage configuration along the roundabout. She explained that whatever happens in the area, it is likely the block sizes will exceed the maximum block length requirement, but the proposed amendment still requires the mid-block pedestrian ways to ensure connectivity and that the development is broken down into smaller project elements. She said they included the provision that requires a minimum of 12 feet of clear sidewalk area along the shopping corridors free from any patios, bike facilities, street trees or any other furnishings to make sure there is plenty of room for the anticipated degree of pedestrian activity in this area.

Ms. Ray said the City is sponsoring the application for an Area Rezoning for 20 parcels, which includes a combination of three zoning districts, the BSC Residential, Office Residential, and Commercial Districts. She said these were designed to reflect the character districts within the Vision Plan and intended to have more of a single use focus to support the more mixed-use nodes that are envisioned elsewhere. She said this zoning had much to do with the fragmented land ownership at the time of the original zoning in 2012. She said many property owners were concerned about their existing uses, and were concerned with the names of the zoning districts, and wanted to make sure their existing properties would not be impacted by the new zoning.

Ms. Ray said the new Riverside Neighborhood District will be applied to the land along the east side of the relocated Riverside Drive including the driving range, the Bridge Point Shopping Center, properties along Dale Drive and the former Wendy's restaurant site. She said on the west side of the relocated Riverside Drive right-of-way, the BSC Public District is recommended, which is the same zoning district applied to the other parks and other publicly owned and operated uses throughout the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Ray said the proposed Zoning Code and subsequent Zoning Map amendments bring this area into alignments with the overall vision and planning for the Scioto River corridor area and generally are consistent with City's policy for establishing as much clarity and predictability for developers as possible for the City's plans and expectations for development within the Bridge Street District. She said the amendments are a prerequisite for any redevelopment of the Scioto River Corridor of this scale and magnitude. She concluded that approval to City Council for the proposed Zoning Code Amendments to create the new Zoning District and a related Code Amendments has been recommended by the

Administrative Review Team. She stated that the Administrative Review Team also recommended approval to City Council for the Area Rezoning of 20 parcels to the BSD Riverside Neighborhood District and the BSC Public District.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone from the general public that would like to speak to this application. [There was none.]

Amy Kramb said she read through all the other Neighborhood District texts to compare them with the proposed text and realized that it is almost identical, with only a handful of sentences that are different. She referred to the description of the district and noted that the phrase "substantial residential presence" should not be used because it implies there is a ton of residential development. She said this is too strong and suggested that it be changed to "residential base to complement a strong mixed-use..." She said she would like to see the land uses balanced.

Ms. Kramb referred to (F)(4)(a)2 referring to corridor buildings with residential, hotel or office uses located on a parcel within 600 feet of SR161. She suggested eliminating the word "parcel" because a parcel could be a huge piece of land and should be changed to say "the corridor building [itself] should be within 600 feet of West Dublin-Granville Road." She said they should go off the building itself and not the parcel because she never wants to see a 7.5-story building.

Ms. Kramb asked for clarification of the intent of (F)(4)(b)1.

Ms. Ray referred to page 26 of the Bridge Street District Code. She said in 153.062, there is a table to address building type incompatibilities. She pointed to the list of existing building types and said that if one of those building types exists, such as an existing single-family detached building, and a developer wants to build a corridor building, they couldn't do it next to a single-family detached given the scale difference. She said the reason why this was noted as a potential amendment is that, as the City has been working with Crawford Hoying, they have indicated that for a portion of their development, they would like to build townhomes first (which is a single-family attached type of product), and then build a corridor building across the street in one area as part of a later phase. She said this could create a conflict with the building type incompatibility table, and that is why Crawford Hoying requested that the amendment be included.

Ms. Kramb said she was concerned with making an overall Zoning Code amendment as an exception for a single developer with an isolated issue.

Victoria Newell agreed with Ms. Kramb and pointed out that was the purpose of the Waiver process. She thought a Waiver would be a much better solution in this instance.

Ms. Ray said the amendment could be eliminated.

Ms. Kramb agreed. She asked why conference centers could not be on the first floor of buildings, and if the restriction no longer applies, then the amendment should apply to all the districts and not just this Neighborhood District.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the nature of conference centers is that people are inside all day with no engagement with the street. She said this was counterproductive to the objectives of the Bridge Street District, because we want the street to be active. She recalled a lot of discussion on this topic when the Bridge Street Code was initially drafted, and she was concerned with the potential negative impact on the streetscape as a result.

Ms. Ray said this Code Section just states that conference centers are permitted to be within one story buildings, not saying that they cannot be on the ground floor.

Ms. Kramb said in the other zoning districts, conference centers are not permitted on the first floor.

Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed that regulations pertaining to conference centers should either apply to all the districts the same way, or applicants should request Waivers for something different.

John Hardt said he is supportive of modifying the text to address fundamental structural issues in the Code that prohibit the present developer from doing what they are trying to do. He said he is not comfortable with changes in the Code that deal with one particular building or one instance that should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, which is the reason why the Waiver process was conceived.

Ms. Amorose Groomes reiterated that Waivers should not be perceived as an obstacle. She said they should be encouraged in the sense that they are really an invitation to excellence.

Ms. Kramb referred to the block length requirements along the roundabout ((F)(3)(b)2). She asked if there was a better way to identify "blocks with frontage."

Ms. Ray said the City is certain that there cannot be a new street with full access that would intersect Riverside Drive south of Dale Drive/ "Park Avenue" to meet the block requirements due to the roundabout right-of-way, so that is the reason, regardless of who comes forward with a development project, that this provision is recommended.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the area of influence for the roundabout should be defined.

Richard Taylor referred to the Riverside Neighborhood District graphic. He said previously, they had discussed extending the shopping corridor farther to the east to at least to the intersection with the Dale/Tuller connector road. He said he hoped there would be accommodations made to allow for a great deal more activity that would allow the shopping corridor to extend all the way along that roadway east toward Sawmill road. He said if that is correct, he would like to see the shopping corridor extended to the east limit of this district.

Ms. Ray noted that mixed-use development has to be fairly concentrated to be successful, and said that we would not want to detract from the success of commercial areas along Riverside Drive or the other Neighborhood Districts in lieu of what could potentially happen farther to the interior of the Bridge Street District. She pointed out that all of the zoning districts allow for a mix of uses and suggested that an arrow be drawn to the end of the shopping corridor diagram.

Mr. Hardt said he agrees with the desire for a concentration of mixed-use development along Riverside Drive. He said he wanted to make sure whatever infrastructure is in place, between the streetscape design and the distance of buildings setback off the street, he would not want to do anything in the easternmost block that would result in a choke point that prohibits the shopping district from going farther east. He said if this is wildly successful as he envisions, the shopping district could someday connect up the hill to Dublin Village Center.

Mr. Taylor said the parking garage height is also something of a concern.

Mr. Taylor referred to page 5 in the district intent, he is not in favor of the statement that "this development within the district will include a strong residential presence." He said he doesn't think that by not including the statement they are denying residential uses in this area, but they are also not encouraging it in specific areas. He said the mix of uses needs to be looked at holistically. He said he would like to eliminate any reference to the "strong residential presence" and that will bring it more in line with the other two Neighborhood Districts that refer back to the charts and tables.

Mr. Taylor referred to page 5, the BSD Riverside Neighborhood District Intent, and asked what was meant by "complementing the Historic District."

Ms. Ray said the intent is the types and scale of uses that are possible in the Riverside Neighborhood District can help support the smaller scale businesses and uses within the Historic District.

Mr. Taylor said he is worried that instead, we may end up creating two separate districts with a neat bridge between them. He said he is concerned that they are suggesting that they are "complementing" the Historic District on the west side of the river and he does not see anything that accomplishes a real connection between the two.

Mr. Langworthy said the idea was to have strong attractions on both sides of the bridge. He said they may need to reword the statement to "coordinate with."

Mr. Taylor referred to the list of permitted building types on page two and asked that this refer to the chart in Code Section 153.062 instead.

Mr. Taylor said with respect to the building height provision referenced earlier, buildings exceeding 5.5 stories should be approved on an individual basis through Waivers, so that eliminates provision 2 under Building Types.

Ms. Krumb pointed out that the other Neighborhood Districts have similar wording.

Amy Salay confirmed that there is a provision within the Bridge Street District that allows up to 7.5-story buildings. She said that height should not be permitted by right, but if there is a reason to allow that height, then it can be allowed as a Waiver. She said 7.5 stories is a large building, and that scale would dwarf everything around it.

Ms. Ray clarified that Code allows for buildings with a maximum of 5.5 stories, but in certain areas, an additional two stories with a "step back" from the front façade of a minimum of eight feet could be permitted. She said the buildings with additional height are intended to be within proximity to I-270, so that if there is a taller building, it is in a more appropriate location for taller heights.

Mr. Taylor said they have talked about larger and taller buildings and did not realize it was already in the other districts.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the height issue needs to be addressed now. She said 5.5 stories should be the maximum without a Waiver.

Mr. Taylor asked for clarification on the sidewalk requirement of 12 feet.

Ms. Ray said the intent was to have 12 feet of clear sidewalk space free of any planters, cycle tracks, or patios, to ensure a highly walkable area within the shopping corridor.

Mr. Taylor said his biggest concern is that this provision and many of the others appear to be supporting the needs of a particular developer and they are being asked to make specific Code changes and to rezone an entire area without seeing what they are voting on. He said this might be the best approach given the situation but he is reluctant to take this much further without seeing any development proposals. He said the Commission is aware that there is already something that has been conceptually designed and presented informally months ago, although the plans may have changed. He said the Commission deserves to see the buildings and what they are voting on before they vote on the Code amendment.

Mr. Hardt said he agrees with Mr. Taylor and requested an informal presentation with an update on the developer's current plans informing the proposed Code amendments.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed with Ms. Krumb's earlier comments related to the Riverside Drive frontage and the first block close to the roundabout. He said with respect to the comments on building height, he is willing to consider 7.5-story buildings on a case by case basis. He said he thought he recalled a discussion about parking structures not being permitted across the street from each other because they create dead streetscapes with no activity and no commercial uses, and the Commission didn't want them dominating a block.

Ms. Ray agreed and said a provision to that effect was discussed with a potential update of the Code. She said it was a lengthy discussion and Planning intended to bring those amendments forward.

Mr. Hardt said when they were having that discussion, he was envisioning above-ground parking structures. He said he could support the need to tweak those provisions to address below-ground parking structures, since that is a very different situation. He said he was expecting to see parking garages be the basis of the issue with building type incompatibilities because the proposed development has spots where there are multiple parking garages planned, which would potentially be fine because they are underground. He said from a Code perspective, there may be an issue.

Mr. Hardt said he is not in support of gateways because they become monuments for developers to put their individual stamps out front indicating where their development starts and ends. He said he thought the intent is to have a cohesive district, from Sawmill Road to the I-270/33 interchange.

Ms. Ray said staff had talked about the intent of "gateways" as well. She said this is going to be a very public area with plaza spaces and open spaces and water features, and so on. She said the intent is that those areas have a higher degree of design to make a statement about entering a *place* and that is why they are along Riverside Drive and not at the edges of the development where the transition should be more seamless.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought that a major statement would be made with the use of granite curbs and paver streets, not with huge signs. She said there is nothing less attractive than a sign across I-270 with a development name on it. She said she thought the intent was to create a place that was identified by the overall sense of place.

Ms. Newell said she thinks the gateway text is appropriate but the problem is with the way it is written, because it states that signs are specifically permitted. She suggested eliminating the reference to the sign provisions altogether, which presents an opportunity to review signs if they are presented as part of a gateway, or reject signs that are not appropriate.

Ms. Ray suggested that in addition, the public function of the gateways could be emphasized.

Mr. Langworthy said Council has asked that they develop a City-wide wayfinding system that includes gateway designs, and part of the presentation that the consultant team with Kolar Design will make will include examples of gateway designs based on location.

Ms. Krumb pointed out that reference to signs in the gateway provisions is also in the other Neighborhood Districts, so the change will need to be made across the board.

Mr. Hardt asked how the use table reflected the uses proposed by the developer.

Ms. Ray said the use table is a mirror of the other Neighborhood Districts, with no differences. She said the developer asked for a potential for a drive-thru for restaurants, and staff was not supportive of that

use. She said that use would then have to be addressed separately. She said when the Commission went through the Code a few months ago, they noted other desired changes to the table and Planning intended to bring those back, but for this short term they wanted to keep it consistent with the other districts.

Ms. Krumb said under the current zoning it is BSC Office and up to the north is BSC Office Residential, so comparing the office zoning districts, conference centers as zoned were conditional uses and in the proposed rezoning allows it to be a permitted use. She said religious institutions under the existing would be conditional and they had some specifics added to the condition and they are now permitted. She said transit stations are conditional uses under office and now would be permitted, and surface lots were permitted and now they are conditional uses under the new district.

Ms. Ray said there are some other size limitations to retail, entertainment and personal service uses, and with the new zoning there would no longer be size restrictions.

Mr. Hardt said if transit stations are conditional in other districts they should be in this district as well because they have a potential for significant impacts on the properties that abut them and need to be located in the right spot.

Mr. Hardt referred to the "Materials" section in the Building Types Code Section, and stated the provisions should be kept the same. He said other high quality materials could be considered, but are subject to the reviewing body.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the use of special materials should be an earned waiver and not codified as a right.

Mr. Hardt said he would happy to approve a modification that gives relief to the dimensional requirements for below grade parking but would be inclined to keep them in place for parking above ground. He said it does not make sense to put something in Code that requires compliance, and if the intent is to say that the minimum clear heights as required in the Ohio Building Code is acceptable then the correct approach is to delete the paragraph altogether because they have to comply with that anyway. He said to modify the text so that the minimum clearances they had in the Code remain in effect but clarify that they only apply to above ground parking.

Mr. Hardt said he is concerned that they are being asked to rezone a chunk of the City that is arguably the most critical and most precious piece of land in the City and the map they have drawn conveniently coincides with the ownership of one particular party. He said the proposed Zoning District boundaries should be in the best interest of the community, and not just a particular property owner.

Ms. Ray pointed out that the potential developer of much of the land does not actually control all of the land proposed for rezoning to the BSD Riverside Neighborhood District. She asked for clarification how the Commission recommended that the boundary be drawn.

Mr. Hardt said they should include the additional parcels to the east of Dale Drive, or they cut it off at Dale Drive. He said either would make sense to him from a planning standpoint and understood that there may be different opinions.

Ms. Ray said they want to make sure whatever happens on both side of Dale Drive has a relationship to each other.

Mr. Taylor said it would be more appropriate to have the Riverside Neighborhood District turn that corner than to have the corner itself be the intersection of two different districts.

Ms. Salay commented that with respect to conference centers, Council had been informed that such facilities would be studied to determine where should be located in the city. She said in terms of the Code amendment and area rezoning, she wanted to make sure they are working for Dublin and not just the property owner, and that we are doing what is best for the Bridge Street District. She said that the conference center use should be moved back to a conditional use so that it can be determined if the location is appropriate.

Ms. Salay said the Crawford Hoying project proposal had a lot of siding shown on some of the buildings. She said the materials provisions in the Code needed to involve less siding.

Ms. Newell said her comments have been addressed by the other Commissioners and her biggest concern was related to spot zoning this particular area. She said she saw merit in creating a Neighborhood District along Riverside Drive but the district needs to follow along Dale Drive and/or include the properties leading up to it.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she agrees with the comments of the Commission. She said her biggest concern is the importance of getting the residential component right. She said the potential for a 7.5-story building was alarming because it allows residential uses. She said she knows that everyone wants to build residential development, because that is where the money is, but she would like to make sure great care is taken with the type of development that is approved and the mix of land uses. She said this is the crown jewel property in the entire Bridge Street District and it should be remain the crown jewel particularly given its prominence along the riverfront.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she dislikes the name "Park Avenue" and that it does not represent who they are as a city. She pointed out that the street is labeled as such on the drawings and to her knowledge the names of the streets have not been approved. She said she does not like the name "Riverside Neighborhood District" because they have a community called Riverside.

Mr. Hardt and Ms. Krumb agreed.

Ms. Amorose Grooms commented on the importance of balance in the Bridge Street District and agreed with the removal of the language specific to creating a "strong presence of residential." She said she was hopeful that in no district is the residential presence stronger than other uses; if so, then by nature they have defeated the mixed use component of the mixed use walkable urban district. She said whatever they are codifying they are codifying the encouragement of a balanced district with as many jobs created as there are residential units created because there has to be a relationship to balance the uses.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she appreciates the number of hours that the Commissioners have dedicated to review the Code. She thought the changes are good and would like to see this come back along with the other residential neighborhood districts with the problems fixed that were revealed through this review so that they are all three amended at the same time.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said they would like to see the project details that have been presented to other the other reviewing bodies, because it would be more helpful for the Commission to become comfortable with the Code amendments. She reiterated that Waivers should not be perceived as a bad thing if the result is a better project.

Ms. Ray requested that these applications be tabled.

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved to table this amendment to the Zoning Code to allow staff to revise the proposed zoning regulations in accordance with the Commission's discussion. Mr. Hardt seconded. The vote was as

follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Tabled 7 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell move to table this request for a Zoning Map Amendment. Mr. Hardt seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Tabled 7 – 0.)

Communications

Ms. Husak introduced four new planning assistants, Logan Stang, Jonathan Staker, Katie Ashbaugh, and Nicki Martin.

Roundtable

Mr. Taylor said the issue with ARB and the Planning and Zoning Commission and the review of the Bridge Street Corridor major projects that are occurring in the architectural review district which was part of a presentation to Council on Monday and there was some discussion and voted on that regard. He said he still thinks it is an issue that they should look at. He said he attended the last ARB meeting where they looked at the Bridge Park West project and it was an informal and the first time they had seen the project and it was the first time he had seen it. He said he saw that body address the issues that they typically address within the Historic District and do that very well, what he did not see them do was address issues that were extremely problematic and major. He said he doesn't want to say that this particular group or commission is more qualified than the people on the ARB to review projects, but he thought the Commission's intense involvement in the process from day one and their long history of reviewing projects of that scale and knowing what questions to ask does make the Commission more qualified and more appropriate to review projects like that to maintain a consistency between the reviews of the both sides of the river and wanted to have this discussion continued and bring it up again at a later date.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that their review of the Code tonight says to the difficulty of understanding this Code and how it interplays together in these districts and she knows that it was presented to Council that the Administrative Review Team was involved and familiar with the Code and all the issues, but she suspects that they were to have a conversation about this particular piece of legislation this evening that the ART comments would be far different than those of the Commission. She said she did not think it was a well representation to say that the ART is as well versed with the districts and Code and the implementation of such.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 10:33 p.m.

As approved by Planning and Zoning Commission on July 17, 2014.