



Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 21, 2016

AGENDA

1. **Village at Coffman Park, Phase 3** **Post Road**
15-116AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan (Postponed prior to meeting)**
2. **Muirfield Village Maintenance Facility** **8372 Muirfield Drive**
15-123AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 0)**
3. **Community Plan – Bright Road Area Plan Amendment**
15-097ADM **Administrative Request (Discussion)**

Staff Presentation – Geographic Information Systems for Public Use

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Amy Salay, Robert Miller, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, Christopher Brown and Stephen Stidhem was absent. City representatives present were: Philip Hartmann, Vince Papsidero, Alan Perkins, Claudia Husak, Devayani Puranik, JM Rayburn, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Aaron Stanford, Matt Earman, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said if anyone is here tonight for Case 1, the informal for Village at Coffman Park, Phase III, please note that the applicant has requested the case be postponed until the February 4th meeting and will not be discussed tonight.

The Chair said there were no consent cases tonight, so they will work through the agenda in the published order.

Claudia Husak said there is a quick change on the consent cases. She said the applicant for the Muirfield Village Maintenance Facility also consented at the last minute.

The Chair asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak on behalf of the Muirfield Village case. [Hearing none.] She emphasized that when a case is on the consent agenda, no presentation will be provided and it will not be discussed.

Ms. Husak said this was going to be JM Rayburn's first presentation and he is prepared. The Chair said due to the circumstances, she was happy to entertain hearing this case.

**2. Muirfield Village Maintenance Facility
15-123AFDP**

**8372 Muirfield Drive
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for an addition to an existing maintenance facility and office within the Muirfield Village Planned Unit Development maintained by the Muirfield Homeowners Association on Muirfield Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.053. She noted the Commission is the final authority on this application and anyone intending to address the Commission will need to be sworn-in.

The Chair swore in witnesses that intended to address the Commission regarding this case.

JM Rayburn presented the site, which is a five-acre rectangular parcel with dense woods on the eastern half of the site. He said the existing two-story maintenance facility and associated parking lots are located in the center of the southern boundary with access off Muirfield Drive. He presented the west elevation/entrance as well as the proposed site plan. He presented the north elevation to show the building is non-descript. He said there are currently 18 spaces for parking including one (1) ADA accessible parking space. He said no additional parking is proposed with this building addition. He presented the proposed addition diagrams.

Mr. Rayburn said approval is recommended with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant will be required to update the plans to reconcile the size of the proposed addition across all sheets;
- 2) That the applicant meet Code for tree replacement as part of the building permit submission and provide details on tree protection fencing;
- 3) That the applicant work with Staff to add evergreen trees to the site to provide screening for residences to the north; and
- 4) That the applicant demonstrate compliance with the Stormwater Management regulations as part of the building permit submission.

Mr. Rayburn said the applicant has agreed to the above conditions as written.

Bob Miller said his concern was with the north side of the building. He said since the leaves have fallen off the trees, the back side of the building is visible to the residents. He said there is a fence laying against the building and it looks a mess. He asked if the City planned to address that in some way, shape, or form.

Mr. Rayburn said Staff is requesting additional screening on the northern end but in terms of the wooded area on the eastern part of the site, it is densely wooded.

Claudia Husak said the condition for screening - trees for the area adjacent to the residences to the north, specifically but perhaps additional screening could be requested for the south side. She said Staff could work with the applicant to accomplish this at the permitting stage. She agreed it is a different view when there are no leaves on the trees.

Chris Brown said he was surprised by the amount of materials stored outside the maintenance building, particularly to the north. He restated it is dense woods but at this time of year, it is visible. He said the residents to the south can see a gas storage tank or oil tank. He emphasized that Dublin has standards

but so does Muirfield Village and this does not appear to meet those standards. He indicated the assurance is if the applicant is adding on to the existing structure to make it more habitable to store everything.

The Chair asked the applicant to come to the podium and address Mr. Brown's concerns but he had to be sworn in first.

Walter Zeier, 1646 Lynnbrook Court, Orient, Ohio, 43146, agreed. He said half of the reason why they are asking for the addition is to bring a lot of that equipment inside. He said in terms of screening, Staff just requested additional trees on the northbound side but thought the applicant was not expected to screen the whole building and immediate surroundings as it is dense woods and they would have to take down trees to plant trees. He said they do not have a problem with anything Staff requested prior to this meeting.

Mr. Brown said the City has wonderful zoning inspectors that work in the Planning Department to come up with the proper solution for evergreen and tree screen.

The Chair asked Staff if an additional condition should be included that state the point of the addition is so the applicant can bring the equipment inside and will no longer be stored outside.

Mr. Zeier said the applicant is still planning on having some goods outside, hopefully not the goods that are in the back. He said they still have some trailers that are parked on the other side. The Chair requested the applicant show the Commission where the trailers are currently located. Mr. Zeier highlighted the areas on the maps shown on the screen. Bob Miller confirmed there will not be any equipment on the north side. Mr. Zeier said their goal is to have all of that inside with the new addition.

The Chair said she was not suggesting that trailers could not be stored outside; she just asked that a condition be added whereas if the applicant planned to store goods outside, that they be properly screened.

The Chair swore in Mr. Lenz.

Peter Lenz, architect for Muirfield Association, 515 Hartford Street, Worthington, Ohio, said his concern for Mr. Zeier was he may not have realized what he agreed to. He said the kind of business he does, has a lot of heavy equipment that is moved in and out. He asked for clarification on screening being requested. He said equipment could stay out there two or three days while Mr. Zeier is getting stuff loaded and unloaded and moved about, just like any other landscape business. He asked if temporary fencing was necessary or if they have an exemption when it is just a few days. He agreed the stuff looks terrible when it sits there all winter long unused. He indicated the building addition will resolve most of that but there are times in the middle of his spring season where equipment will need to be out for days at a time.

Victoria Newell said in those instances, the goods stored outside are to be screened; she said that is a requirement of all commercial property within the City of Dublin. She said there is not a provision for storage on a temporary basis. She restated that even if equipment is there for several days at a time, it must be screened from other property.

Mr. Lenz said looking at it from a practical angle, he does not want to put a burden on Mr. Zeier that is beyond reason.

Mr. Zeier said Mr. Lenz is right. He said he has absolutely no problem trying to screen it and the goal is when the addition is completed, the area will look much better than it does now. He said if everything in his parking lot is required not to be visible to any additional resident or property - that is probably not

likely. He said they store trucks occasionally, a backhoe, which he intends to store inside but there are times like right now when they are working on equipment and he needs extra room inside. He asked if he is no longer permitted to park a dump truck outside because that is not what Staff has advised them.

Ms. Newell said nobody is saying the applicant cannot have a dump truck outside; if vehicles are parked outside on a regular basis, and equipment is stored on a regular basis, that they are appropriately screened as the Commission would ask of any commercial owner within the city limits of Dublin.

Mr. Zeier asked what is appropriate screening. He asked if he should work with Planning. Ms. Newell said the condition states the applicant work with Staff but there are specific regulations in the Zoning Code for appropriate screening that address opacity and the height of screening, etc.

Mr. Brown reiterated screening is required of every business in Dublin, particularly in Muirfield under the guidelines insisted upon those residents. He said the same courtesy should be made to the residents that back up to this property. He restated the applicant must work with Staff to properly screen stored equipment.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else from the public that wanted to speak with regards to this case. [Hearing none.] She asked the Commission if they had any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] The Chair asked Staff if the additional condition was added.

- 1) That the applicant will be required to update the plans to reconcile the size of the proposed addition across all sheets;
- 2) That the applicant meet Code for tree replacement as part of the building permit submission and provide details on tree protection fencing;
- 3) That the applicant work with Staff to add evergreen trees to the site to provide screening for residences to the north;
- 4) That the applicant demonstrate compliance with the Stormwater Management regulations as part of the building permit submission; and
- 5) That the applicant must work with Staff to properly screen stored equipment.

The Chair asked the applicant if they agreed with the additional condition. They responded affirmatively.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown made a motion, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with five conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

3. Community Plan – Bright Road Area Plan Amendment 15-097ADM

Administrative Request

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is an introduction of amendments to the Community Plan recommendations, illustrations, and conceptual graphic for the Bright Road Area Plan. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback prior to a formal recommendation to City Council for approval of an Administrative Request under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.232. She noted the Commission will not take a vote on this application this evening.

Devayani Puranik said this is an informative presentation only. She reported that in August 2015, the City of Dublin initiated an update to the Bright Road Area Plan. She said the last major update to this area plan occurred in 2007, with minor technical revisions completed in 2013. She said changes in market and development trends have necessitated the need to revisit the plan and evaluate how this area can best benefit the greater Dublin community in the future. She added other trends include:

- Increasing parking demands for office development effecting site design
- Growing competition for office development for income tax revenues
- Desire for amenities and services for employees for more walkable office development and access is an important consideration
- Decline in single-family development trends nationwide

Ms. Puranik affirmed with the completion of Emerald Parkway, the City of Columbus' planned roadway improvements to Sawmill Road, and a shift in office development trends occurring nationwide prompted a re-evaluation of the Bright Road Area Plan. She indicated a concept is now getting finalized with all these changes in market conditions. She said some of the objectives for refining the existing Bright Road Area Plan's policy and direction have been identified:

- Update recommendations on land use types
- Update design recommendations for identified land uses.
- Establish appropriate development character for the land uses
- Consider the impact water and sewer accessibility will have
- Identify strategies to address traffic concerns
- Emphasize bicycle and pedestrian connections
- Reinforce the importance of natural features

Ms. Puranik said this process began with a Kick-off meeting in August 2015 of a Core Group that included staff representatives from Planning, Engineering, and Building Departments and two Citizen/Resident representatives. She noted a meeting with the Dublin City Schools in September 2015. She explained the Public Workshop I process involved the following:

- Core Group (October 10, 2015)
- Public Workshop I (October 27, 2015) ~ well attended
- Staff Workshop I (November 4, 2015)
- Online Public Survey I (November - December, 2015) ~ nearly 60 hits with good responses

Ms. Puranik explained the same process was followed for Public Workshop II:

- Core Group (November 25, 2015)
- Public Workshop II (December 9, 2015) ~ again, well attended
- Staff Workshop II (January 15, 2015)
- Online Public Survey II (December- January, 2015) ~ approximately 27 responses

Ms. Puranik said this is an on-going process and Staff is still receiving comments from the public. She said these comments will continue to be posted. She introduced Justin Goodwin, from MKSK, who are the consultants for this project.

Justin Goodwin, MKSK, presented a map of the Bright Road Area that is largely undeveloped land with some single-family and office development as well as condominium development along Sawmill Road, generally south of Bright Road to I-270. He said through analysis, staff has expanded the boundary slightly to include all the land along Sawmill Road and up to Hard Road, incorporating the Lifetime Fitness site. He said the existing character in this area ranges from single-family residential adjacent to Grandee Cliff Estates to the east (on Dublin City Schools property), the rural character of Bright Road, and the more suburban auto-oriented character of Sawmill Road. He said focus is on what the future development character might become once development progresses on Emerald Parkway. He said the Bright Road Area Plan as presented in the Community Plan that was updated in 2013 just reflected the final design of the roundabout at Bright Road and Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Goodwin presented a map of the area from the Community Plan including Neighborhood Office, Mixed Residential, Single-Family, and Holder-Wright Park. He said one design note that was added to the plan in 2013 suggested a potential for a future overpass crossing between Emerald Parkway and the Bridge Street District (BSD). He indicated it was not drawn and it was simply an idea for future investigation.

Mr. Goodwin reported at the initial public workshop, the goal was to listen to the community and understand the issues that are affecting the people that live in this area. He said everyone recognizes at some point, there is going to be a substantial amount of development. He said the expectation of the City had been that development would happen quickly with the completion of Emerald Parkway. He indicated one of the reasons that has not happened is because of very poor vehicular access on the Sawmill Road corridor. He said being near I-270, the feasibility is great for office development but access is poor right now. He reported the City of Columbus is exploring various scenarios for how Sawmill Road could be improved. He indicated there was a potential northbound lane expansion and southbound lane expansions being explored but final solutions are not determined at this time. He said the people that live in the area are very concerned about traffic congestion, even with the roundabout at Bright Road and Emerald Parkway. He added there are a number of residents that experience traffic backing up from Sawmill Road.

Mr. Goodwin indicated there is always a desire for more and improved pedestrian and bicycle connections in Dublin. He said there was a discussion at the first public meeting about the design notes in the Plan now about exploring an overpass connection to the BSD. He said with the second workshop it became clearer; the interest is primarily a pedestrian or bicycle connection. He said some are concerned with a vehicular connection but it might improve connectivity to the BSD and a relief to Sawmill Road. He reported a lot of comments have been heard about that particular item and more are interested in a pedestrian/bike connection over a vehicular one.

Mr. Goodwin said at the second public workshop, Staff had produced a few diagrammatic land use scenarios for consideration and they were deliberately generalized. He said at the first workshop, what could potentially happen adjacent to Grandee Cliffs was discussed since it is owned by the Dublin City School District. He reported the School District said there are no immediate plans but they recognize there is a need for schools in this general vicinity and are reserving the possibility that an elementary school could be built there. He indicated residents recognize single-family development might not be what the market will bear with frontage along Emerald Parkway; they were interested in residential use, considering senior housing options. He reported combining medical office with a senior housing component was considered. He went through various concepts discussed for the Bright Road area and emphasized institutional use (school facility) could be considered but not industrial use.

Mr. Goodwin summarized comments from Public Workshop II. He indicated they were most in favor of the first concept that involved residential along Bright Road, most similar to the existing area plan. He noted there were a number of concerns with orienting the school along Bright Road and that stemmed largely from bus traffic and vehicular access to the school. He stated they are most concerned about the vehicular connections and the future character of Bright Road between Emerald Parkway and Sawmill Road. He said the Thoroughfare Plan and current Area Plan call for Bright Road to be widened to a four-lane road divided with median turn lanes to accommodate the traffic anticipated and to help alleviate the congestion but there is not a lot of room between the Inverness Offices and condominiums to the south of Bright Road. He said road designs/configurations were considered and those with narrow medians were received favorably. He added a connection between Bright Road and Emerald Parkway was considered and noted that connection was shown in the current area plan but there are no immediate plans scheduled in the CIP. He said there was a lot of desire for a cul-de-sac of Bright Road to deal with cut-through traffic and speeding but there is also a desire for some sort of other solution. He reported bicycle connections within landscape buffers between different uses as a way to connect Bright Road out to Emerald Parkway. He said they would also like connectivity along Riverside Drive itself but topography

makes it difficult to run a path directly along the roadway. He reported they would like a naturalized landscape buffer along Bright Road, which could include a bike path as well and ensure existing tree rows and stands are preserved.

Mr. Goodwin concluded that MKSK will work with Staff and the Core Working Group to refine the concepts and develop them into recommendations for updates to the Bright Road Area Plan. He indicated a third public workshop is tentatively scheduled for the last week of February but an exact day is still to be determined. He said after that the recommendations will be brought back to PZC for review.

Mr. Miller said he attended both sessions and was extremely impressed with the amount of participation and strong leadership. He said there was a lot of discussion about the roundabout and the poor family that has the driveway right off of the roundabout. He asked if there was a consensus on what to do with the options that exist because of the land restriction with the condominiums going up and down from Sawmill Road to the roundabout because that is clearly problematic.

Mr. Goodwin responded a divided median is needed all along that stretch to provide access management and safety but it needs to be narrower than you might typically see and cited Eiterman Road as an example.

Mr. Miller asked if the owners of the condominiums at Inverness whose units back up to Bright Road were made aware of the possibility of that road being widened. Mr. Goodwin stated it has been in the Thoroughfare Plan for a number of years but it would depend on when those owners moved in.

Mr. Brown asked how the public felt about a cul-de-sac for Bright Road where it intersects with Riverside Drive. Mr. Goodwin stated that has also been in the Community Plan for a number of years. He indicated they have yet to quantify the information received but generally, most people are favorable to that concept and would like to see it happen as quickly as possible. He said some signalization there or a right in/right out or just a right out were all considered. He said Engineering said there are physical limitations to that section of Riverside Drive that would allow that to work safely and effectively. He added a median divider on Riverside Drive would be needed to make it function as intended.

Mr. Brown recognized that it is difficult for motorists to make a left off Bright Road to Riverside Drive. He said for the residents that live on the western most part of Bright Road it appears as a huge inconvenience to go all the way up to the roundabout to go anywhere. He said that should be considered a right in/right out only. He asked if the potential north/south connector from Bright Road to Emerald Parkway could be moved even further west of Grandee Cliffs near the park.

Mr. Goodwin said they are trying to balance providing access for as much of that land as possible but not dividing up that area where it would make it difficult for development to happen in a logical manner. He said there is also concern amongst Grandee Cliff residents of having a connection that would be more of a direct connection into Jenmar Court that might pull traffic into Grandee Cliffs Drive. He indicated he thought the concept in the Community Plan could be shifted but there are only a few places on Emerald Parkway where it would make sense to have that intersection.

Victoria Newell asked if any traffic studies were being conducted along with explorations of this area. Mr. Goodwin answered that is not part of this scope and there will need to be some level of additional traffic analysis.

Ms. Newell asked if they were going that far with what the discussions have taken into account for planning. She asked if Staff has done anything recently. Ms. Devayani replied with the section from the roundabout east to Sawmill Road depends on what happens on Sawmill Road. She said transportation staff is in communication with the City of Columbus.

Ms. Newell said so much of the traffic congestion is out of our control as it progresses into the City of Columbus.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about the discussions had with the City of Columbus about what could happen on Sawmill Road at the intersection with Bright Road. She asked if there were other possibilities for in/out before Hard Road. She indicated widening Bright Road to four lanes will just bottleneck at Sawmill Road.

Ms. Puranik said there has been conversations about whether or not to widen Sawmill Road (adding one lane coming south from Powell) to the I-270 intersection.

Ms. De Rosa again asked about ways in before Hard Road as there is an incredible bottleneck there. She said it has been her experience that once motorists get passed that hiccup, the traffic seems to improve. She asked if there is anything the City of Dublin can do or if that was solely a City of Columbus decision.

Mr. Goodwin said he would defer to Staff but his understanding is that planning from the City of Columbus has slowed from its original schedule.

Tina Wawzkiewicz said it is good news that Columbus at least has it on their radar and are talking to the City of Dublin. She said it would be difficult to get another access point because of the character of Sawmill Road. She said there are limited opportunities especially with that Lifetime development there taking a lot of that frontage.

Mr. Goodwin added that one of the conceptual diagrams showed a potential connection from Sawmill Road to the north of the Inverness Office condominiums that could connect down to Bright Road but it would function as a right in/right out from Sawmill Road so it would help pull southbound traffic but it is not a solution for northbound traffic, which is the real issue. He said more connectivity is always better but it is difficult to find additional access points on Sawmill Road that would really alleviate congestion.

Mr. Brown inquired about Holder-Wright Park. Mr. Goodwin indicated the City's Park and Recreation Department has a master plan for the park's preservation and targeted improvements including a pedestrian/bicycle connection over Bright's Run to the ground that the City owns along Emerald Parkway. He said one of the design points on the existing area plan is to limit vehicular access from Bright Road and minimize the impact on the parkland itself.

Mr. Brown suggested pedestrian access from the BSD up Riverside as it becomes more populated depending on what other connection we might have across I-270 in the future.

Mr. Miller asked if there were any cost estimates for a pedestrian bridge crossing.

Mr. Goodwin said that would be another level of detail and analysis that would need to be undertaken if that concept is something that the community wants to explore in the future. He indicated it is fair to assume that would be expensive.

Amy Salay asked what the impact would be for widening Bright Road between the roundabout and Sawmill Road. Ms. Wawzkiewicz said detail engineering has not been done on that. She said what MKSK has done for this exercise is actually looked at that interface from building face to building face and it is 120 feet, which is tight. She said the right-of-way for Emerald Parkway is typically 100 feet. She said a narrower lane width with a very narrow median could be explored.

Ms. Salay asked if there was impact information for a cul-de-sac for Bright Road in terms of the network.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said that information is in the travel demand model, which then relates to improving the east side of the roundabout to four lanes.

Ms. Salay asked if those two things should happen simultaneously. Ms. Wawzkiewicz replied not necessarily; Engineering has come further on the cul-de-sac than the widening aspect but neither projects have been funded.

Ms. Salay said she was hoping with this process that we could get more certainty with the road network and more connectivity of Dublin to Dublin. She suggested we get creative and confirmed the BSD would never go any further north than I-270.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment.

Stewart Maier, 4025 Bright Road, said he has resided there for 30 years and still enjoys living in Dublin. He said he works in construction including land surveying. He asked about the Notices that stated there was going to be rezoning in the area but was assured that was a mistake. He asked if the City can rezone an area if the residents do not find it favorable. He said he has no interest in rezoning his property. He said anything is for sale at the right price.

Phil Hartmann said generally the City will not change zoning without notification and receiving resident's input. He confirmed that when there is a change in zoning, it does not affect taxes and clarified the property owner only pays taxes on the current land use and not on anticipated use.

Don Spangler, 3614 Jenmar Court, said he has attended all the meetings in the Bright Road Area Plan that he is aware of. He said in the meetings, there was just one person that expressed an interest in a bridge across I-270. He said that resident was trying to get a better route to get from their home north of Hard Road to the Whole Foods Store. He said he does not understand the logic for a bridge unless it is to help the BSD project to get people into and out of their area. He said driving south on Riverside Drive trying to get into Bridge Street is always going to be a nightmare. He said the only alternative is off of SR 161 and he is not certain how well that is going to work.

Mr. Spangler said the City cannot do anything with that school property until the School Board makes a decision. He asked if a school was added, how school buses would get around the corner at Bright Road and Sawmill Road. He said a 40-foot bus in a turn lane will be unable to turn onto Sawmill Road that is already busy. He said the same argument was made during the COTA discussions.

Mr. Spangler said the residents in the condominiums cannot sell their units. He said it is very difficult coming out of those condominiums today. He said many of the residents are seniors, and he himself is 68 years old. He said for some of those residents that is overwhelming.

Mr. Spangler said for the suggested four lanes on Bright Road, there should be one lane going out to Sawmill Road as right turn only, the next lane over is straight-thru only, the third lane over is left turn only, and the fourth is a single-lane entry from Sawmill Road into Bright Road. He said he is not supportive of closing off Bright Road. He noted Martin Road was not closed off but instead, speed bumps were installed to control the speed. He said he is not disturbed by the number of cars that go through his neighborhood, it is the speed that is a concern. He said these drivers are trying to avoid that jam at Bright Road and Sawmill Road.

Mr. Spangler asked that the Commission think about the OSU campus area where there is a huge number of people and vehicles. He said they deal with it by using remote parking, parking garages, and a transit system. He said if the City of Dublin needs anything it is a way to move people. He said we cannot continue to build parking lots, everywhere. He asked the Commission to consider smaller parking lots and offer trolleys, or whatever it takes to get remote parking.

Randy Roth, 6987 Grandee Cliffs Drive, said he is president of the East Dublin Civic Association. He said we have been involved with this for many years and often know a lot more about these issues than the

new staff members. He said when the Wilco offices of the north were zoned in we said at PZC this will be widened to four lanes and to move Wilco back and the staff said they were going to keep to two lanes. He said as late as the COTA meeting this summer, Paul Hammersmith said the City had no plans to widen Bright Road. He indicated this is part of the frustration. He said a request was made to have a three-story office building right over the park at Riverside and Emerald and PZC said only two stories are permitted but the residents keep getting pressed by the staff to have a taller building. He indicated the residents are tired of getting the runaround. He emphasized it is important not to misunderstand our neighborhood. He asked how one green dot in favor of a bridge over I-270 got turned into "most of us" were supportive when 20 red dots said they were opposed. He asked what is going to happen at that cul-de-sac if half of the traffic from Sawmill Road suddenly goes through our neighborhood. He said when the City is trying to gain access from the interchange, to bring office people in there to get upscale office, the numbers do not work. He said he is frustrated because staff is not accurately representing the residents' views and comments. He said this makes it hard for trust. He said the notices for this meeting stated there was going to be rezoning in our development and he had to call staff and question this. He said this was supposed to be an informal so everyone did not have to show up. He said it turns out there was a mis-quote in the paper that was later cleared up but imagine what my neighbors thought when they heard this could be an industrial use when it was supposed to state institutional use.

Mr. Roth said a transportation task force studied this in the early 2000's and there is no solution to widening Sawmill Road. He said what the residents tried to emphasize to the staff, which did not appear in the report, was to fix the interchange, work with the City of Columbus, and get rid of the light at Billingsley and make it right in/right out, and build a road behind the car dealership.

Mr. Roth said he gave all four candidates a tour that included where you have to build that road to connect from Billingsley up to Sawbury Road so you can bring all the traffic to one intersection. With the light removed from Billingsley, he said there could be a long left-hand turn lane coming into Bright Road from Sawmill Road going north. He said it is in the Community Plan and something we need to do. He said the residents told staff that is the first priority and it needs to get done and then we can see what else has to be done over I-270. He concluded by saying he really wanted the Commission's support for being visionary on this traffic and do first things first. He said the problem is at Billingsley; it is the most important thing to the residents to make this all work and it did not appear in the document for tonight's review.

Mr. Roth said the Community Plan always stated before to first preserve the residential character and the quality of life of the resident and secondly, economic development. He asked the Commission to push staff to listen to the residents about traffic.

Jim Davis, 3832 Inverness Circle, said his condominium is right on the corner of Inverness and Bright Road. He said earlier in this meeting a gentleman asked if the residents were informed about the Bright Road Area Plan. He reported he purchased his condominium in September 2013 when it was nice and quiet and not a whole lot of traffic at Bright Road and he was not informed at all about this plan. He indicated the only thing they heard was after the construction started on the roundabout, at some point several years ago there was a plan to tear down the row of condominiums along Bright Road and expand the width but that had been dropped in favor of the roundabout. He said earlier a man said the condominiums cannot be sold. Mr. Davis said if the condominiums stay and the road is widened, he will be able to stand on his deck and hand a driver waiting at the light a cup of coffee. He said at that point it would be impossible for us to sell our condominiums. He does not know the solution but is very concerned about what is going to happen here. He said there is just a few of us but we are people too. He said at 63 years old, he did not want to have to deal with these sort of problems. He asked at the first meeting what the plan was for those condominiums and there was no answer. He said what the Commission decides directly impacts their properties.

The Chair said every one of the Commissioners are residents of the City and care about Dublin and it is our task to come up with good land planning. She said this is an introduction to the Area Plan Update and the Commission wants this to be in active communication with the community so she appreciates everyone's input. She invited further comment from the public. [Hearing none.] She closed off the public portion to take comments from staff and fellow Commissioners.

Ms. Puranik said draft concepts will be provided by the end of February to be shared with the residents to gain further input before moving on to the adoption process.

The Chair asked if Staff received enough feedback from the Commissioners. Ms. Puranik said Staff received good guidance from the Commissioners.

Victoria Newell said we really need to think about how to treat traffic on this side of the road. She said the rural character of the residential area needs to be preserved.

Ms. Salay said she agreed and wanted to ensure the residents are comfortable with the neighborhood. She said since the market has changed, this area does not need to be a revenue generator as much as we need it to be part of the community. She suggested proposing traffic studies and actual engineering modeling of different scenarios and road network possibilities. She said grafting land uses around the traffic aspect could be provided to the residents for their feedback.

Vince Papsidero said we could consult with Engineering to discuss options. He added in the latest staff workshop they wrestled with the amount of ground shown as office and the concepts of building on the previous plan. He said until the Sawmill Road issue is resolved with the City of Columbus; that ground is not marketable for office and the question is what it is marketable for. He said Staff could provide different options but even with traffic modeling, it is hard to say what the future will bring. He said it is a complicated puzzle to say the least.

Ms. Newell asked how close there could be a curb cut for the area designated commercial zoning. She asked if access had to come off Sawmill Road or Emerald Parkway. Ms. Puranik answered Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Papsidero said there is a concern from the Economic Development Staff. He restated that area is not marketable.

Mr. Roth asked to make another comment. He said they had a really exciting proposal from a firm in Houston, TX, a few years ago for luxury office that they were all excited about until the developers found out about the traffic problem. He indicated they went straight to ODOT and asked to bring in the road south of Perry Township Hall into there and the state said no as it was too close. He said we are not going to be allowed any access from ODOT.

Bob Miller said the objection for a vehicular bridge across I-270 was discussed earlier. He asked Mr. Roth if there was support for a pedestrian bridge. Mr. Roth indicated it was supported as the residents enjoy the bike paths but are concerned about safety for crossing a huge expansive bridge.

Ms. Salay said the challenge of the community is the desire for bikeable/walkable neighborhoods but we are so used to an auto-oriented community.

Mr. Brown said he lives up Dublin Road so it is one mile down to Starbucks but only 3% of people will use that tunnel under Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Brown said he understands a lot of residents in attendance are protecting their interests and the comfort of their homes. He said we are all residents here. He said he knows some residents' distrust Staff

but they are human and not all communication is perfect at all times. He said Staff is not trying to pull a fast one on the residents; they are trying to do a job, taking into account what is in the best interest of the City but also being mindful of the residents. He indicated it is a tough situation but that is why there is PZC and City Council.

Cathy De Rosa said one of the things that would be helpful from her perspective as being relatively new, is the context up front in the Community Plans about the nature and flavor of what the community is. She said trees and traffic are top issues in Dublin. She said it would be helpful to have some narrative about what we are trying to do to give us guidance. She said it is helpful for the Commission to have the context. She said presenting Community Plans adjacent to this would be helpful to achieve the right flavor and economic development. She indicated one of the great things about Dublin is they try to learn from others in the rest of the country and this is quite useful as we transition to walkable urbanism. She said when this comes back she would like to see some "best practices".

The Chair closed the discussion on this case and moved onto the presentation.

Staff Presentation – Geographic Information Systems for Public Use

Devayani Puranik introduced Rick Frantz from the City's GIS team.

Rick Frantz asked how many members on the Commission used the GIS and learned they all do. He clarified that GIS stands for Geographic Information Systems and for the most part, that means mapping. He said the team consists of: himself; Brandon Brown, GIS Administrator; and Damon Leonard. He said most people use this through Dubscovery, which is a one-stop shop for all of the data and information. He gave a brief demonstration. He said this technology has been around for a while and is dying so they are in the process of building a new version, which is still under development.

Mr. Frantz explained they place the maps on the webpage where someone from the public would most likely look for a map. He presented the map of Zoning Applications that the Planning Staff maintains, a map of Future Land Use, maps for the Thoroughfare Plan, and a SnowGo map. He said all of this data feeds the 911 system.

Chris Brown asked if traffic study information could be included to which Mr. Frantz answered affirmatively.

Mr. Frantz said the Community Plan website is being updated by Devayani Puranik.

Mr. Frantz said Google has much more information handled much easier than the City. He said an example is a bike path app such as Map My Run or Map My Ride because they are great. He said residents would go there before visiting the Dublin website for that information. He said when the City updates that information, it is captured by others. He said they keep in contact with Garmin and Tom Tom. Cathy De Rosa suggested adding information to the various paths that could include benches or vistas of interest.

Ms. De Rosa asked what other cities are doing. He said like Dublin, they are moving away from Flash and using Java Script. He said drones are a big topic of conversation. He indicated it is an interesting time in GIS because it is becoming easier and easier to use, requiring less training. He said Dublin is becoming a partner with Waze.

Planning Items

1. Vince Papsidero said the new and improved and final format of our monthly report has been distributed.

2. Claudia Husak reminded the Commission about APA - rooms and travel need to be booked soon.
3. Mr. Papsidero said updating the BSD Code is on the list but will probably be completed in phases and not to begin before mid-year.

Communications

Vince Papsidero said there were no communications to discuss.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:02 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on March 10, 2016.