

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### MEETING MINUTES

**FEBRUARY 5, 2015**

#### AGENDA

1. **Thomas Kohler PCD, Subarea E, Emerald Town Center – Elli Nail Spa**  
**14-115AFDP/CU** **5681 Woerner-Temple Road**  
**(Approved 6 – 0 Minor Text Modification)** **Amended Final Development Plan**  
**(Approved 6 – 0 Amended Final Development Plan)** **Conditional Use**  
**(Approved 6 – 0 Conditional Use)**
2. **Coffman Park PUD – Skate Park** **6565 Commerce Parkway**  
**14-117AFDP** **Amended Final Development Plan**  
**(Approved 6 – 0)**
3. **Coffman Park PUD – Justice Center** **6565 Commerce Parkway**  
**14-118AFDP** **Amended Final Development Plan**  
**(Approved 6 – 0 Minor Text Modification)**  
**(Approved 6 – 0 Amended Final Development Plan)**
4. **BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development**  
**15-002PP** **Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road**  
**(Approved 6 – 0)** **Preliminary Plat**
5. **Perimeter Center PUD, Subarea F4 – Mathnasium** **6716 Perimeter Loop Road**  
**15-003CU** **Conditional Use**  
**(Approved 6 – 0)**
6. **COTA Park and Ride Relocation** **Emerald Parkway & Bright Road**  
**15-006Z/CU** **Standard District Rezoning-Conditional Use**  
**(Approved 6 – 0 Rezoning)**  
**(Tabled 6 – 0 Conditional Use)**

The Vice Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: City Council Representative Amy Salay, Todd Zimmerman, Robert Miller, Deborah Mitchell, and Cathy De Rosa. Christopher Brown was absent. City representatives present were: Jennifer Readler, Philip Hartmann, Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Joanne Shelly, Gary Gunderman, Tammy Noble-Flading, Jennifer Rauch, Dana McDaniel, Colleen Gilger, Marie Downie, and Flora Rogers.

#### Administrative Business

#### Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to adjourn to Executive Session for personnel matters. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Ms. Newell announced the members returned from the Executive Session.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to elect Victoria Newell as 2014-2015 Chair. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. De Rosa moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to elect Mr. Zimmerman as 2014-2015 Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve November 13, 2014, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve December 4, 2014, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve December 11, 2014, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve January 22, 2015, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**1. Thomas Kohler PCD, Subarea E, Emerald Town Center – Elli Nail Spa  
14-115AFDP/CU 5681 Woerner-Temple Road  
Amended Final Development Plan/Conditional Use**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a minor modification to the development text to permit a beauty salon as a conditional use and a proposal for a 1,480-square-foot tenant space to be used as a nail salon within an existing shopping center at the southeast corner of the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Woerner-Temple Road. She said three motions are required, one for the minor text modification, one for the Amended Final Development Plan, and one for the conditional use. She said the Commission is the final authority on this entire application and we will need to swear-in.

The Chair swore in anyone wishing to address the Commission regarding this application.

Claudia Husak explained the first request for a minor text modification is to add personal service as a conditional use within the Subarea. In this particular instance, she said, the service is a beauty shop as defined in the Zoning Code and the analysis for the text modification lies with the review criteria in the Zoning Code. She said the second request is for an Amended Final Development Plan and approval is required for a minor text modification even though there are no modifications proposed to the site, location, or building. She said the final request is for conditional use as Staff is proposing to modify the development text to make the personal service a conditional use for this particular tenant in this shopping center.

Ms. Husak provided a view of the site and development with the Emerald Town Center Shopping Center. She reported that in 2013, the PZC approved patio spaces for two of the tenants. She pointed out the tenant space allocated for the nail spa. She provided a map of the Thomas Kohler Planned District that showed Subarea E that would be affected by this development text modification.

Ms. Husak indicated the applicant was present to discuss the use and the specifics of the site as proposed for this application.

Sarah Campbell, and Lisa Tebbetts, said they both work for Continental Realty, 2186 E. Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43209. Ms. Campbell said they were present to answer questions as they represent the out-of-state owners of the property that was acquired six months ago. She said they have been working with these owners for many years on different locations.

Ms. Husak said Staff has reviewed all the components to this application and approval is recommended for text modification to allow a personal service to be operated as a conditional use within Subarea E. She said approval is recommended for the Amended Final Development Plan as the entire criterion is met that are applicable to this application. She said approval is recommended for conditional use as nothing was found to be detrimental to the operations of the center or the neighborhood in general surrounding the site.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Amy Salay said she did not have any problems with this application as this salon would be a fine addition to this shopping center. She questioned the location of signs.

Ms. Campbell said signs have not been determined yet.

Ms. Husak said there was a Sign Plan approved with the Final Development Plan that very specifically lays out the sizes and locations for the signs so everyone has the same blade and size of text within the blade, which are for a sign on the parking lot side as well as the street side.

Ms. Salay said she wanted to know that the sign would fit and look appropriate since this is a very small tenant space versus the bigger tenant spaces there.

Ms. Husak said the sign would be reviewed during the sign permitting process.

Ms. Salay said it was brought to her attention that there is a parking issue in the center and the number of cars is too high at peak times and customers may be lost due to confusion at finding certain businesses. She said she wanted to bring this to the attention of Staff as well as the management of this site and suggested that maybe the tenants could work something out whereas the employees park in an area farther out.

Ms. Salay said when she has visited the site, she has witnessed code enforcement issues as the trash bins remain open and there are two additional black containers that are outside of the enclosure. She noted some big tires lying over by the guardrail, which need to be stored elsewhere. She added there seems to be a proliferation of window signs on the parking lot side.

Ms. Campbell said she appreciated the feedback and would address all of those issues.

Bob Miller said he was extremely supportive of the applicant's intent. He asked if the conditional use stayed with the tenant and when they left, if it would revert back. Ms. Husak confirmed that information. She said it would allow a substantially similar tenant to move in and continue operating under that

conditional use but if it was something different, like a shoe store for example, and then a nail spa went in, the conditional use would no longer be valid.

Mr. Zimmerman moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve minor text modification. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Mr. Zimmerman moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Mr. Zimmerman moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the conditional use. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**2. Coffman Park PUD – Skate Park  
14-117AFDP**

**6565 Commerce Parkway  
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for an Amended Final Development Plan for a skate park; restroom and shelter building; tennis and basketball courts; and parking spaces for City-owned parkland to be constructed in phases within the Coffman Park Planned Unit Development. She said the site is on the southwest side of Commerce Parkway, south of Perimeter Drive and west of Emerald Parkway. She stated the Commission is the final authority on this application.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Commission regarding this application.

Marie Downie said the application requires just one motion for the Amended Final Development Plan to make park improvements to these sites. She reported there are two sites that have proposed modifications; both are located within Coffman Park. She said the first is on the Justice Center site located southwest of the Perimeter Drive and the Commerce Parkway intersection. She said the second site is northeast of Commerce Parkway and Perimeter Drive.

Ms. Downie provided an aerial photo of Phase I of the proposal that includes the existing sport courts and the skate park located just off Coffman Park Drive.

Ms. Downie said the Community Plan includes a number of special area plans that are intended to provide illustrative representation of the potential development. She explained that both of the sites are included in the Emerald/Perimeter Area Plan and show additional parking as well as park improvements to the north of the Justice Center.

Ms. Downie said the Coffman Park Master Plan also includes these two locations. She said the plan was initiated by a Task Force in 2003 to improve the traffic flow and park area in general. She presented the graphic for the Coffman Park Master Plan that was included in the rezoning in 2011 and is intended to be used as the Preliminary Development Plan.

Ms. Downie said Laura Ball, of Parks and Open Space, is present to provide a more detailed background for this proposal.

Laura Ball, City of Dublin Parks and Open Space, 6555 Shier Rings Road, presented a graphic of the first portion of Phase II-A, which includes the Commerce Parkway 80-car parking lot that will be lit and landscaped. She showed the existing bike path along Commerce Parkway, which will be connected at the north entry of the parking lot. She noted the pavement changes to a sidewalk coming in front of the

parking lot to minimize the conflict between people using the sidewalk and to slow down the cars at the mound.

Ms. Ball presented a graphic of the additional improvements included in Phase II-A, which are located on the Justice Center site. She pointed out the area to the north of the Justice Center where half of the planned lit and landscaped parking lot is proposed; a skate park that was designed by Spohn Ranch Skateparks; and restrooms to service this portion of the park. She indicated the field will be graded to accept the Phase II-B amenities. She showed the proposed restroom location. She said the proposed materials are heavy cedar timbers, cedar siding, vertical raised seam copper cladding, and a boulder stone water table. She said the overhang is extended to provide shaded seating for park users.

Ms. Ball said in Phase II-B, the second portion of the parking lot will be completed with lighting and additional spaces for 40 cars. She said five fenced and lit tennis courts are proposed and two basketball courts with fencing at either end to prevent the balls from entering the pond or the tennis courts. She indicated room would be saved for two potential future raised platform tennis courts.

Ms. Ball stated that Coffman Park is one of our oldest parks and is really well connected as far as pedestrian access. She explained there are bike paths on the south side of Post Road and showed the graphics for the bike path system where some sections transition to sidewalks.

Ms. Ball said once the improvements are completed in front of the Justice Center, the existing skate park and courts will be removed.

Ms. Downie reported there are four conditions included in this Amended Final Development Plan:

- 1) That the remaining five inches of tree replacement for the Justice Center addition be located on the northern portion of the Justice Center site;
- 2) That the applicant provide additional landscaping at the north end of the parking area on the Coffman Park site;
- 3) That a buffer along Perimeter Drive be installed with Phase II-B; and
- 4) That a revised landscape and lighting plan be submitted subject to Planning approval prior to building permitting.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended as the criteria are met.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Victoria Newell said she was concerned about the park text where materials were to be stone and wood. She said there are no other buildings in the area with metal panel siding. She asked if the material would be real copper or metal panel siding with a copper finish. Ms. Ball confirmed a copper finish was proposed. Ms. Newell asked if anyone else had an objection to that as she was uneasy with that material.

Ms. Newell said she may be more accepting if the material was real copper and would weather really nicely, bringing out some of the green tones that are over there.

Ms. Ball said the restroom facility was designed by Ford and Associates and was initially presented to Staff in a weathered look of copper and Staff thought it was too stark of contrast so the copper color was proposed to complement the wood tones.

Ms. Salay asked if the roof would look like the Municipal Building roof.

Ms. Newell said there is the green roof on the Recreation Center and there is weathered style asphalt shingles on the Justice Center so this would be a whole new element. She said she preferred the same palette.

Todd Zimmerman asked if Ms. Newell preferred the design to be closer to the Justice Center. Ms. Newell confirmed that she did.

Ms. Salay said she thought that was a really cool building and liked the design but also considered the different materials. She asked why wood was proposed and not some sort of cementitious siding based on weathering and wear long term.

Ms. Ball said two designs were presented to Staff initially and the one proposed tonight reminded them of the architecture of the south pool with the heavy timbers.

Ms. Newell said she too liked the architecture of the south pool but that is not was represented in the rest of the park. She said this was not an approved material in the text and admits the text was not very detailed but it just said stone and wood, which is consistent with the surroundings.

Ms. Newell said it was a great application so she asked if anyone was interested in placing a condition to keep to the same palette and materials that are already in place.

Ms. Salay said she had questions with the tennis courts being fenced, and screening on the north side between Perimeter and the tennis courts. She asked if a thick evergreen screen could be planted there in advance of the fencing so the people playing tennis are not so visible. She said a chain link fence is not putting our best foot forward and would prefer thick landscaping. She asked if the plantings could occur before the basketball courts are constructed so they have a few years to grow.

Ms. Salay asked about the 50-foot tall lights proposed. She asked about the height of lights that are on the City's streets.

Ms. Ball said 50 feet is a typical height for a sports court; that is what was used at Avery Park as softball field lights are taller.

Ms. Salay said there seems to be a lot of tall poles and light in that area and is not sure how that blends with the balance of the park to the south in terms of the ambiance. She said she thought 50 feet was taller than the Justice Center and might be pretty stark.

Ms. Ball reiterated that 35-foot light poles are not made for sport courts. She said in order to do that it would need to be a custom order and would need to add a lot more poles. She said Parks and Open Space Staff prefer to have the number of poles as minimal as possible.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about the current height of the poles at the current tennis courts. Ms. Ball said they were done a while ago and could not recall.

Ms. Salay said the current lighting was adequate at those tennis courts.

Mr. Zimmerman said from personal experience, when playing tennis at night, you want the height of the light as it makes a difference.

Ms. Salay asked what the timeline will be for removing the existing skate park.

Ms. Ball said the existing skate park would come down in 2018 and the new skate park would be constructed in 2015.

Ms. Salay questioned the impact of two skate parks.

Ms. Ball said it was simply a budget issue as to why the plan was split.

Ms. Salay reiterated she was concerned about two skate parks open at the same time.

Ms. Ball said partial demolition of the current skate park is being considered budget wise.

Ms. Salay said if the cost was not significant, Finance could bring the issue to Council if it would be an optimal plan for Parks and Open Space.

Ms. Salay inquired about the office site envisioned for next to Delta Energy and asked if they are aware of everything being proposed.

Ms. Husak said she thought they had a site permit approved or a permit pending.

Ms. Husak clarified that in this Subarea, there are no material requirements for the shelter building. She said the Justice Center has fiber cement as a permitted material.

Ms. Newell said she had no objection to wood siding and is also fine with the siding being fiber cement. She said she was just surprised at the introduction of metal as a building material.

Ms. Salay read where the Justice Center has a metal standing seam roof in dark bronze to match the profile of the existing Justice Center. She asked if the darker bronze look could be considered to blend with the Justice Center. Ms. Ball said that could work.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what the surface color will be for the tennis courts.

Ms. Ball said the current standard is a beige and red.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the traditional green could be considered because the balls blend into the surface of beige courts when the lights hit them a certain way.

Ms. Ball said she could make the change to traditional green.

Cathy De Rosa asked if there was safe passage around the roundabout to and from the skate park.

Ms. Husak said there are cross bars painted on the pavement for pedestrian crossings in the roundabout.

Ms. Salay asked if a sign should be considered for the roundabout alerting drivers of the nearby park. She said her concern was for the safety of the pedestrians and the skaters as they will not be paying attention to the traffic.

Tina Wawzkiewicz said a line of text could possibly be added to an already existing sign.

Ms. Ball said a Coffman Park sign is being considered for this area to ensure the park users use the park entrance and do not conflict with our employee parking.

Ms. Newell asked Ms. Downie for a suggestion for the condition for the bronze finish.

Ms. Downie said she modified the conditions.

Ms. Newell asked the applicant if they agreed with the conditions and the answer was yes.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Zimmerman motioned, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with the six conditions:

- 1) That the remaining five inches of tree replacement for the Justice Center addition be located on the northern portion of the Justice Center site;
- 2) That the applicant provide additional landscaping at the north end of the parking area on the Coffman Park site;
- 3) That an evergreen buffer along Perimeter Drive be installed prior to Phase II-B to allow the plant material to mature;
- 4) That a revised landscape and lighting plan be submitted subject to Planning approval prior to building permits;
- 5) That the applicant replace the proposed metal siding materials for the shelter to match the metal roof material and color on the Justice Center; and
- 6) That the applicant change the color of the tennis courts to green.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**3. Coffman Park PUD – Justice Center  
14-118AFDP**

**6565 Commerce Parkway  
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for an Amended Final Development Plan for a two-story building addition on the south side of the City of Dublin Justice Center and all associated site improvements and two modifications to an approved development text to reflect pavement setbacks affected by right-of-way acquisitions and a change in the required parking ratio. She said two motions are required: one for the minor text modification; and one for the Amended Final Development Plan. She stated the Commission is the final authority on this entire application.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Commission regarding this application.

Marie Downie said she knew this application is on the consent agenda so she asked if a presentation was warranted.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve the two minor text modifications:

- 1) Decrease the 50-foot required setback for the existing parking along SR161/US33 to 40 feet.
- 2) Decrease the parking ration to 1/300 from 1/250 square feet of gross floor area.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with four conditions:

- 1) That all missing or dying trees in the parking lot and within the buffer adjacent to SR 161/US 33 be replaced and the landscape plans be revised accordingly at the building permit stage;
- 2) That all tree replacements be made at 2.5-inch caliper trees;

- 3) That Parks and Open Space Staff work with Planning to meet the landscape and lighting requirements as outlined in this report; and
- 4) That tree protection fencing be installed around the 12-inch tree on the south side of the building to ensure its protection.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**4. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development  
15-002PP Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road  
Preliminary Plat**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a Preliminary Plat that includes new public streets and nine blocks for development for a 30.9-acre site for a new mixed-use development at the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road. She said the Commission will make a recommendation to City Council on this request.

Rachel Ray gave a brief summary of the City's review process. She explained the Preliminary Plat is the first step in the subdivision of land and dedication of right-of-way (ROW) for public improvements. She listed the review criteria. She said plats in the Bridge Street District (BSD) require very close coordination with the BSD zoning regulations and the applicable Development and Site Plans.

Ms. Ray presented an overall BSD area map and pointed out the site's location. She presented the map from the Thoroughfare Plan and Community Plan that showed the major streets to which this plat must coordinate. She said the grid street network with nine development blocks, five new public streets, and a future mixed-use shopping corridor were part of the Basic Development Plan that was approved by City Council on January 20, 2015. She said the Preliminary Plat is a technical analysis of the subdivision of land and dedication of rights-of-way. She explained the Preliminary Plat identifies where new ROW is proposed to be dedicated to the City, and in this case, where some land is currently controlled by the City that would be incorporated into the new lots. She added the details of this arrangement will be determined through the development agreement, and presented a graphic showing how the ROW reconfigurations are proposed. She presented a slide showing where the existing east/west portion of Dale Drive will be vacated, and the new Bridge Park Avenue will become the new east/west street segment, in addition to the other new proposed streets. She presented a slide showing where there is reconfiguration of the ROW at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive.

Ms. Ray stated that a condition of approval for this application is that City Council approves a plat modification for the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent. She presented a slide that diagrams this condition.

Ms. Ray said street sections are the other major element included with the Preliminary Plat, which show all of the elements that are to be provided within the ROW. She explained that in an urban environment, the line separating the public ROW from private property is much harder to discern and is preferred for the overall area to be considered public realm (the spaces between the building façades on each side of the street); this includes the vehicular and pedestrian realms but they are much more closely related. She indicated the vehicular realm is entirely within the public ROW, but the ROW overlaps the pedestrian realm, and beyond the ROW is private property, where dimensions can vary depending on where the building is situated. In a successful urban environment, she said a pedestrian walking along the street should not be able to tell where the ROW line is; it should feel seamless.

Ms. Ray said the other hallmark of a great urban street is how well it is framed by buildings. She said the narrower the space between the building façades, the more comfortable it is from a pedestrian standpoint. She said once the buildings faces get too far apart, the street starts to feel too wide open and

suburban. She stated it is important to make sure the public realm includes just the right amount of pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular elements to maintain this delicate balance from an urban design standpoint.

Ms. Ray said on Bridge Park Avenue, which is part of the BSD Cycle Track Bicycle Network, the pedestrian realm is a little different than all of the other street sections. She said there are five-foot at-grade tree pavers, a five-foot cycle track, and a five-foot sidewalk at the edge of the ROW. She explained the 5 -30 feet of additional space provided on Bridge Park Avenue is for additional walkways, patios, and seating areas.

Ms. Ray presented the BSD Cycle Track System graphic. She explained that most of the cycle track will be provided along greenways; however, the section leading up to the pedestrian bridge necessitates a different approach. She noted some examples of cycle tracks that were included in the packets that have similar arrangements from around the world to show how they will function. She indicated that cycle tracks are designed for a range of bicyclists, from children to casual riders, whereas more “serious” commuter cyclists will tend to ride in the street. She said the cycle track is designed to serve as an overlap zone and an extension of the sidewalk.

Ms. Ray presented the approved street section for each of the five new streets, as approved by City Council with the Basic Development Plan and formalized with the proposed Preliminary Plat. She pointed out the various sections and how they differ in width on Bridge Park Avenue, Riverside Drive, Mooney Street, Longshore Street, Banker Drive, and Tuller Ridge Drive.

Ms. Ray reported that Planning and the Administrative Review Team have reviewed the proposed Preliminary Plat, and based on the review criteria, approval is recommended to City Council with two conditions:

- 1) That City Council approves a plat modification for the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent; and
- 2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted on this report are made prior to final review by City Council.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Victoria Newell asked to see the bicycle examples again and pointed out that one of the images shows a street heavily congested with bicycles. She said she is concerned with only having 10 feet of area left over once a restaurant with a fenced-in patio is added right next to the public sidewalk. She pointed out there is 14 feet, 5 inches from the building area to the edge of where the cycle track is proposed in some areas.

Ms. Ray said the recommendation for this section was to ensure a balance, the right delineation of spaces. She said there might be some days or even times during the day where there are lots of pedestrians and no bicyclists, and other times when the opposite occurs. She stated that this area should be shared by a variety of users. She said when this project comes forward for Site Plan Review we will see where those fences are proposed to make sure there is enough space remaining.

Ms. Newell asked if there was anything in the text that will hold that line. She said the way it is written now, the applicant will return and will be allowed to build all the way out to the right-of-way. She said “you never know what the future is going to bring.” She said she believes this amount of space for a very active area, which we want to be active, is too tight.

Amy Salay said she shared Ms. Newell’s concern. She said she was never a fan of combining the cycle track with the sidewalk but was persuaded by points made by Staff and fellow Council members. She

indicated the expectation is that cyclists are not going to be whizzing through this area. She said it is anticipated that the 'serious' cyclists will use the street and not the cycle track. She indicated discerning the correct width is a challenge and a balance needs to be reached.

Cathy De Rosa pointed out some differences in the types of paths shown in the examples provided by Staff, based on her experiences with some of the European examples. She said there are some paths meant for cyclists who are commuters not using a car, and others where the paths are meant for leisure day outings, tourists, and weekenders, and that there is a real difference between the two of them in terms of the way they are designed and feel. She indicated the design seems to facilitate what the most common use of that space will be. She said the question for the Commission to determine is what we want to happen in that particular corridor, and the commuters would need a wider path as opposed to the casual riders.

Ms. Newell said there were previous discussions among the Planning and Zoning Commission members, where the Commission had envisioned a scenario in the Bridge Street District where the bicycle is the primary mode of transportation to work, live, and play rather than relying on cars. She said she is concerned with bicycle congestion on top of pedestrian activity, patio areas, sandwich board signs, and all of the other activities that happen in this space. She said this does not mean that the right-of-way needs to be substantially wider, but a six-foot walk and five-foot cycle track would be more comfortable if there was more space around it. She said previously, the Commission's consensus was that 12 feet of sidewalk area seemed reasonable, but when bicycles are factored in with adjacent patio areas crowding up to the sidewalk, there is no guarantee that there will be enough space. She said she was concerned that applicants would be coming in and requesting to build fenced-in patios right up to the edge of the right-of-way, with no room for overlap.

Ms. Salay requested clarification regarding the 12-foot clear area sidewalk requirement. She said she assumed there was additional width at the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue.

Ms. Ray said the 12-foot clear area is the zoning requirement along designated shopping corridors, which the applicant has designated along both sides of Bridge Park Avenue between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street, and along portions of Riverside Drive. She said Staff's recommendation is that the 12-foot area is provided through the five-foot sidewalk, the five-foot cycle track, and two feet of overlap space on the paver tree grates. She added that in the portions of the streetscape where there are no street trees, there will be an additional five feet of pavement.

Ms. Salay verified that there is at least 12 – 15 feet of clearance in Staff's review.

Ms. Ray said in the Basic Site Plan, nothing less than five feet is shown on the adjacent private properties and the minimum 12 feet is provided within the public right-of-way. She said at Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive, the sidewalk widens from five to seven and a half feet adjacent to the five-foot cycle track.

Ms. Newell said there is a 12-foot clearance but it is being judged as going over what are actually tree grate planting areas where the Commission had previously envisioned planting beds.

Ms. Ray said at-grade pavers will be used in all areas except at the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue.

Ms. Newell reiterated her point that she did not consider the tree pavers a path for travel.

Deborah Mitchell said she was concerned about the safety for bicyclists and pedestrians and that there is enough room for them to coexist without problems. She said she has never seen paths delineated in the manner proposed with this application, but her experience has been when both groups are sharing the

same right-of-way or path, typically there is more than 10 feet and maybe even be more than 12 feet. She said people walking dogs should be considered as well as someone walking with children, strollers, etc. She stated that the paths can get very congested.

Ms. Mitchell stated that we do not know what is going to happen with restaurants or other businesses that would encroach into this public space. She said in her experience, in vibrant urban environments, all the action is on the walkways and they have to be more than just ways to get around. She indicated the paths have to be wide enough so festivals can occur, there is enough space for street performers, and people can do things individually and in groups. She said without any kind of rules or restrictions to ensure that space is not lost, she fears this will become a path to go from point A to point B. She said if one restaurant is encroaching into that area, maybe that is fine in limited instances, but if there is not enough room to have people milling around, a lot of vibrancy will be lost.

Steve Langworthy pointed out that this is the plat phase, and not the Site or Development Plan phases. He said there are a series of squares and open spaces that are also planned to occur along the streetscape with this project so the activity will not all be forced onto the sidewalks, although there will still be space for that. He said he hopes congestion is a problem. He referred to a meeting staff had held with David Dixon, formerly with Goody Clancy, who had assisted with the Bridge Street District vision. He said Mr. Dixon emphasized the need to provide a balance of space. Mr. Langworthy recalled Mr. Dixon saying if areas are too large that are not used all the time, the spaces appear to be too large and too empty and uncomfortable. He said Mr. Dixon had recommended that it was better to have smaller spaces with some congestion rather than larger, emptier spaces.

Mr. Langworthy said the population in this area will not be huge – certainly not like New York City population numbers. He said it is expected to be more like 1,500 – 2,000 people living here. Obviously, he said there will be visitors to Bridge Park, but they will not all be on the street at the same time. He indicated he is not anticipating huge crowds here that would require 15 – 20-foot wide spaces to accommodate them; this is not that kind of environment. He added this cannot be compared to Boston or New York City.

Ms. Mitchell stated 10 feet wide would be fine if it did not also include bicycles and that is what she is struggling with – that there is space to provide enough room for people, bikes, events, etc.

Ms. Newell indicated she had the same concerns. She said she remembers when sidewalk sales occurred and tables were pulled out onto the sidewalk for display. She said there are still a lot of places you go where that still happens, like in resort communities or farmer's markets. She stated Dublin has had a number of festivals that have been well-attended and included vendors. She said her concern was that lively environments like that would be created but there would not be adequate room to accommodate the activity.

Ms. Newell asked how five feet was determined to be an appropriate dimension for the cycle track. She said she is a cyclist that would likely use the path since she has never been comfortable riding in the street with her kids. At five feet, she said she envisions two bicycles traveling side-by-side because it is very common to have a parent and a child riding together. She said maybe kids are not envisioned for this area in the short term, but planning should be considered for 30 – 40 years out, and there may be kids here in the future, or as visitors.

Ms. Ray said the five-foot cycle track was intended for one-way traffic so people on the north side of Bridge Park Avenue will traveling west toward the river, and bicyclists on the south side of the street will be traveling east away from the river. She said the dimensions had been reviewed by representatives who had served on the City's Bicycle Advisory Task Force as well as the City's streetscape design consultant, MKSK.

Ms. Salay said she envisions the casual bicyclist using the cycle track, and that those types of bicyclists would disembark and walk their bikes in the areas that were too congested. She agreed that the more serious commuter cyclists would ride in the street.

Ms. De Rosa asked if all the cycle tracks were planned to be five feet wide. Ms. Ray said the cycle track configuration along Bridge Park Avenue is a special circumstance in the overall BSD Cycle Track loop network. She said elsewhere on the loop, including along the west side of Riverside Drive between Bridge Park Avenue and John Shields Parkway, the path would be two-way and would be 10 feet wide.

Ms. De Rosa indicated that it may be possible to make tracks in certain areas intended for commuters and make tracks in other areas for the casual riders that will be traveling at a much slower pace.

Ms. Ray presented the BSD Cycle Track loop map and stated that the planned network provides a lot of unique and interesting contexts, with the path adjacent to a number of planned greenways, through the highly active Bridge Park development along Bridge Park Avenue, through the Historic District, and across the pedestrian bridge. She pointed out the paths adjacent to the Indian Run would be more natural in character than the newer areas that are a result of the extension of John Shields Parkway that will be more urbanized in character. She indicated there are a lot of different experiences offered.

Ms. Salay asked if there will be sharrows in all of the public streets. Ms. Ray said Staff is just recommending the sharrows in the center of the travel lanes on Bridge Park Avenue at this point in time.

Ms. Salay asked how wide the pedestrian bridge is going to be. Ms. Ray answered 15 feet wide.

Bob Miller asked if the City's bicycle consultants were ever asked to discuss conflict and conflict resolution. He said he believes the cyclists will be primarily on the road and when Ms. Newell said she would not be on the road, it caused him some thought. He said for the most part, if he is riding in this area, he would be on the road so he would be able to get where he needed to go quickly. He said he sees the cycle track as aesthetically pleasing more so than functional, but could see residents and pedestrians having issues with bicyclists being in what they would consider to be "their" space. He asked if that is something that would be traffic controlled and would have to be policed.

Mr. Langworthy reported that the Bicycle Advisory Task Force told Staff that when comparing the serious bicyclist to the recreation bicyclist, the serious cyclist would stay on the road (even if you try to force them off the road) and would not be in the conflict area.

Mr. Langworthy recalled a time when he visited Portland, Oregon and he was at a restaurant watching bicyclists go by and when they would get on the sidewalk, they would tend to get off their bikes and walk them through the congested areas. He indicated there may even be some signs to that effect. He said cities make accommodations that way and the various cyclists and pedestrians ultimately learn to live together in that environment.

Mr. Langworthy commented on walking around planting areas. He said he will walk a few steps around a tree and that would not prevent him from walking in that area just because there are tree pavers.

Ms. Newell said she thought she recalled a presentation that suggested trees would be planted in raised planting beds and not just within tree grates or maybe something has changed. She said at one time the plantings were to be raised. She said someone wearing high heels would not be comfortable crossing a tree grate.

Ms. Salay asked if there would be individual trees because she read in one section there would be raised planters.

Joanne Shelly explained the way the Code reads, there is an option to have a planter box with plants or have an option to do some type of pervious pavement, whether it is a tree grate or a permeable paver. She said in areas where there will be high pedestrian activity we encourage the applicant to go with some type of tree grate and pervious paver material. She said for areas right at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive, we would encourage extra lush seasonal plantings as an entry feature, and at the bridge, there would be planter boxes. She said the City also has a preference of instead of having planter boxes everywhere, make sure we have planter boxes in areas where we can maintain them at a high level of quality and make expressions of interest and seasonal color in those locations and be more subdued and careful of our plantings in other locations so we can maintain the level of quality and visual interest we want at these intersections.

Ms. Newell said she appreciated that response. She said as a Commission, we have to make the decision on what the bike path is going to be. She said if it is really going to be just a casual bike path, then maybe the solution here is a little bit more agreeable, but the Commission's previous discussion had been an attempt to accommodate something that works for all types of users. She said she thought she recalled the Commission's last recommendation involved a path on a different level, separate from the pedestrian sidewalk and the street with their own truly dedicated bike lane. She said where it becomes difficult is now they are right next to one another. She said she does not know that there is a magic solution one way or the other. She said she anticipated struggling with this solution as it goes forward, but at this point, she did not think the discussion would prevent the application from being approved. She said she remained concerned with what would happen adjacent to the public right-of-way on the private side of the public realm.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Zimmerman motioned, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to recommend approval of this Preliminary Plat to City Council because the proposal meets the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations, with two conditions:

- 1) That City Council approves a Plat modification for the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent; and
- 2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to final review by City Council.

The Chair asked if the applicant agreed with the two conditions. Nelson Yoder said he agreed with the conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

#### **5. Perimeter Center PUD, Subarea F4 – Mathnasium 15-003CU**

#### **6716 Perimeter Loop Road Conditional Use**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a tutoring facility for a tenant space within the Perimeter Center shopping center within the Perimeter Center Planned Unit Development on the east side of Perimeter Loop Road, south of Perimeter Drive. She said the Commission is the final authority on the conditional use.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Commission regarding this application.

Tammy Noble-Flading said this case was on the consent agenda and was prepared to make a presentation if necessary.

The Chair asked the applicant if they wanted to add anything. [Hearing none.] She invited the public to speak. [Hearing none.]

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell motioned, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Conditional Use. The vote was as follows: Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

### **6. COTA Park and Ride Relocation 15-006Z/CU**

### **Emerald Parkway & Bright Road Standard District Rezoning - Conditional Use**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a rezoning from R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District to SO, Suburban Office and Institutional District in accordance with the Community Plan. She said this is also a proposal for the use of the site as a Park and Ride, which requires the review and approval of a conditional use. She noted the site is at the northeast corner of the intersection at Emerald Parkway and Bright Road. She said the Commission will forward their recommendation to City Council for the Rezoning and the Commission is the final authority on the conditional use.

Chair Newell swore in all those intending to speak on this application.

Jennifer Rauch introduced this application for relocation of the COTA Park and Ride with two parts of the application with the standard district rezoning, which is the request to change from R-1 Restricted Suburban Residential District to SO, Suburban Office and Institutional District. She said the review and analysis is based on the Community Plan and the designations called out as part of the plan. She said the second application is a conditional use application, which is required within the proposed SO District for park and ride facilities and the Code outlines specific requirements related to the shelter details and review criteria. Ms. Rauch said the applications will be reviewed separately and two separate motions will be required.

Ms. Rauch said the site is at the northeast corner of the intersection of Bright Road and Emerald Parkway. She said the current zoning for this site and the areas to the south and west are R-1, and to the north and east are zoned PUD as part of the NE Quad Rezoning.

Ms. Rauch stated there was a public meeting held in January with COTA and City representatives, and the neighbors within the area regarding the proposal and the feedback provided from that meeting is in the packet.

Ms. Rauch said City Council is reviewing a separate action related to real estate and a development agreement. She stated that as part of those discussions, concerns were raised related to the Community Plan and of the Bright Road Area Plan. She said in 1997, the Community Plan Future Land Use designated this site as existing residential. She said when the City undertook the Community Plan update in 2005, they looked at all the future land use designations and area plans. She said through numerous joint work sessions and meetings with the neighbors, the various area plans were developed including the Bright Road area, which originally had shown this site as a multiple-family designation. She said as part of City Council's final review of the Bright Road Area Plan in 2007, Council made a recommendation and voted to change the site to Neighborhood Office. She said those minutes were also included in the packet. She said this designation was retained in the most recent updates to the Community Plan in 2013.

Ms. Rauch said the Future Land Use Map designation is Neighborhood Office, which calls for density not to exceed 9,500-square-feet per acre. She said area plan recommends development with low lot coverages, increased setbacks, and the provision of a transition between the residential and the future

office developments. She said the area to the east of the site is zoned for office and the area to west is residential, making this site the corner piece to provide the transition between the uses. She said the most consistent zoning district with the Neighborhood Office designation is SO, Suburban Office District, which is the recommendation of this site.

Ms. Rauch said the Bright Road Area Plan recommends the preservation of the natural features, which would include substantial trees on the site as well as along the creek on the northern boundary. She said future development needs to ensure that those features within the area are accounted for. She indicated the area plan calls for opportunities for improving traffic circulation. She said the completion of the final phase of Emerald Parkway has helped open up and provide better access and traffic movement within the area.

Ms. Rauch said based on the standards of the standard zoning district review, Planning has determined the proposal meets the criteria based on the future land use designation and the specific recommendations of the area plan. She said the proposed zoning district is the most compatible district and provides for office and institutional uses in line with the Community Plan. She stated the recommendation for this site is a recommendation of approval to City Council.

Ms. Rauch said the second portion of this application is the conditional use review. She said under the Suburban Office standards conditional use approval is required for park and ride facilities.

Ms. Rauch noted the proposed site shows two access points; one is off Bright Road and the second is off Emerald Parkway. She said there is a bus lane for the buses to circulate on the site that is separate from the parking area. She said the bus circulation action and route traveling is handled on-site, which is different from the current location on Dale Drive where it is done on the street. She said the setback on this site is based on the width of the right-of-way, which in this area, has been increased significantly from the Thoroughfare Plan and the Community Plan.

Ms. Rauch indicated the proposal meets the parking setback lines but the building setback lines are encroached by the proposed shelter, which is one of the deviations requested as part of the proposal. She said based on the significant setback from the roadway and the proposed landscaping and mounding, Planning recommends the location for the shelter be permitted. She said the Code specifies the shelter be limited to 50-square-feet and the architecture of the shelter coordinates and is harmonious with the architecture of the surrounding area. She said Planning's analysis finds these two requirements to be met.

Ms. Rauch said the specific perimeter landscaping and interior landscaping meet required Code. She said there is a pond at the northern end of the site for stormwater retention and the creek runs along the northern boundary. She said the proposed pond and setback will not disturb the 100-year flood plain.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is proposing a sign at the property line at the corner of the site. She said Code requires signs to be setback 8 feet from the right-of-way; however, due to utilities within the area that they are trying to avoid, Planning recommends the sign be permitted within the proposed location. She indicated there will be lighting proposed on-site, which will meet the lighting requirements within the Code.

Mike Bradley, Vice President of Planning and Service Development, 5941 Hadler Drive, Dublin, Ohio, said a park and ride facility is preferred next to a main arterial and located north of I-270 with good access and visibility. He said COTA is looking to consolidate the park and ride facilities with the goal of increasing the number of trips at each park and ride for greater success. He said their consultant has recommended consolidating the park and rides and having more trips making it more convenient for the people by providing direct service to downtown destinations and operate on the freeway network. He said there is

an express fee, which is higher than local circulation, which comes with it an expectation that the trip is to be express.

Mr. Bradley said they surveyed the customers that currently use the Dale Drive Park and Ride and determined most of the riders are north of the current location. He said a park and ride is designed for commute trips and is weekday-service only. He said there will be 170 parking spaces on site with a passenger shelter and a separate bus lane. He said COTA will start off with six trips in the am that generally operate between approximately 6:00 am to 8:00 am. He said COTA will run three trips down Riverside Drive to Griggs Dam and three trips on I-270 to SR315. He noted operation for pm would be approximately between 3:45 pm – 5:15 pm.

Mr. Bradley said COTA has 29 Park and Rides and not a single incident has been reported on record. He said the majority of the Park and Rides have security cameras and the noise is reasonable. He said lighting is directed down and light/shadowing does not go outside of their property. He said COTA has no trash problems to note. He reported this is COTA's second highest Park and Ride.

Ms. Rauch said based on this information and the analysis completed, approval is recommended for conditional use as the criteria has been met with the two deviations related to the location of the proposed sign and shelter.

The Chair invited public comment.

Gerry Kosicki, 4313 Wyandotte Woods Blvd., said he understands building a city is complicated and if Dublin is going to be successful in the long run the Bridge Street District needs to be about inventing a city and anticipating all the needs of a dense urban area including transit, safety services, environmental, and economic sustainability. He said the COTA relocation project provides an opportunity to rethink the future of transit needs and options. He said if BSD is going to be based on dense, urban walkability, then it should have priority to future transit needs and space should be set aside for this; the city needs can be addressed systematically. He said Dublin cannot rely on COTA to anticipate future transit needs as BSD is built out over the coming years. He indicated COTA has no credible plans for light rail and what they have proposed in the past has been inadequate. He said the area suffers from the lack of such plans. He said mass transit guides future development and infrastructure has a way of channeling density into areas that can be meaningfully served by mass transit. He indicated the Park and Ride relocation plans on Bright Road seem to be business as usual for COTA by replacing one Park and Ride with another to haul some people downtown and back. He said this will not meet the future transit needs of BSD and the City as a whole. He requested a vision for how a new location for the Park and Ride can best facilitate future development of transit options within BSD and between BSD and other parts of the City as well as the surrounding areas. He urged the PZC to carefully consider both the merits and design of this site as well as how this fits into the larger issue of future transit.

Amy Krumb, 7511 Riverside Drive, said she was representing the East Dublin Civic Association. She reported she attended both of COTA's meetings in January. She said this proposal would be a win for COTA at this location. She said the Smokey Row neighbors are extremely upset about this location because they would lose a bus route. She indicated this site was not the best for the City of Dublin. She pointed out that the future land designation and the area plan state this should be office. She said one day it may be acceptable to rezone this parcel as Suburban Office but premature to rezone it tonight based on this application. She said Emerald Parkway is lined with beautiful corporate headquarters. She questioned why the City is asking to place a parking lot on this prominent intersection on this new signature roadway that recently just opened as a gateway from Columbus to the City of Dublin and the first parcel being developed along Emerald Phase 8. She said this is suburban office. She said in a work session in 2007, one of the former city staff members, Mr. Combs said that this plan is intended to preserve the key natural features and to maintain the residential character along Bright Road. She said the plan also continues the high quality design in corporation of offices along Emerald Parkway. She read

where Mr. Combs said the concepts give the general expectation for future development with buildings closer to the street, internal parking lots, appropriate landscaping and buffer zones. She said that vision that Staff said was going to be in this area is in nothing like what is being presented tonight. She reiterated that this parcel should not be rezoned tonight.

Ms. Kramb said this is the wrong location for a Park and Ride with regard to the conditional use request. She agreed with the prior speaker-resident that BSD was a much better location. She reported 2013 Census data that showed the City has 21,338 Dublin residents over the age of 16 working in the City. She reported 8,248 of these residents drive alone to work. She said only 74 reported riding transit to work. She referred to COTA's point of origin survey that showed where people come from to ride their services. She said there were 43 riders by adding up the little dots on the survey originating in that area, which extended up to Union County, Powell, Delaware, over to Smokey Row and Columbus. She said there were just 23 dots in the City of Dublin and only 5 of those dots were on the east side of the river. She said if we are looking at this proposal from the City of Dublin's perspective, and their residents, excluding COTA's demographics, we are looking at building a parking lot on land that was \$1.2 million. She said there are more than 25 people present tonight that are opposed to this Park and Ride going to the proposed location. She said the City is in a hurry to acquire this land because it is needed for the Bridge Park District. She said there are other mechanisms for the City to acquire the land. She said the City relocated Spa at River Ridge and they can do that with COTA. She summarized this does not have to happen now and does not have to happen at this location.

Ms. Kramb said vehicular circulation will interfere with the existing circulation around there. She said Planning said it is not going to interfere at all. She said she contests that because Bright Road is not sufficient to handle those trips or those buses at Bright and Sawmill Road. She said that is a horrible intersection at rush hour, which is the exact time these buses will be going through there. She explained that intersection backs up past Inverness every morning and every night as it is and now buses are proposed to be added to the congestion. She said Engineering has repeatedly said Bright Road would be widened to alleviate traffic at this intersection and that when Emerald Parkway went in, there would be less traffic on Bright Road. She said the City is now proposing to allow additional traffic onto Bright Road when the City said they were going to take it off by using Emerald Parkway. She said we will get additional traffic from Smokey Row when their route has been closed down.

Ms. Kramb said this application impedes the development of the area and is harmful economically. She said there will be two residences stuck there between the existing offices to the east if a parking lot is constructed on that site.

Ms. Kramb indicated we should take pride in this corner of the intersection and build something worthwhile on this valuable parcel at this corner. She said the Planning Report states this Park and Ride is going to be an amenity but it is just an amenity for COTA, not for the City of Dublin.

Ms. Kramb said even if people are drawn from Delaware, Powell, and Columbus, there is nothing to keep the riders here. She said they will come, add congestion to our roads, and then will leave the area. She said if the Park and Ride was down in the BSD and riders were dropped off the bus after work, they might grab some dinner at the new restaurant, have a drink at the new bar with a happy hour, hit the gym, or use any number of amenities they could walk to before heading home, spending money in our City.

Ms. Kramb concluded she hopes the PZC votes no to the rezoning and conditional use tonight. She said if the conditional use is approved, there should be a condition added, which is to require COTA to restrict all buses from using Bright Road. She said it would be appropriate for the buses to enter on the south entrance off of Bright Road but always exit north on Emerald Parkway, using the Emerald Parkway and Hard Road intersection. She said COTA is getting everything they want with this application and the residents are not getting anything.

Randy Roth, 6987 Grandee Cliffs Drive, said he is president of East Dublin Civic Association. He said he just learned about this application at the end of December. He said whether Council is going to vote against this or not, the residents are being heard and taken very seriously. He said he is concerned about stream buffer locations and the natural habitat. He indicated the landscaping trees appear to grow right at the edge of the creek. He said 20 feet at the top of the bank should be natural to retain the habitat and the key is the top of the bank. He said we like our coyotes and had them shifted over from Brandon. He said not only should the traffic be diverted from the Sawmill/Bright intersection but consider a way to make it natural.

Mr. Roth said he serves on the Community Plan Steering Committee and served on the Transportation Task Force. He suggested there should be two centers of Park and Rides; one in the BSD and one on Perimeter in the commercial area. He said we could have our own circulator system of buses and suggested working with COTA. He said once you come here, you are far from our Metro Center and the hospital where the jobs are. He read from the website that states "The existing Park and Ride on Dale Drive is in the area that shows potential BSD mixed development and realignment with Dale Drive and any relocation of this facility should minimize service disruptions and should remain in close proximity to the existing Park and Ride." He reported persons with disabilities live between the interstate and along SR161; persons 65 years old and older are in that same parcel. He reported persons in households without a vehicle are in the same area. He said he spoke with some COTA riders and they do not own cars. He said all of this new demographic data really fits our original vision but that is where COTA needs to be to help us. He suggested we take time to consider options and plan this out for an ultimate transportation solution.

Mr. Roth said the City of Dublin voted down a request from COTA to locate near the interchange on the north side. He said every intersection on Sawmill Road by 2030 will have seven lanes. He said we need a decentralized system to pick up Columbus people in Columbus, Powell people in Powell and try to keep them off of Sawmill Road. He said with this plan, COTA will forget about the people of Powell, close the Park and Ride on Smokey Row, and draw all traffic to the jump point. He said we already know all these intersections are going to fail. He said there will not be a Park and Ride between Sawmill Road and US23.

Mr. Roth referred to the Community Plan for Bright Road. He said if this plan is defeated he wants to flip back to the plan they all support. He said this land should be used for multi-family and put the office on the more barren land to the south.

Don Spangler, 3614 Jenmar Court, said there does not seem to be a lot of riders to justify the need. He said the long-time residents of Dublin did not expect to see a parking lot as the first thing constructed on the new section of Emerald Parkway. He said they are very disappointed. He believes there probably is not anyone on City Council that desires to have a Park and Ride in their neighborhood. He said if this is an amenity as described, sitting in a residential area, why it was not an amenity sitting in the BSD where there were a lot more people to use it. He said if the bus would stop where there were restrooms, activities, entertainment, or shops revenue could be made. He said the Park and Ride appears to be a loser as it does not generate revenue and it takes up space. He suggested that if the Park and Ride were located by Chase Bank by Kroger Marketplace on Sawmill Road there is open space and shopping areas besides the grocer and bank. He reiterated at Bright Road and Emerald Parkway, there is nothing. He said people will drive in, get on the bus, and when they return they will get back into their cars and Dublin will never make any money off of them. He said if this is an amenity, we need to rethink how we look at amenities. He concluded this only seems to be an amenity for approximately 50 people and does not see how this Park and Ride fits the criteria for businesses, entertainment, opportunities, parks and recreational facilities that benefit and protect the majority of Dublin residents.

Scott Haring, 3280 Lilly-Mar Court, said he understands the City owns this parcel and the City's purchase of this parcel was to facilitate a little bit of the frontage and west edge to make this new roundabout. He

said he read where this parcel was referred to as over three acres of access land. He asked to clarify that the PZC was being asked to rezone the parcel from R-1 (one house per acre) to Suburban Office and then once that is in hand for the parcel to be used as a parking facility as a conditional use. He stated he did not believe this was the right place.

Mr. Haring said he heard the applicant say they wanted good visibility but he also heard there would be mounding around this so it would be hidden from the street. He added being a block back, west of Sawmill Road, does not sound visible. He said other speakers have noted more recognizable commercial areas where this Park and Ride could be located. He said this proposal reminds him of another facility that is west of Sawmill Road with mounding, which is Dublin Village Center. He recalls hearing years ago that mounding and lack of signage killed Dublin Village Center so he is surprised to hear that these are some of the goals here tonight.

Mr. Haring said he attended the recent City Council meeting that precipitates all this for a new road that is going to bisect the current Park and Ride facility. He said he still does not understand the mechanics that the City could buy the right-of-way on that parcel but it sounds like the preference is to purchase the entire parcel. He said then the City will go back to having two small slivers of excess land. He said it is not clear what happens to that excess land if Dublin does this. He indicated we are a heck of a city to say to COTA you have a Park facility, we would like a sliver of your land for a new road, let us build you a new facility for \$1 million. He said he understands there is supposed to be some land trading and some value but as he had mentioned to City Council 10 days ago, there is another parcel near a roundabout in the City where a little portion of that will be for the future SR161/Riverside Drive Roundabout. He said he understands the City also owns the former Wendy's restaurant lot. He suggested that would be a great place; ±two acres will be taken for the roundabout but it would be a much more 'like for like' and it would be closer to BSD. He said earlier it was stated that the previous goal was to keep it near the BSD and Wendy's lot would meet that requirement. He said there is a line on the map showing a bus route down Riverside Drive and this piece is right next to Riverside Drive. He said he had heard repeatedly from PZC over the years a phrase "the highest and best use for property". He said he went to the party at Emerald Parkway for its opening of the final phase. He was told there were a few more parcels and hopefully big office to come and this parking lot does not seem to fit in the whole spirit of it.

Mr. Haring concluded by stating he hoped the PZC would table this application and consider other ideas or say no; this is not good use.

Robert Cudd, 4281 McDuff Place, said the creek that runs alongside this parking lot, actually runs along the residential area in his back yard. He said he often pulls debris out of that creek, like whenever there is a storm; the stream runs pretty quickly. He said if this lot is fully utilized it will have approximately 44,000 cars parking in it during the year. He said he is concerned about radiator needs, litter, and all the other things that blow into the stream, which feeds right into the Scioto River. He asked the PZC to consider the elements that could go into the stream including the sealants that will be applied to the parking lot. He indicated this is bad for wildlife such as deer, rabbits, and squirrels that are there. He summarized this is a bad idea of putting a parking lot with that kind of capacity right on a stream that feeds into the Scioto River.

The Chair asked if there were any further public comments to be made. [Hearing none.] She closed off the public comment portion of the meeting and invited questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Amy Salay remarked on the phrase "highest and best use". She said that is a development term and it has to be used very carefully because a lot of times a developer looks at a piece of land very differently than we do in Dublin in terms of maximizing what you can get out of a piece of ground. She said she was unsure that they ever wish for "highest and best use" in Dublin as that is a dangerous term.

Ms. Salay asked Staff about stormwater. She asked if pervious paving was considered for the parking lot so there would not be runoff. She admitted she did not know the price comparison from one to the other. She asked if maybe the part that is not going to be used all the time could be pervious. She asked if that question could be answered before this proposal goes to Council.

Ms. Salay said she had a couple of questions for Mr. Bradley of COTA. She said she had spoken to a few people from Smokey Row that attended the COTA meeting and they did not know that they would necessarily lose their park and ride but the bus service might be decreased. She asked him if he could answer that question.

Mr. Bradley said COTA was proposing that but it was not final yet to combine Route 30 with this proposed location. He said the consultants for the transit system review first recommended eliminating it completely. He said the reason COTA left it in was because it was a little bit further from Dale Drive. He said COTA had made a statement if a park and ride is established in the Sawmill corridor they would consider combining the routes. He said they do see the people from Smokey Row using the Dale Drive Park and Ride. He said the watershed for the Park and Ride is pretty large. He said in short, we will not make that decision until the end of May. He said during the transit system review, they considered a lot of changes redesigning the network.

Ms. Salay said what the Smokey Row residents heard, or maybe it was wishful thinking, was that there may be a bus or two removed but that there would still be a facility. Mr. Bradley said that was the residents' suggestion, not COTA's.

Ms. Salay said we have heard a lot of suggestions about keeping a park and ride facility in the BSD. She asked Mr. Bradley how he sees the COTA service within the Bridge Street District working in tandem with park and ride facilities. She said she knows he wants one somewhere on the west side of Dublin in the Perimeter/Avery area. She asked how he sees COTA serving Dublin in the future or would it be something that Dublin would invent themselves.

Mr. Bradley said the long range transit plan was done around 2011. He said even with the Dale Drive location and without the proposed Bridge Street District, COTA was considering a park and ride in Sawmill Corridor as those are the growing corridors. He said in the early 1990s, Dublin was not as extensive and dense to the north and west. He explained the key to a park and ride is capturing people before they get to the highway. He said if they go beyond the freeway they do not want to back up for the most part. He said we have to change with the community. He said COTA is proposing local service on SR161 coming from Sawmill Road over to the Metro Place by 2017. He said the denser an area, the more people will use their service. He said he does not expect the large numbers from the BSD. He said it takes a larger watershed in order to be effective on a park and ride.

Victoria Newell asked Engineering about the circulation with the buses. She thought the buses were going to function at the intersection at Bright Road.

Tina Wawszkiewicz said the site layout shows the Emerald Parkway access as a right in/right out only because there is a median. She said the applicant is proposing to include a left turn lane on Bright Road to get into the site and the length calculated for that left turn lane is only a 50-foot stacking lane. She said Engineering has been working with them to increase that to 125 feet. She said from a traffic perspective a park and ride is good for the transportation system by consolidating trips. She said Engineering wants to see how things go with Emerald Parkway as traffic patterns have not fully been established there. She said they still believe that the completion of Emerald Parkway will take some burden off of Bright Road as those patterns develop. She said Bright Road will continue to be evaluated, but Engineering is aware there is congestion.

Ms. Newell asked if there was a formal traffic study completed for this project. Ms. Wawzkiewicz said a traffic study was submitted and reviewed by Engineering. She said the details are being finalized and will be completed during the site planning process.

Ms. Newell said that was not included in the packets. Ms. Rauch said the planning report included an overview of the traffic study.

Ms. Salay asked Ms. Wawzkiewicz about a timeframe for improvements on Bright Road. She stated the Community Plan discusses the widening to Bright Road between Emerald Parkway and Sawmill Road to four lanes.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said it is not programmed at this time and reiterated Engineering wants to understand the traffic patterns of Emerald Parkway before any improvements are made.

Paul Hammersmith agreed with Ms. Wawzkiewicz that traffic patterns have to be established with the opening of Emerald Parkway. He recalled what was said during the update of the Community Plan that they were very uncertain as to what Bright Road needed to be when it grew up and what would happen to the network. He said Engineering would start taking counts later this year to understand these patterns. He reported the City of Columbus is considering a southbound lane addition to Sawmill Road, which will include the Sawmill/Bright intersection. He said working from a systemic standpoint we need to work together with Columbus not only to improve Bright Road but also the intersection of Bright/Sawmill. He said Bright Road could be widened to eight lanes wide but if the capacity does not exist at the intersection it does not matter how wide Bright Road is between Emerald and Sawmill. He explained the controlling factors are always going to be the intersection and again that is the City of Columbus' jurisdiction.

Ms. Salay asked about the timing of the cul-de-sac at Bright Road and Riverside Drive. Mr. Hammersmith said Engineering has not determined that yet. He said it will be discussed during the next CIP update. He said there will be some land acquisition required.

Cathy De Rosa asked about the traffic flow. She said the traffic study is completed and Engineering is evaluating what will happen now that the intersection is open. She asked what the anticipated change is in that demand. Ms. Wawzkiewicz said Engineering's expectation would be for people to gravitate towards Emerald Parkway. She said there is no question that there will still be a delay on Bright Road at Sawmill Road.

Ms. De Rosa asked if Engineering was starting to see that happen or if it was too early to tell. Ms. Wawzkiewicz said there have not been any formal counts as it would not help during the change in the traffic pattern.

Deborah Mitchell asked for clarification about the results of the traffic study. Ms. Wawzkiewicz said the study provided for this site is directly related to the two access points that are proposed and the impacts on the roadways.

Ms. Mitchell confirmed Engineering has completed the review of the traffic study, but it was not included in the packet for this meeting. Claudia Husak said Engineering has conducted the analysis of the traffic study and the numbers were provided in the Planning Report. She said detailed traffic studies are not provided to the Commission for review, because those are under the purview of Engineering.

Ms. Mitchell confirmed the conclusion drawn by Engineering was an extreme traffic problem is not anticipated. Ms. Wawzkiewicz said the use outlined in Community Plan as an office would be a more intense use and generate more trips than the proposed park and ride.

Ms. De Rosa asked if any additional properties were forecast to be rezoned in the near future to align with the Community Plan designation. Ms. Rauch said no additional properties were being considered at this point.

Todd Zimmerman asked if any other locations were considered for the park and ride or if this was the primary targeted area. Ms. Rauch said this is the site we were presented to consider for this particular use.

Ms. Salay said the City needs to consider COTA's request to be located north of I-270. She indicated with the Bridge Street District becoming a reality the City needed to relocate some businesses, which includes the park and ride. She said Council's goal was to determine how to make that happen with COTA as a partner with the City. She said the City owns this land and it was considered to be an option for the relocation COTA. She indicated the use works from a traffic standpoint and that is how the proposal turned in an application.

Mr. Langworthy said the Commission needs to evaluate this site and this use on this site and not focus on where it might be better located. He said ultimately, the site location is up to COTA to determine where they think the best location is and the Commission's task is to evaluate this proposal on this particular site.

Mr. Zimmerman said Dublin will give ownership over to COTA. Ms. Salay confirmed that is what is envisioned.

Mr. Zimmerman said COTA will be responsible for the maintenance of the facility. Ms. Rauch agreed.

Mr. Miller asked if there were options to keep the buses off Bright Road and move the buses across Emerald Parkway to Hard Road.

Mr. Bradley said it would add operational costs for every day they serve this site and there are no restrictions at this time. He said the routes are done very efficiently and not being able to get through on Bright Road would cause a run around every day at 16 times at \$70.00 per hour. He said it adds up and the cost to deliver this service to Dublin is passed on to the passengers, who only pay about 20 percent of the total costs.

Ms. Salay asked if COTA was talking about four trips down Bright Road and two trips down Emerald Parkway. Mr. Bradley said COTA is not sure at this time. He said to provide the best service would be to travel on Sawmill Road to I-270 and travel the freeway downtown.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said from Engineering's perspective, if this were an office use as it was envisioned in the Community Plan, those trips would not be restricted to any particular route. She said rerouting this particular use, even if those trips went up to Hard Road and came south on Sawmill, they are still using the same intersection, which would be the same level of delay.

Ms. Newell said the retention basin is 11 feet deep and not a very attractive shape as a triangle and extremely close to the creek. She said the suggestion about pervious pavers or underground storage could contribute to reducing the size of the pond. She said this would add a benefit to the site. She referred back to the tree survey noting a good grouping of trees pretty close along the property line. She said if the retention pond is reduced through underground storage there may be an opportunity to reduce a row of parking and extend the green space to the north. She indicated COTA might be able to hold the front parking a little bit farther off of Emerald Parkway and save a few more of those trees that are in that area. She said the plan can be improved and is still bothered with the access along Bright Road. She expressed concerns for the residences across the street and the traffic being too great.

Ms. De Rosa said she had driven around and found the intersection at Bright and Sawmill to be really hard to navigate. She said she was not sure if rerouting solves all the problems because congestion still ends up back on Sawmill Road. She asked if there was any opportunity as far as timing here to think about some ways to advance what could be done at Sawmill and Bright Road. She asked if that was totally out of our hands and if it was a broader conversation with the City. She said waiting until 2018 or 2019 to solve that problem seems impractical.

Mr. Hammersmith said it is going to be a long study process; there are no cheap solutions and again it has to be a systemic approach. He said not only at Bright and Sawmill Roads but they are looking at Billingsley. He said the study will look at the entire corridor and not just one location, and it is not going to be an immediate solution. He said there will need to be funding sources identified. He said in the end, this is going to be a project between \$10 million – \$15 million to implement a correction. He explained this is being driven by the City of Columbus. He said he would report back to City Council as alternatives come forward but it is not going to be something that this project is going to solve.

Ms. Salay thought a decision was made but it looked like prior to that there was a lot of discussion about the Bright Road plan. She said we decided on the alignment of Emerald Parkway, 20 some years ago. She said the properties that are adjacent to the park and ride as you go eastbound toward Sawmill Road, are all in single ownership and being sold for redevelopment. She suggested the neighbors sit down with Staff, PZC, and Council to discuss the Community Plan and possible land uses west of Emerald Parkway.

Ms. Salay agreed with Ms. Newell about holding stormwater underground.

Ms. Newell said Suburban Office is the appropriate rezoning for this site. She said she takes exception to the conditional use.

Ms. Salay addressed stream protection and invited Mr. Roth to speak.

Mr. Roth said it would be nice to have natural woodland for about 20 feet; whole preservation would require more than that.

Ms. Newell said it can be two working together and does not have to be one or the other. She said the design of the retention basin on this plan is poorly functional and has no aesthetic redeeming qualities whatsoever. She said by doing a portion of piping underground and splitting the depth the site design would be improved. She said Engineering can speak to how to best balance the retention. She indicated there is a better aesthetic solution than what we were presented with this evening.

Ms. Newell said she was not in favor of the current plan conditional use. She said it fails to be harmonious to the existing intended character of the vicinity. She said she is comfortable with the rezoning of Suburban Office as it meets the Community Plan. She said there is an option to table this case and return with a revised plan that addresses the Commission's concerns or the Commission can vote on the application as presented.

Ms. Rauch said the City is the applicant for this project. She suggested if the Commission was inclined to vote on the rezoning tonight that portion of the application could be forwarded on to Council. She said Planning could work through the details and comments with regards to the conditional use and come back with a revised plan.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Zimmerman moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to recommend approval to City Council of this rezoning from R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District to SO, Suburban Office and Institutional District because it complies with the Community Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to table this conditional use. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

### **Communications**

Claudia Husak reminded the Commission that the early registration for the National Planning Conference ends February 19, 2015. She said if anyone on the Commission is considering traveling to Seattle, Washington, she asked that they get in touch with Flora Rogers with dates and check some flights beforehand so Flora can book the hotel at least. Victoria Newell said she was interested in attending. Ms. Salay said she was going too.

Todd Zimmerman asked if the next PZC meeting was set aside for training. Ms. Husak said the February 19 meeting is a training session in conjunction with ARB and BZA. She explained Mr. Foegler will speak about our history with the BSD and where we are currently; Engineering will provide a transportation update; and Rachel Ray will discuss the form-based Code, which is another aspect of reviews. She said the material is geared more for the new members as the others should already be familiar with the content but are welcome to attend.

Deborah Mitchell asked if it would be beneficial to talk to Rachel Ray or other Staff before the February 19 meeting as she has questions and would like to get up to speed. Ms. Husak said it might be a benefit to all to hear the conversation so it would be better to wait until the 19<sup>th</sup>. Steve Langworthy said anyone can come in and have a one-on-one discussion with Staff for more detail at any point in time and recommended sending a request via email to schedule a meeting.

Both Ms. Husak and Mr. Langworthy commended the new Commission members on their first meeting as their questions were great.

Ms. Husak said MORPC has offered to come to one of our training sessions. Ms. Newell said that was a great idea.

Mr. Langworthy suggested the possibility of a Planning Commission Exchange in the future.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:15 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on March 12, 2015.