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 must 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. Kramb 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. Kramb'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 mad 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. Kramb 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. Kramb 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 Groomes 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 Groomes 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. Kramb agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes 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 Groomes 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 Groomes 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.)