

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 11, 2014

#### AGENDA

##### 1. Bridge Street District - Update

The Chair, Chris Amorose Groomes, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were, City Council Representative Amy Salay, Todd Zimmerman, Richard Taylor, Victoria Newell, Amy Kramb, and John Hardt. City representatives present were Jennifer Readler, Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Joanne Shelly, Megan O'Callaghan, Terry Foegler, Jean Ellen Willis, Mandy Bishop, Rachel Ray, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Gary Gunderman, Devayani Puranik, Marie Downie, and Laurie Wright.

#### Administrative Business

##### Motion and Vote

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

##### Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve the October 29, 2014, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

##### 1. Bridge Street District - Update

The Chair, Ms. Amorose Groomes, said this will be a work session format with respect to the Bridge Street District (BSD) Update. She said the following request is in response to requests by the Commission for a presentation on City Policies on Projects, Transportation, and Housing as they relate to the Bridge Street District.

Amy Salay asked to address the Commission before the presentation by Terry Foegler.

Ms. Salay said she wanted to talk about why the Commission is here and the vote that was taken Monday night at City Council. She indicated she was thinking today about Dublin and what makes it Dublin: growth, change, and innovation. She added the Councils of this town have never been afraid to take calculated risks and that risk taking has paid off. She said that is how she sees the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Salay indicated she thought about successful and not so successful corporations and how they grow and change. She used Apple as an example, as a little company that started out in the late 1970s to create/develop personal computers and at some point they had to make a decision to get into cellular communication. She said someone there had the leadership and the vision of someday, cellular phones

that were currently as big as a brick and have to be wired into a car, are going to be small enough to fit in the palm of one's hand and they will be able to do everything the big computer on their desk can do. She said Apple changed their business model for this risk. She asked where everyone would be without their iPhones today. Ms. Salay's second example was Wendy's. She mentioned the idea of the drive-thru window for any business for that matter. She said it was a new idea of serving people food directly to their cars and at some point Wendy's decided this is was a trend they needed to embrace. She suggested to consider how common drive-thrus are today for food, dry cleaning, and banking. Ms. Salay's third example was Cardinal Health. She said this fortune 500 company is one of Dublin's largest corporations. She said they started out as Cardinal Foods. She said Cardinal's risk was deciding to go into pharmaceuticals where they believed would be a strong market and they would do well by changing their business model. She said obviously, Cardinal has had great success with that becoming Cardinal Health. She said she sees Dublin at this point in the same place.

Ms. Salay said the recession was a wake-up call for the City and "goal setting" in 2009 was changed to "a strategic planning session", with Mr. Foegler as the City Manager. She indicated the economic future was very much on the mind of City Council. She said the thought process was that they had built this wonderful community that they love so much and the quality of life is the tax base. She indicated Council believed they had to do something a little different to ensure viability and relevance in the region, state, and country. She said they were fortunate to have visionary leaders at that time and started studying how viability and relevance was to be achieved. She stated this has taken us nearly five years to get to this evening. She said we realized we have to have economic sustainability and development. She said this new vision is going to have to work for our schools, attract new residents, appeal to the younger generation, and keep Dublin viable and relevant by growing, changing, and evolving and not fearful of innovation. She indicated true innovation has set Dublin apart. She mentioned staff and consultants that Dublin is fortunate to have. She said City Council has invested very heavily in this effort. She said she has to believe when Apple was going into cellular phones and Cardinal Health was going into pharmaceuticals, there were people who said the companies were going in the wrong direction and not the company for me, and went somewhere else to further their career.

Ms. Salay said we are here tonight because Council trusts the process that we have been through, trusting our team, trusting this is the right thing for our community, and are moving forward. She said we are not standing still or going back. She indicated Council was excited and energized about this undertaking. She said Council is ready and wants the Commission to be with them and it is really important that we move forward together. She said if that is not something the Commissioner's feel they can do, there are other ways to serve the community. She stated it is time to move the Bridge Street District forward.

Ms. Salay said at the Council meeting on Monday night they discussed an amendment to the Zoning Code that a Council Member proposed and Council ultimately agreed with. She said this created a lot of stir in the community. She reported Council voted to take the Basic Plan Review for the bigger projects that are going to require development agreements and initiatives that Council is ultimately going to have to approve so Council would be on board with what the developers are proposing. She said developers are going to come to Council first, and Council will decide who the reviewing body will be and that is really all that Council did. She said the process will stay the same for the smaller projects; there is absolutely nothing that will change. She said there have been accusations of subverting the process, rushing things, sneaking, and doing things in the back room. She said Council did not take kindly to these bizarre accusations. She said Council said they will debate the idea of the Bridge Street District all day long but said not to question their integrity, process, or the daylight that has shown on this project for the past five years and will continue to shine for as long as this 30-year vision takes to come forward.

Ms. Salay said she hoped that answered any questions but would be happy to answer more. She stated that Jennifer Readler will speak later this evening about the legalities of what Council did on Monday. She thanked the Commission for indulging her.

Terry Foegler said the goal of this evening is to provide additional background with regard to some of the issues and questions the Commission has had with certain aspects of the Bridge Street District. He indicated there may have been varying levels of engagement with planning studies, analysis, as well as the policies, regulations, and plans that were produced from that analysis. He said the Commission has expressed a desire to get a better understanding of projects moving forward now. He stated staff and resources have been assembled to address all the questions and concerns.

Mr. Foegler reported there have been five years of process for the Bridge Street District. He indicated it is probably as thorough and comprehensive of a planning process that he has seen for something like this. He said it began with a vision and engagement of folks to help envision the City with a significant amount of time, energy, effort, and financial resources to evaluate the infrastructure system associated with the development including transportation, sewer, water, and stormwater. He reported firms were engaged to do fiscal impact studies to understand the nature and character of the revenue these projects produce and the services that they consume. He said consultants were brought in to assist with the preparation of Codes and advance the vision for implementation purposes once those studies were done to try and make sure those were as state-of-the-art as possible to advance the project and the framework planning of the river corridor.

Mr. Foegler said then it had to be determined where to start, what the priority areas are, and what kinds of capital improvements the City needs to focus on that might catalyze some of this private investment. He noted the river corridor has the highest priority area to start because there were opportunities there, extraordinary visibility, and some of the amenities, assets, and public projects that would emerge from that process. He indicated this would not just be a benefit to the surrounding development and wanted to encourage that it would have major beneficial assets to the community as a whole, particularly some of the transportation river park related enhancements for the corridor from a public amenity, public recreation and open space perspective.

Mr. Foegler stated demographics and other things drove this process with the involvement of economic development folks, the public, and private sectors together. He said how we develop as a region is critical. He added the demographic drivers that framed the form of our development for the last 40 years is not going to frame it for the next 10, 20, or 30 years; it will be radically different. He said they focused on housing for young talent; environments for growing an entrepreneurial company; jobs for aging office parks in the suburbs; and a diverse, vibrant, and vital active walkable core.

Mr. Foegler said it was deemed absolutely critical for its implementation that an agreement with our school system be included that would establish an incentive framework that could help fund what we knew would be significant public investments in infrastructure up front. He said to achieve density and walkability that goes with that density, and to implement a grid of the quality streets that we want to include within that grid that there would be much higher than normal developer investments required and City's investments required such as structured parking and streets.

Mr. Foegler said as the first few projects came through, those became much clearer to us as to what the nature of those gaps were. He indicated they were fortunate after about a year of discussions and negotiations with the school district to allow the City extraordinary flexibility in the kind of real estate tax incentives it may use. He explained all real estate tax incentives available under state law are available to the City. He said for the first time, Council is looking at things like new community authorities like CRAs in addition to TIFs to understand how these different tools can come together to help to move forward. He said once these projects burn off their incentives, that because of the value per acre of this higher density, it was not uncommon that the per-acre valuations were 10 times higher than the more conventional lower density developments. He said the entities whose resources are being diverted in the near term will provide much higher tax reduction from these entities in the long term.

Mr. Foegler indicated the City has already had to balance the notion that it is not just about carrying as many cars as efficiently and quickly through our City but also about the environments around the roads and some of the other planning objectives such as apartments and development review processes. He said all these things relate to the transformational nature of what we are dealing with here. He discussed some of the things likely to be emerging in the near term, in addition to a series of private projects in the pipeline such as Casto and Crawford Hoying and also noted the library and new developments emerging in the Monterey Drive area. He believes there are many public investments poised and ready to proceed in 2015.

Megan O'Callaghan said staff has been working for quite some time to proactively plan and prepare and make sure we are thoughtfully and successfully ready to address the transportation needs in and around the Bridge Street District. She stated plans are in place to implement a well thought out street grid, which Jeannie Willis has been spearheading that included a phasing study. She reported we have two of the first public infrastructure projects under construction in the District: the first roadway is the John Shields Parkway, a short segment of roadway nearly complete; and second is the Dale Drive/Tuller Ridge connector. She added these both will maintain traffic as construction of two much larger transportation infrastructure projects begin in March 2015.

Ms. O'Callaghan noted that early in September, a comprehensive overview of all efforts having to do with major transportation projects to be under construction in 2015 were presented. She said that included the I-270/US 33 interchange, Dublin Road South Bike Path, Sawmill Road/Hard Road improvements, Riverside Drive realignment, and the State Route 161/Riverside Drive intersection roundabout. She noted there has been a detailed scheduling and coordination effort due to the complexity of the work that is planned, the anticipated overlapping maintenance of traffic, and a wide range of impacts throughout the City. She said tonight's goal was to show transparency and make sure everyone was prepared for what is coming. She said they are well into the design of the next two projects, which are the Riverside Drive Realignment and SR 161 Roundabout.

Jeannie Willis said she welcomes questions during her presentation on transportation updates. She indicated the Bridge Street District is a shift in the way we view transportation and began with the background of the transportation studies. She said this all began with Goody-Clancy's Vision Plan in 2009 and at the conclusion of that study, the City's engineers realized that the transportation component needed more emphasis and more detailed study, which produced a grid network as a core organizing and transportation framework for the more urban development pattern proposed for the District.

Ms. Willis said in 2012, the Nelson/Nygaard BSD Transportation Study was received and confirmed the grid would serve the needs of the District. This led, she said, to the Zoning Code for the Bridge Street District adopted by City Council in March 2012 that incorporated the dense, grid-style street pattern of development and added that the area rezoning into BSD zoning districts that accompanied the Code eliminated the need for individual sites to be rezoned and performing site specific traffic impact studies. She explained a balance was achieved between the vehicular realm and the rest of the need for the area that included pedestrians, bikes, shopping, and the land uses.

Ms. Willis said in July 2013, the Community Plan was adopted that prescribed the right-of-way widths and street hierarchy of the BSD within the Thoroughfare Plan. She indicated at the conclusion of all this, Staff was still concerned about the impact where the District meets the suburban key areas such as SR 161, Dublin Road, Sawmill Road, and Riverside Drive. She said evaluating traffic operations at these key intersections was the main goal of the BSD Transportation Planning Study.

Ms. Willis said in March 2014, Resolution 17-14 was passed, which directed staff to enter into design contracts for the SR161/Riverside Drive Roundabout, the relocation of Riverside Drive, Dale/Tuller connector, and John Shields Parkway.

Ms. Willis noted the key conclusions of the Nelson/Nygaard Report:

- 1) A dense, grid-style street pattern was verified to operate well in the urban core context of the District;
- 2) Multiple grid connections help alleviate congestion so turn lanes are not required except at key locations;
- 3) A dense, mixed-use development environment supported by a multi-modal transportation system likely results in about a 40 percent internal capture of vehicle trips in the District;
- 4) New river bridges improve overall neighborhood connectivity but do not relieve current or projected congestion for the Bridge Street/High Street intersection; and
- 5) "Street Family" classifications are used to better convey the character of the area's streets and the Bridge Street District as an urban core, rather than the traditional suburban roadway functional classes, which convey street hierarchy.

Ms. Willis presented a graphic of the area in 2007, a traditional suburban model as well as the Bridge Street District area now, which compared the number of roadways. She said this reflects a 45 percent capacity network increase; the suburban model vs the urban model. She noted multiple redundant routes mean more capacity.

Ms. Willis presented a graphic on the LJB Transportation Planning Study to show what happens to the urban core when meeting surrounding suburban networks. She said at the conclusion of the study, the number of lanes that were assumed in the original Nelson/Nygaard Report were found to be correct, turn lanes were needed at key intersections, and this plan is meant to be a guiding document, not meant to be prescriptive. She reported that vehicular levels of service were not the only modes of travel considered. She added several projects are needed independently, whether or not the Bridge Street District moves forward. She cited: SR161/Riverside Drive; SR161/Bridge Street/Frantz Road/Post Road intersections; and Riverside Drive/Tuller Road intersections.

Ms. Willis said there are five different planning windows: 1) 2012 – 2015; 2) 2016 – 2020; 3) 2021 – 2025; 4) 2026 – 2030; and 5) 2031 – 2035. She presented a graphic that showed traffic levels of service during am/pm peaks as the network grid develops over time that are rated A, B, C, D, or F. She said a lot of them get better but some of them do not, some are just bad, but that is not altogether different than what is seen in other areas of Dublin. She stated these are all based on assumptions of possible development through the years of 2012 – 2035.

Ms. Willis explained the engineers are not planning the network based on 15 minutes in each of these peak hours. She said they are trying to strike a balance between traffic constraints and land-use at different times of the day. She said the City is willing to live with some congestion for the beauty of the corridor, valuing what is in place.

Ms. Willis presented a table that showed highlights of the key infrastructure improvements in planning/development scenarios. She said they are numbered but do not imply any sequence of priority. She noted these are groupings of roadway projects that occur around the same area. She reported the reasons behind the need for these improvements have been identified: Planned Capital Improvement Projects; Development Infrastructure; Network Connectivity; Roadway Capacity; and Intersection Capacity. She said the development levels triggering improvement have also been identified.

Mr. Foegler said when this was presented to City Council earlier in the year, initially these improvements were set out with timeframes predicting where the development would happen and therefore, what infrastructure would trigger. He indicated Council wisely said they did not know that is where the developments are going to go so these were developed as 'development scenarios' to illustrate the kinds of ways the study informs the programming of capital improvements.

Ms. Willis said with all these development scenarios, we would not need traffic studies in the District. She explained that a traffic impact study is triggered by rezoning and they are used to identify the number of new trips that are going to be assigned to the roadway network, how the trips will be disbursed across the network, what happens to the surrounding roadways, and how the impacts are to be mitigated. She said the traffic impact study is not necessary within the boundaries of the BSD because during the planning process, it was studied as one large overall development with land uses and density types that were tied back to the vision plan capacity study. She said once that was complete and agreed to by Council, what was needed to be put in place at the worst case scenario was identified. She said what was done for the transportation network was what is usually done for water, sewer, and stormwater.

Ms. Willis concluded that a picture is worth a thousand words and showed a slide that illustrated the vision and what is to be captured. She indicated there is so much more to a vibrant street than vehicular levels of service. She said focus for transportation in the BSD is to create a sense of place with vibrant streets by the use of cars, trucks, bikes, and pedestrians. She compared examples of the two extremes for levels of service and asked where someone would prefer to be.

Todd Zimmerman inquired about the peak levels and the specific 15 minute periods. Ms. Willis answered the am peak hours are from 7 am – 8 am and the pm peak hours are from 5 pm – 6 pm, which are very traditional time periods.

Ms. Salay said when all these apartments are added and everybody who lives in the apartment has a car, they are not going to stay in the grid, and they will travel somewhere else. She asked how the transportation system is not going to be completely overwhelmed.

Ms. Willis responded there are a couple different ways but the main way is because of the grid and how traffic will be disbursed across multiple redundant routes. She explained if one roadway or intersection is congested, the drivers can go down one or two blocks and find an alternate route and still access the same roadways that will carry them outside of the BSD area: Riverside Drive, SR161, and Dublin Road.

Ms. Salay said Riverside Drive, SR161, and Dublin Road are going to still function even with all that extra traffic.

Ms. Willis said the levels of service that were presented showed there will be periods of congestion during certain times.

Ms. O'Callaghan said development plans for SR161/Riverside Drive Roundabout and the Riverside Drive Realignment started in June 2014. She reported in September, they were approximately 40 percent complete with the construction plans and at that point they started to conceptualize how traffic would be maintained during construction of these projects. She said based on the level of development at that time she said they anticipated a closure at that intersection for a period of time of one construction season or so. She said in October, 60 percent of the design plans from the consultants were received and immediately considered how construction could be sequenced. She said she anticipates 90 percent of the plans in a week or so, when they are due. She noted how traffic will be sequenced and phases have been projected. She reported staff has evaluated the means of traffic alternatives, opportunities to expedite construction, and presented Council with an informational memo that outlined innovative contracting techniques considered and explored while keeping the safety of motorists, contractors, and workers a top priority.

Ms. O'Callaghan said construction of the first BSD infrastructure projects began in 2014 with the important final phase of Emerald Parkway, which opened up just last week. She said John Shields Parkway is the City's first example of a signature street and Dale Drive/Tuller Ridge connector will wrap up in the spring. She said the Dale/Tuller connector is an example of a proactive step to make sure we are prepared to manage traffic in 2015.

Ms. O'Callaghan said in 2015, two major infrastructure projects will begin – Riverside Drive Realignment and SR161 Roundabout. She said they are separate independent projects but they are anticipated to be constructed as a single project so there is ease of contract administration as well as a very coordinated maintenance of traffic.

Ms. O'Callaghan showed what the area looks like now where Riverside Drive is adjacent to the Scioto River, which could be one of Dublin's premier attractions. She indicated when the state route was constructed it was built to hug the river without consideration to access to the river. She said the intersection is controlled by a signal, (left turns from SR161 have been restricted since the early 1990s) and the intersection is the third highest crash location in the City. She then showed an illustration of the area in the future, much improved. She said important parklands will be opened up and the Scioto River will be accessible. She indicated the roundabout will be a tremendous improvement and all of the movements of the intersection will be restored. She suggested the new roundabout will also accommodate traffic volumes well into the future and there will be a lot of aesthetic improvements as a result of these two projects.

Ms. O'Callaghan said many traffic options were reviewed. She said a consultant took an in-depth look at how all the construction activities will be sequenced and proposed two options:

- 1) Maintain at least one lane of traffic in all directions with the exception of some short-term closures such as weekends, evenings, and nights that have yet to be defined. This option would not maintain turning movements. Traffic capacity would be reduced but the bridge would be open to east/west through traffic and subject to short-term closures mentioned above; or
- 2) Propose closing SR161 to traffic across the bridge for about 10 weeks. Northbound and southbound traffic would be maintained on the bypass lanes that exist today.

Ms. O'Callaghan said it was decided that there would be further development of Option 1 that would maintain at least one lane of traffic in each direction on SR161 and one lane of traffic in each direction on Riverside Drive throughout the duration of the project.

Mandy Bishop, GPD Group, Bridge Street District Consultant, presented a map that showed the project sequencing for Option 1 above: open lanes in green, closed lanes that are under construction are in red, and the lanes under construction for the realignment of Riverside Drive are in yellow to begin in March 2015. She said the first part of construction will be the closure of the Riverside Drive bypass as it needs to be widened, utility work completed, and then it will be ready for maintaining two-way, one-lane traffic in each direction. She said disruption will not be noticed at the main intersection as all lanes are open.

Ms. Bishop indicated in June of 2015, the north side of the roundabout will be constructed. She said when they move into the westbound lanes of SR161, approximately June - August one lane will be open in all directions. She said once the north side of the roundabout is open, the north side of the roundabout will be used to maintain one lane of traffic. She said the south side of the roundabout will be constructed and one lane north/south on the bypass and one lane east/west through the newly constructed roundabout portion.

Ms. Bishop said in approximately September – October 2015, the work will be continued and the roundabout will be opened but only one lane of traffic in all directions so more work can be completed in the roundabout with the islands, etc. while Riverside Drive continues to be under construction.

Ms. Bishop said in approximately October 2015, more lanes will be opened, two lanes in each direction in eastbound and westbound capacity. She said north/south traffic will be maintained on the bypass lanes as work continues on the realignment of Riverside Drive and the southern portion of Riverside Drive.

Ms. Bishop said in June 2016, it is anticipated that all lanes of traffic will be open. She said the bypass lanes would be worked on as well as all the streetscape elements such as sidewalks and planters through October 2016, it is estimated.

Ms. Bishop summarized the recommended option to maintain one lane in all directions throughout the construction process except for intermittent weekend closures. She said all movements in all lanes will be open in June 2016, except the bypass, and final completion is anticipated for October 2016.

Ms. Bishop restated the BSD projects:

- John Shields Parkway - April 2016
- Dale Tuller - May 2016
- 90 percent of the Riverside Drive realignment plans will be received on Monday for the roundabout

Ms. Bishop said some of the key elements of the Riverside Drive project are enhanced pedestrian street crossings at John Shields Parkway and at Bridge Park Avenue when the new pedestrian bridge ties in. She said these enhanced pedestrian areas will actually have brick inlay and granite pavers for the crosswalk delineations to really bring a sense of attention to the area for pedestrian's safety when crossing. She said another element is on-street parking between John Shields Parkway and Bridge Park Avenue on both sides of the street as well as on-street parking proposed between John Shields Parkway and Tuller Road. She presented a slide that showed at-grade street crossings, the on-street parking, as well as the greenway. She said with the recently approved pedestrian underpass, there will be a pedestrian underpass at John Shields Parkway.

Ms. O'Callaghan provided an overview of a tool developed the past few months called the BSD Streetscape Guideline that was initiated to ensure excellent design standards, construction, and maintenance. She explained this streetscape covers the area within the right-of-way with particular emphasis given to pedestrian realm such as sidewalks, streets, lighting, and curbs, etc. She said the purpose of the Guidelines is to create an exceptional sense of streetscape identity and unity throughout the BSD and to establish a streetscape environment that is conducive to development. She explained the Guidelines establish baseline treatments for streetscape elements that are consistent and of high quality materials. She said the streetscape needs to be pedestrian oriented as well as equal intensity throughout the District while encouraging unique development identities. She said this effort was initiated by staff in March 2014 while projects were coming forward. She reported it was decided that the Guidelines would be applicable to all projects and followed so each individual project did not need to be individually reviewed for the streetscape aspect. She reported MKSK was retained to assist with developing the Guidelines. She said City Council was consulted in May through work sessions to discuss the value and the cost and effort of maintaining various sample materials. She said the decisions on these materials is reflected in the Streetscape Guidelines and provide guidance for the designers all to work from for a consistent approach to public infrastructure projects throughout the district. She said an example of materials to be used throughout the district can be seen out in the field in the John Shields Parkway section that is currently under construction. She said the Guidelines are being finalized but it is going to be an evolving document as more decisions are made on more features and will be shared with City Council in the near future.

Mr. Foegler provided a brief overview of how the incentive structures and development agreement parameters guide some of the project design development implementation measures. He said the City's traditional use of tax increment financing is a primary tool capturing the new increased value off of the development and the real estate tax attributable to that new value. He said generally assigning that towards off-setting the cost of public improvements. He said among the first major ones they did back in the mid-1990s was Cardinal Health and that got Emerald Parkway off and going and was able to capture a 100 percent of the increment and a whole series of improvements in that area as a result. He said there are two significant statutes related to tax increment financing in the Bridge Street District to provide more

flexibility: Chapter 40 and 41 of the Statutes. He said TIF is used more for redevelopment and this will be done in the areas of Bridge Pointe, Dublin Village Center, and around Monterey. He said this will help underwrite the cost of private improvement. He explained there may be instances where the City would want structured parking but do not want to own, maintain, or operate the parking on a going forward basis. He said in some circumstances, developers can front costs and agree to be reimbursed over time through TIF revenues. Conversely he said, in other circumstances, the City fronts the cost and might get reimbursed over time. He noted the City tends to value the income stream very conservatively. He said typically deals are structured to be reimbursed within 20 years.

Mr. Foegler said with the Casto project, Tuller Flats, it was determined that the construction of John Shields Parkway is a high priority public improvement. He said the increments that get produced depend on the development that will define our estimate on what the TIF revenue will be and that ties extremely closely to the cost of improvements. He said there is a close, integral relationship between a revenue producing project and the amount and types of incentives that it can leverage. He restated most of these have been TIFs in the past but now the City has more flexibility to use other tools based on the arrangement with the schools. He said TIFs have less value when used with anything other than commercial property (office, retail, and apartments). He said condominiums can make less use of TIF revenue so they leverage less there. He said Council recognized that the larger projects will require these kinds of arrangements with the developer and it is important that they understand early on what the development is, what the infrastructure needs are, and how that structure can be put together.

Mr. Foegler said if the Commission was interested in demographics, there is a lot more data produced in the last couple of years. He said if you look at it from the perspective of age of householder, and review what drove the last four years of development, not just in Central Ohio but nationally. He said for Central Ohio, it is absolutely astonishing. He said the growth of detached single-family homes in the suburbs really dominated the residential model for the last 40 years and it ended in 2010. He said going forward in 2010 and is true for every 10-year increment, the overwhelming majority of households, over 80 percent, is 1 – 2 person households without kids. He said the households that typically represent the single family detached home buyer replaced what is here with a little bit of growth. He said for housing development going forward, supply and product, most of the product being demanded for the next 10 – 40 years, will be product to serve those other demographics. He said the supply is adequate to serve what is a relatively stable number, in the demographic that drove suburban development over the last four years. He said that is just what the market drivers are going to be. He said the City tied into the message that attracting young talent is critically important. He said suburban office parks have a challenge attracting young talent, as they are the mobile market of 25 – 30 year olds. He said 30 – 35 is extremely less mobile. He said creating environments where offices are in more walkable urban areas is very important to ensure Dublin's long-term economic competitiveness as well as the region.

Mr. Foegler said all of the data suggests the key housing types for those demographics are going to be apartments within these dense more walkable areas. He said retail projections are based on if you can create this type of environment and that starts with critical mass of housing and density in those neighborhoods. He said there are substantial amounts of housing that are critical to the achievement of the vision. He said the key is: that it be done well; designed in the appropriate urban fashion; aligned around a series of grids that we are talking about; well managed; with high quality environments and open spaces around it; and located strategically to feed those nodes where other kinds of uses could be successful. We believe, administratively, it is not recommended or advised that at some locations, where the City's adopted plan currently recommends that it is appropriate to try and integrate uses that our advisors, staff, and developers are telling us are not viable for the purpose of having a use mix internally within areas that do not have great visibility or are not good locations for office or other uses.

Mr. Foegler said the notion is we want to reinforce the nodes where mixed-use can be successful. He said here it means ultimately that the Dublin Village Center redevelopment will be one of those where those kind of uses will be, as that has the most land area, access and is located in an environment where those

things occur. He said there is a modest amount of retail but over 600,000 square feet of non-retail activity proposed to buffer Crawford Hoying's developments and those are a combination of restaurant, office, retail, conference center, and other uses but at a critical intersection or along the major roadway within the district. He said our key in having housing go in elsewhere that does not have those prime locations is to make it as walkable and connected to those settings as we can. He said with the school site, as it may eventually redevelop at some point in the future, which is another one of those larger sites that is many years off, significant kind of uses could be attracted to that location. He said OCLC with the visibility of the I-270 frontage, would be a great place for a variety of uses. He said with Crawford Hoying's development on the west side extending up Dublin Road and Wagenbrenner's along SR161 to the west where you are building upon our core and your street frontage, clearly those locations are ones we want to reinforce and build upon critical mass and these are the kinds of uses as well.

Mr. Foegler said for the vast majority of projects that are in the pipeline right now, other than Casto's Phase One, they all have a very substantial mix of uses incorporated with them. He said in virtually all cases, a significant amount of first floor retail and an increasingly encouraging level of office is proposed. He said we expect more office to come after the housing gets initiated and what we are hearing from all of these developers are pre-requisites of meaningful amounts of housing in the immediate area to show that this kind of environment is being created. He said it is important for them to get the deals done for the other uses that we think will be seeded by the residential. He said the fact that we have so many other uses coming in with the initial phases of most of these projects, we think is very encouraging.

Ms. Newell asked about the percentages for mixed-use development because at some point residential development is going to reach a critical mass and if you go past that point, you are never going to get the supporting commercial development. She asked how this can be achieved.

Mr. Foegler said there are two parts to that. He said first off, he does not think that is what we are seeing; the only project that is proposed exclusive residential that is active in the pipeline now is an area where the plans are recommending residential and not recommending other uses so it is fully consistent with the plan. He said the other aspect is for those other places we are getting both commercial and the residential going in hand-in-hand but ultimately from Council's perspective and a real critical piece, although we have established the zoning, these projects will not happen unless there are partnership agreements fashioned with the City. He said to the extent that projects come online, and if there is not enough office for example, the City can structure incentives to encourage and discourage whichever kind of projects we want. He said the City established the river corridor framework and put out a vision of what it wanted to encourage there; we are seeing projects that are very responsive to that. He said the notion that Council would keep doing a series of agreements and deals with developments that are just multi-family, is not aligned with City Council's vision. He said there are not that many locations within in the adopted plan for BSD where that is the case. He said most of the relatively easily developable sites desired by developers are just not there. He said it is going to be the economic life of those buildings going away over time before they become good development sites. He said the City will have the ability to control this by virtue of who they are choosing to deal with and who they are not.

Ms. Newell asked if there were studies that can be shared in terms of an ideal percentage mix.

Mr. Foegler said what it should be at buildout, which is seen in the plan that is adopted now, and what it takes to get it going, is two different phases. He said if you talk to Crawford Hoying and others who are out leasing the space, particularly office and even some of the other kinds of retail uses and restaurants, they are wanting to see substantial amounts of housing going hand-in-hand with that now. He said it is not because those provide a meaningful or large portion of the market, but the fact that they are developing their whole concept around a walkable urban environment as opposed to a drivable suburban environment, which would be totally different. He said developers want evidence that this is happening. He said the kinds of offices that are probably paying a premium here for a second floor or upper floors and a four or five story building are going to be more expensive and parking is going to be more

expensive. He said developers want to see evidence there are places for their workers to come. He said they are not going to build the office first and hope that some housing happens later. He said the fact that the City has a really strong commitment in these projects, supporting substantial residential development is critical to getting those nodes to have the other kinds of uses that we think are so important.

Ms. Newell said that aspect she completely understands. She said she has worked with developers and understands the concern. She reported she watched developments when they take the opposite direction and commercial development has gone in first and the businesses die because the residential is lacking in their City. She said she understands the aspect about it but her question is still about a balance so she asked if there were studies done to reflect a percentage of mix that is desired in the ultimate buildout.

Mr. Foegler said his response to that was the vision and the plan that exist that represents a mix of x amount of units, x amount of office, housing and other related uses is appropriate. He said we are going to respond and learn and react to the market over time but there is no ideal. He indicated it is just a lack of meaningful amounts of residential that will really hurt the advancement and implementation of this. He said there has to be a commitment to this for it to work and if those suburban projects get very low in density and more suburbanized in character, the ability to get the more urban commercial uses than we are seeking for this will be diminished substantially.

Jennifer Readler said at the December 8th meeting City Council reviewed the proposed BSD Code Amendment and approved several revisions. She said fundamentally, those changed the development review process for applications where there is going to be a development agreement with the City. She briefly summarized those amendments:

Ms. Readler said on November 17, City Council discussed the fact that because of this significant infrastructure investment that is going to be required in the Bridge Street District, most of the substantial projects in the District are going to necessitate development agreements between the City and private developers. For this reason she reported, Council thought it was important to ensure their early understanding and general support for those proposals that will involve these financial commitments from the City. She stated Council requested that Section 153.066 be amended to require the Basic Plan applications be reviewed by City Council for projects that will involve development agreements and City Council will then determine the required reviewing body for the Development Plan and Site Plan applications. She pointed out that this process amendment is only applicable when the City and the developer would be entering into a development agreement. She reported Council also requested that there be a more direct appeals process. She indicated any appeal in the BSD previously would first go to the Board of Zoning Appeals and a discretionary appeal to Council. She said Council requested the elimination of that interim body so any decision in the BSD can now be appealed directly to Council. She indicated those amendments were the only real difference to what the Commission recommended in those Code amendments. She said this was all approved on Monday night. She clarified this would also apply to the Architectural Review Board reviews in the Historic District as well.

The Chair invited public comment. [There was none.]

Richard Taylor thanked all of the staff that was present. He said he had a different view than Ms. Salay and said he did not think Apple was a relevant metaphor for what is being done here. He said we are trying to create Walkable Urbanism, which has existed since man created villages and it exists all over the world today. He indicated we need to look and learn from the good and the bad ones. He said with all of the data and studies that have been done to get us here the past five years, it is easy to forget what we are ultimately trying to accomplish. He said we are not trying to build roundabouts, streets, or underpasses and things like that.

Mr. Taylor said Walkable Urbanism was rather new to him when the idea first came up in Dublin about six years ago (2008) when he picked up a book by Peter Katz called *The New Urbanism* that was a pretty picture book describing what urbanism is and covers in some detail a number of projects around the country that are really good examples. He said Mr. Foegler introduced him to a book by Christopher Leinberger called *The Option of Urbanism-Investing in a New American Dream* in the summer of 2009. He said that was an eye-opener to him as it went way beyond *The New Urbanism* book describing how to make this work and happen. He indicated this lead him to read a book by Jeff Speck, an Urban designer, city planner, and collaborator to Andres Duany. He has designed Bridge Street Districts for the past 25 years all over the country. He said they have some 300 different small town plans and similar types of projects. They wrote a book called *Walkable City: How Downtown Can Save America One Step at a Time*. He said he ate that up as each chapter is a step to create walkability for new downtowns or how to revive existing downtowns. He said *Suburban Nation* explains how we got to everything we are trying to fix today. He said that was viewed in the Urban Planning and Architectural circles as one of the bestsellers. He said one thing that came out of that book that was of direct interest to him and played a role in this whole process was they end the book with a rather extensive checklist of items that need to be present in traditional neighborhood design. He said that checklist was the genesis of our principles of walkable urbanism in our Code, which he primarily wrote and collaborated with Justin Goodwin to get what is in the Code today. He said we had an opportunity to measure projects against something other than just the rather prescriptive information we found on the form-based Code. He said another book he got a great deal of information out of was *The Smart Growth Manual*. He said that is actually his favorite book and shared it with several other Commissioners here over the years. He said what was most interesting was it is very much a page-after-page of "this is what you do to make walkable urbanism work" and "this is what not to do". He said again that was a collaboration with Mr. Speck and Mr. Duany. He said Mr. Duany is an architect and he is a co-founder of the Congress of New Urbanism and also the fellow that wrote the very first form-based Code so he is kind of an expert in this area. He said *The End of the Suburbs* came out last year by Leigh Gallagher, an editor at Fortune Magazine. In her writings, he said, she found these trends happening in America. Mr. Taylor said he mentioned all of those books because in each one of those books, Jane Jacobs' name kept appearing, a community activist that lived in Greenwich Village in New York in mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. He said she tried to stop urban renewal, freeways blowing through Washington Park, and other things to maintain the character and life of her neighborhood and wrote a book called *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, which is widely regarded as an extremely detailed Bible on what makes cities work at the 'boots on the ground' level.

Mr. Taylor shared one of his sketchbooks. He said up until recently, some of the contents were special to him. He said the special part starts on the page dated September 25, 2008, and it says Greenville. He said in Greenville, he began to see a vision for the redevelopment of Dublin's core. He said at the time, he felt so fortunate to be appointed to this Commission at such a critical and exciting time in Dublin's journey. He said the last relevant page in this section of the book is a sketch with Commissioner Freiman during a discussion at the Greenville airport waiting for their flight back to Columbus at the end of their trip. He said that lead to a larger more detailed sketch that he shared with Commission, staff, and City Council. He said the sketch turned out to be one of the seed documents for the work among BSD planners.

Mr. Taylor said he brought up all of these books that have influenced him because his reviews and critiques of the BSD concept and individual BSD projects are not based on whim or based solely on the information presented to him by the applicants and city staff. He said those opinions are also based on many hours of research and study, much of which were shared with his fellow Commissioners. He said with the exception of three of his colleagues here tonight, and two colleagues that are no longer on the Commission, nobody has had a greater interest and passion for the success of the Bridge Street District than him.

Mr. Taylor said when he was interviewed for a position on the Planning and Zoning Commission six and a half years ago, City Council told him about Dublin's very high standards and some of the reasons they

were interested in having an architect on the Board was that members of PZC had difficulty reading architectural drawings and determining whether what they were seeing was quality. He said Mr. Hardt told him he was told something similar. He said at his planning and orientation meeting in spring of 2008, he was seated next to the Director, during a presentation by senior staff of the very high standards for development in Dublin. He said the Director turned to him and said and if they do not want to do that, it is ok to tell them to go build in “blank” suburb. He said with those instructions from Council and the Director, he dove into the role of Planning Commissioner. He said at his second Commission meeting, he brought six pages of notes with him regarding the Tartan Ridge Development Text. He said his purpose in saying that is when BSD concept came along, no one should have been surprised that he thought it was his responsibility to become as knowledgeable as possible about new urbanism and walkable urbanism for multipurpose perspectives, hence the books he mentioned tonight.

Mr. Taylor indicated as the BSD process progressed, there were bumps along the road he assumed could be smoothed out as development proposals began to come in. He stated he was wrong about that. He said the bumps have gotten bigger because increasingly he has been unable to reconcile what he has learned from the walkable urban experts with the proposals he has been shown for the BSD, especially as it relates to creating walkable urban neighborhoods. He cited one example: He said it was not long ago that the architect for the Tuller Flats project stood in this room in front of this Commission and told us that the Tuller Flats project was a suburban apartment complex because that was the only model that made financial sense for the developer. He said yet in their book, the *Smart Growth Manual*, Jeff Speck and Andres Duany wrote, “a neighborhood should endeavor to include a balanced mix of housing, working, shopping, recreation, civic uses, while a perfect balance is rarely possible, larger parcels containing single-uses must be avoided”. He said, simply put, housing subdivisions, apartment clusters, office parks, and shopping centers are the ingredients of suburban sprawl and the antithesis of smart growth.

Mr. Taylor noted, similarly, in a 2013 interview, our friend David Dixson from Goody Clancy was asked the following question: What makes a great neighborhood? His answer was - the real test is, can a five-minute walk be a journey of discovery. He said to him, a great neighborhood has cafés and restaurants, shops that are unique and varied, an animated square that he wants to spend time in, ideally with a fountain, enabling him to see, hear, and touch water, lots of different people who make him curious and other qualities such as diversity, interactions, and surprise. He said apparently, Tuller Flats is not intended to be a great neighborhood. He noted Jane Jacobs makes the case that not only is mixed-use critical to a residential neighborhood’s success, but that those mixed-uses should be fine grained. He quoted another piece that summarized Jacobs’ point: “If a public space is surrounded by one type of land use it would only be used at certain periods during the day”. He said “combining the primary activities of living and working implies a better distribution of demand over the day and will support a greater variety of secondary facilities, all of which add to local diversity and even spread activity in the public realm throughout the day and evening.” Finally, he said, Chris Leinberger and the *Option of Urbanism* discusses 19 different standard real estate product types that define drivable suburbanism, which we are trying to avoid, and must be avoided in walkable urban areas. He said #10 on that list is what Mr. Leinberger calls garden level apartments, which Mr. Leinberger describes as “variable level apartments”, which means they are two to three story drivable suburban apartments known as walk ups. Mr. Leinberger said they would be flats or townhouses or some combination of the two. He said during the 1990s, individual garages were introduced into many of the new complexes being built, though plenty of surface parking was included for residents and guests, these complexes will typically include more than 150 units and often many more to allow for economies of scale for marketing, amenities, and management, there will be a pool, Jacuzzi, exercise room, and maybe a business center. He said management will be provided 24/7, the location will be on a major highway, with maximum visibility from passing cars, because more than 70 percent of new tenants will find out about the apartment complex by driving by. Mr. Taylor said that sounds like a description of Tuller Flats.

Mr. Taylor said all of the above tells him to be skeptical, which he has been, and what he believes is an important part of his job as a Planning Commissioner. And yet in spite of all the evidence to the contrary he said, he has been clearly told by City Council that he must accept this project. He said a few minutes ago, he shared his sketchbook and said it was special to him up until this past Monday evening. He said that is when City Council and the Planning Director informed him through their public discussion, and the Zoning Code Amendment, that his knowledge, experience, and passion for excellence for the Bridge Street District was no longer desired, even though he has been doing the job that City Council and the Director asked him to do six and a half years ago and he believes, doing it well. And so tonight he said, he finds himself confused about his role on the Commission, and unsure of what he is expected to do from this point on. He said tonight's presentation has been interesting and informative but largely irrelevant since the Commission has been affectively removed from any meaningful further participation in the BSD process.

John Hardt restated that he is supportive of the Bridge Street District. He said Mr. Foegler spent a lot of time tonight, Monday evening, and previously talking about the changing demographics and the need to be competitive as a community and the need to offer alternative housing and living settings and he has been on board with that from the beginning. He said the very purpose and whole goal in notion in BSD is something he has always supported.

Mr. Hardt said Ms. Salay referred to the visionaries and the speaker series, and the great minds that we have working on this and also spoke of calculated risks. He said he has a story of his own. He said back in the 1970s, the Citi Corp Center in New York, a 60-story iconic office building was designed by some of the greatest architects and structural engineers in the world, and it took a grad student doing a thesis to figure out a year after it opened that a 60 mph wind could blow the whole building over. So as great as the lens might be he said, there are opportunities where sometimes we have to take lay people like himself and at least listen to what they have to say. He said his concern with some of the things that have transpired over the past couple of months, while he is supportive of taking calculated risks, he sees possible miscalculations.

Mr. Hardt said one of the things we heard from the speakers and visionaries and the folks Mr. Taylor referenced, that were firmly written in the Vision Report was that the success of the BSD is dependent upon many things but among those things is residential diversity. But the proposals we have seen thus far, he said, according to the documents that have been given to us previously, are made up of one-bedroom garden units, two-bedroom garden units, and a small number of two-bedroom townhouses. He said there is virtually no housing diversity to speak of that has been proposed.

Mr. Hardt said we have heard repeatedly that the street network and the grid are essential to the success of the BSD, which he understands. He said but the very early maps that we saw, had another bridge on it that was eliminated with virtually no discussion and he has yet to hear a legitimate explanation as to why that was done other than it interfered with developers' plans.

Mr. Hardt said traffic calculations again, which make sense to him, have inherent in them, several assumptions, not the least of which is the 40 percent capture rate. He reported he has talked to a number of traffic engineers on his own and has been told by each of them that 40 percent capture is the highest they have ever seen used in any traffic study. He said he was told that one of the examples of communities that would achieve that level of capture referenced downtown San Francisco and Brooklyn. He said the only way 40 percent capture is going to be achieved is to pay exquisite attention to the mixed-uses, where they are, and pay attention to Mr. Dixon's five-minute walking rule of thumb and thus far, he has not seen any of that transpire. He said we seem to be saying, in general, that the residential stuff goes over there and the commercial stuff goes over here, which is a very fundamental approach he has objected to since he saw the first maps, before the Code was even adopted. He said having the residential and commercial split is called the suburbs. He said he realizes that some

commercial uses may come later but that is not going to happen if space is not allowed for them and we have not done that.

Mr. Hardt said he does not dispute much of what was talked about tonight, he has appreciated the work of staff all along, including tonight's presentations, as it was informative and helpful. He said candidly, it did not do a whole lot to alleviate some of his fundamental concerns and miscalculations that he thinks he sees.

Mr. Hardt reported he received a number of phone calls and emails the other night from residents, too. He said the majority of who were not at the meeting Monday night. He said the question of speed that was asked as a way of explanation he thinks people were curious about was the fundamental idea of moving the review processes to City Council was first brought up at Council's meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> of November and he went back and watched that video as did some of the people that contacted him. He said at that meeting, there was less than two minutes of discussion about it. He said it was brought up by one Council Member and that was it; there was no further follow up. He said at the following Council meeting that was this week, there was a vote taken after the documents that were relevant to that change had been posted 48 hours before. He said the people he heard from were not questioning the BSD or the care or thought that has been put into it over the past five years, they were questioning that decision, which was a fundamental change to the way the City reviews and approves projects and it seemed, at least to who he talked to, to have been done with very little discussion in very little time.

Mr. Hardt referred to Ms. Salay's comment about being on board to be transparent and communicate as clear as possible. He said he was kind of offended. He said in particular, when he was appointed to this Commission, he was told that his professional expertise and experience in reviewing plans and looking at things critically was part of the reason he was appointed. He said he took an oath to use those skills to review things for the benefit of the community and to do what he thought was best. He said he did not take an oath to agree with City Council. He said he intends to continue reviewing things and calling it like he sees it and thought Ms. Salay's comment tonight deserved some response.

Amy Krumb thanked Engineering, especially for providing traffic information. She reported she has actually read all the traffic studies. She indicated it would have been very helpful to hear this information six months ago; sounds like most things were wrapped up in June. She said the Commission did not receive the LJB Study until a couple of weeks ago. She said her hesitation is something Mr. Hardt brought up, which is the 40 percent internal capture figure. She said we know there are going to be impacts, we plan for them, and she understands the plan that is all great but we based it on assumptions and her question remains of how the assumptions of 40 percent capture rate are ensured. She said she works with traffic engineers constantly and has asked many of them and they all said that was a very high number. She said she has not seen a Master Plan, that phase was skipped of where things go to ensure we get the 40 percent capture. She said the other big piece that worries her is how the transit is going to interact; that has not been studied on these roadways. She said there are no bus stops or bus lanes in the street sections and there is no mention of how transit will be accommodated on these streets. She said perhaps it is still coming and maybe it is in those street guidelines that are supposed to be coming out but that is still one area she remains uncomfortable.

Ms. Krumb said over the past six years she has become comfortable with the Bridge Street District and understands that is the way our city is moving and we have this vision plan adopted. She said she has tried to learn as much as she can about urbanism, much of it thanks to Mr. Taylor who sends her information weekly. She said it seems we are moving forward based on the plan of the developers rather than the plan of what we want. She said the Commission has been very critical with the developments that have come forward and it seems that all the time and effort put into reviewing these projects, providing critical feedback, to make these better projects, is being dismissed by the recent actions by City Council to take the review away from the Commission because Council does not like how we are reviewing the projects.

Ms. Kramb said she was appalled that at the last Commission meeting when Ms. Amorose Groomes specifically asked Ms. Salay and Planning if there was anything to be discussed or shared during roundtable at the end. She noted Ms. Salay did not have the courtesy to even mention that revisions were being made to the review process. She said the Commission was treated as every other citizen who would have had to scour the internet, search the agenda, and find out what was on Council's table for the night. She said that was extremely disrespectful. She said Ms. Salay was given ample opportunity to say that these revisions were coming. She said she would have never expected that Ms. Salay would ask the Commission's opinion on it, but just to let us know that it was on the table. She said because of those changes, from comments that were made by Council Members and staff, we were really trying to be minimized and whether it is true or not, it should only affect one or two projects, it has been minimized to the public. She said the action has very far reaching consequences. She said it opens up developers to go directly to Council, and ask for what they want, it removes the authority that this Commission has. She said she does not know that she would spend her usual hours reviewing these plans knowing that her comments will be dismissed, either by Council or by the developer that knows they can appeal directly to City Council. She said the Basic Plan sets the foundation of what will happen and that further minimizes not only the Commission but the ARB as well.

Ms. Kramb referred to Ms. Salay's comment at the beginning of the meeting where she said if the Commission members do not like it, there are better ways to serve our community. She said without the Commission having any affective role anymore, maybe there are better ways to serve our community.

Victoria Newell said she has a great deal of respect for the people she serves with on the Commission. She said she is the wife of a former Council Member so she may have a slightly different perspective. She said one of the things she has experienced in the years her husband served for the City is that often she would hear residents complain about City issues for which she would hear her husband speak, sometimes hours, to people about the decisions Council made. She said what she has always taken away from that is that often she would hear what Council members discuss. She said this is not stated to defend Council but to explain why she took a slightly different take on what transpired on Monday.

Ms. Newell said there are City dollars from City Council being invested in those properties. She said her take was that City Council was looking for a way to be able to negotiate and say whether they were going to put money into those projects. She said in the same regard with that, as a Planning Commissioner, our authority was taken away. She said she struggled with potentially seeing both sides of the perspective. She said she would hear all of the facts that City Council members took or listened to her husband explain the decisions of City Council. She said she would often hear from residents who have complete opposition to something and would make the comment "now that I understand all the facts, maybe I would have made the same decision". She said moving forward with this, she would like to keep an open mind towards that step but equally said she was really disappointed at the decision on Monday night.

Chris Amorose Groomes thanked the presenters for their time and recognized it was a tremendous amount of information and certainly worthy of the phrase 'drinking from a fire hose' trying to download that much technical data in that short period of time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she had some concerns about the District and really believes that it is a wonderful thing for the City. She said she has been very supportive and one of the few of us left on the Greenville trip and it was fantastic, eye-opening, and a great experience to see what our city could be. She said she got the sense from her time in Greenville it was not about any project but about the experience. She said she thinks we have largely focused on projects and not experiences. She said she does not believe that Emerald Parkway was a really calculated risk because she traveled every month to 16 different cities and frontage on the highway is always popular and always makes money and if the City can get more property on the highway we would get more money as it is a well-established,

historically ingrained endeavor. She said it worked out really well; Emerald Parkway is beautiful, lots of revenue is being generated, and more revenue will be generated in the near future. She said her concern with the experience we are trying to create in the BSD is that we have gotten to a disposition of desperation, that we need a project, we need a catalyst, we need something, we need a golden ring. She said her kids are big Hobbit fans and they read all the books, and she feels as though we might be the one trudging down into the waters calling out for our precious project. She emphasized it is not about a project, it is about an experience and we have lost sight of that. She said we have lost our vision for what we are trying to create and focused in on a few things that might get us close. She said she did not want to be the city of 'get it close', she wants to be the city of 'get it right'. She said it is difficult when we talk about our traffic studies that we claim to know the impact without knowing the project; that has never held true in any development that has happened. She said it is difficult to make those decisions in isolation.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she is convinced the cost to the City will be great. She said she fully understands that the real estate will be more valuable, and therefore higher taxes will be created and collected by the City, the Schools, and others once the TIF funds are either repaid or the TIF expires. She said she is not so convinced that we are doing it in a judicious way. She recalled Ms. Salay in her comments earlier that to question City Council was not to be done. Ms. Amorose Grooms said in a highly democratic society nothing is more welcomed than questions and when there is great confidence, questions are greatly welcomed. She said this body has asked a lot of questions, we received a lot of information tonight to questions that we asked 18 months ago; although some of the information might not have been forthcoming, she did not see anything other than they have a 90 percent plan in place for the new roundabout. She said she did not see much that was more recent than June.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she could not agree more with Mr. Hardt's comments with respect to speed. She said the question was not addressed at all; it was not speed about the five years of study it was the speed of why are we so desperate to get this particular project. She said if the project is good, the proof will be in the pudding. She said 14 sets of eyes are more valuable than 9, any way that it is calculated. She added even when not all 14 have answers, she is enlightened by having more feedback and narrowing the feedback pool and that is significantly what has happened.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said we talk a lot when we write Code in this body and we talk a great deal about not writing this Code for us, but are writing the Code for others, people we do not know yet, people that will sit in these seats long after we are gone. She said it is a very dangerous and precarious place to remove steps of that democratic process; not in secrecy but limiting the amount of input that could be placed on something. She said Council did not change the Code for the Council that sits today; they have changed the Code for the Council's that will sit someday. She said we have started to trod down a very slippery slope; it started with West Innovation District, and we have removed essentially a large part of the welcoming for citizenry to be engaged. She said that was extremely frightening to her and disappointing. She said she knows sometimes when you are too close to something, it is difficult to see that perspective but if you have the openness of thinking and take the time to step back, you sometimes view things in a different light. She said that is a step that really should be taken.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said it has been unfortunate. She said she is not sure we will get the 'experience' but knows that we will get 'projects'. She indicated time will be the determining factor of that.

### **Communications**

[There were none.]

Ms. Salay asked the Chair if she could respond. She said she heard a lot of anger, hurt feelings, and disillusionment. She responded to Ms. Krumb's criticism. She said Ms. Krumb was right, she did not say anything at the last meeting because frankly she did not want to get into it. She said she has two roles: a City Council member and a Planning Commissioner. She said she has six colleagues she takes orders

from, too. She said she had told herself to take the easy way out and was just not going to go there. She admits she is guilty for that, she feels badly, and said she was sorry. She said there is a misunderstanding of how Council views the Commission's role and maybe the 13 of us needed to get together in a room, just us, and have a discussion about Council's expectations and why decisions are made. She said as frustrated as this body is with the back and forth, the developer comes to one body and gets one answer and goes to another body and gets a different answer. She said that is equally frustrating for City Council.

Ms. Salay said the very nature of the Bridge Street Corridor is that these big projects are going to require very complicated development agreements and if they come to Council and we say yes, we are willing to enter into a development agreement, based on what the applicant is thinking, and then they come to this body and get a completely different direction or answer then what is that developer going to do. She said the idea that Council is dismissive or cutting Planning Commission out is simply not true. She explained Council is going to look at the Basic Plan Review and talk about that in the context of the economic development aspects, infrastructure aspects, and the public parts of it. She said if she were a betting woman, most of those things after they go through that period will be sent to this body.

Mr. Taylor said the Commission makes a lot of decisions at the preliminary stage that they then compare to the next. He said that is what you are asking us to do. Council is going to make the big decisions and tell us to decide whether the siding is the right color. He said that is all it really is within the Site Plan, Development, and Development Plan stuff; all the big stuff has been done, that is just the details. He said we would have no input on the concept of the project, whatsoever.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the other comment that really negates the fact that if you were a betting woman they would be sent here. She said one of the council persons stated that Council would give at a minimum, as good of a review of this project, as the Planning and Zoning Commission. And by inference she said, meant that it would be better, thorough, and complete.

Ms. Salay said she is one of seven and cannot speak for her colleagues and what their thought process is. She said she knows some of the Commission members are angry and does not blame them. She said she is here to take the anger and can completely appreciate where this is coming from. She said she thinks there should be a meeting of the minds because their expectations are not being met. She said Council is concerned with how applicants have been treated. She said she believes it is a time of reflection for all of us. She said there have been mistakes made on both sides and this process has gotten very messy. She said it seems like the two bodies are at odds.

Ms. Salay said what she hears talked about in this Commission in terms of what the dreams are for this District are pretty much identical to what Council's dreams are for the District when talking about the experience, the community, and what this is going to be like for our kids, grandkids, and 30 years down the road when we are all in nursing homes/elderly care facilities in the Bridge Street District. She said she does not believe there is any perfect project but wishes that there was. She said she does not think there is a gold ring. She said we are going to build some projects, just like we have always built projects where we said, oh wow, this is ok but we could have done this better and then when the next project comes along, we will have learned, and it will be better but there may be some things on that one we get wrong. She said it is an imperfect process; humans are imperfect.

Ms. Salay said she does not know about any other traffic engineers, just the traffic engineers that we have and they are really good. She said she has to believe that when Ms. Willis tells her, that every time they have said that something was going to happen with regard to traffic, even if she had been skeptical, it happened. She said she is not a traffic engineer and has to trust them.

Ms. Salay said she would certainly take the comments from this evening back to City Council and will propose that both sides sit down together and have a discussion. She said that is very important going

forward so we can all coexist and hopefully diffuse some of the angst and tension and carry on together because we all have a place at the table and we all have very important work to do. She said she does not want anyone to think they are not valued or respected because that is simply not true.

Ms. Newell said she was really proud to serve on the Planning and Zoning Commission and has a great deal of respect for City Council. She said she agrees with the point that City Council and the Commission share the same vision for the Bridge Street District. She said part of what is making this process so complicated for the developers, Commissioners, and Council is because there are two bodies that have been reviewing a project at different segments within and all will react to new information if not given the background information. She said she hopes that everyone on City Council realizes that. She said the Commissioners would not be here if they did not have a love for this City and the Planners felt passionately.

Ms. Salay said that was very well stated and thanked Ms. Newell.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:59 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on February 5, 2015.