

**COUNCIL WORK SESSION INFO ONLY ITEMS**  
**6-20-16**

**INFORMATIONAL REPORTS**

- May 16 Joint Work Session – Follow up and Next Steps
- February 29 Work Session – Follow up re. Legacy Office Competitiveness



**To:** Members of Dublin City Council  
Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission

**From:** Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager

**Date:** June 17, 2016

**Initiated By:** Donna Goss, Director of Development  
Vincent A. Papsidero, FAICP, Director of Planning

**Re:** May 16 Joint Work Session – Follow Up and Next Steps

## Summary

At the May 16, 2016, Joint Work Session of the Dublin City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission, consensus supported the following priorities for moving forward. Further discussion regarding each item can be found in the next section of this memo.

### Bridge Street District

- Begin the process of updating the Bridge Street Code (BSC).
- Prioritize the sign code within the BSC code update (please see note below regarding Historic Dublin).
- Separately, investigate options for creation of a sign/graphics commission.

### Administrative Review Team

- Formalize the ART process through adoption of Bylaws.
- Improve reporting of ART decisions.
- Consider the role of the ART as part of the BSC update and recommend code changes in response to specific issues upon which consensus is reached.

## Discussion

### Bridge Street District

Process Overview: Planning has under contract Clarion Associates, who led the team that developed the original Bridge Street Code with staff. Planning will utilize that contract to undertake the BSC update. Since the May 16<sup>th</sup> workshop, issues have been raised regarding Historic Dublin south of W. Bridge Street, and that has been added as a separate task under the contract with Clarion. It is expected the overall Code update process will take over 12 months and include the following major steps.

## **Signs – Priority 1**

### Background

- City Council has asked staff to investigate and propose a process whereby pre-existing auto-oriented retail/restaurants would be subject to the citywide sign standards and not the Bridge Street Code (BSC) sign provisions.

### Process

- A. Identify in a database and map the properties that could be subject to these provisions (group A).
- B. Identify in a database and map the signs approved since adoption of BSC that would become “non-conforming” because of adoption of these provisions (group B).
- C. Prepare the proposed language for review by staff and the Law Director.
- D. Create an illustrative document explaining the proposal in text and graphic terms. Notify the impacted property and business owners (groups A and B) of the proposed amendment. Schedule a public meeting(s) to present the proposal and gather feedback. Summarize in a report. Post report on the web, share with City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC).
- E. Initiate the formal code amendment through preparation of an application. Schedule review with the Administrative Review Team (ART). Schedule presentation with PZC (and ARB, if impacted). Schedule presentation and action with Council.
- F. Notify impacted property owners of the adopted code amendment. Establish a unique sign application for the affected properties (group A).

### Timeframe

- 60 to 90 days, pending public reaction.

## **Historic District – Priority 2** *(To occur concurrently with Priority 1)*

### Background

- Residents of Historic Dublin, south of W. Bridge Street, have raised concerns regarding the scale of redevelopment/infill and the “intrusion” of commercial uses. Council directed staff to undertake a code update in response to these concerns. The affected areas are located within the BSC – Historic Core and Historic Residential Districts.

### Process

- A visioning process is needed to engage stakeholders and reach consensus on development expectations for the study area. This must involve commercial property and business owners, as well as residential owners. This could be managed as a facilitated design charrette over two days. The outcome should be a report with recommendations for changes to use and development standards (height, massing, setback, etc.); this should include illustrations to depict the proposed changes. The report will be posted on the web and forwarded to ARB and Council; presentations may be necessary.
- Initiate the formal code amendment through preparation of an application. Schedule review with the Administrative Review Team (ART). Schedule presentation with ARB and PZC. Schedule presentation and action with Council.
- Notify impacted property owners of the adopted code amendment.

#### Timeframe

- 90 to 120 days, pending public reaction.

### **General – Priority 3** *(To be initiated following the conclusion of Priorities 1 and 2)*

#### Background

- The City has nearly three years of experience implementing the Bridge Street Code, which is its first, and only, form-based code adopted to date. At the same time, the approval process has evolved and become increasingly complicated. Staff has been tracking issues with the process and code requirements. At a joint workshop of the Council and PZC, staff was directed to begin the update process.

#### Process

- Staff consolidates its list of issues and prepares a memo.
- Undertake a comprehensive set of stakeholder and focus group interviews; consisting of Council, PZC and ARB members; applicants, developers and land use attorneys; architects, engineers and landscape architects; and HOAs and other neighborhood groups; separately, an online survey is posted on the web. The results and the top issues based on consensus are summarized in a memo.
- Conduct an independent review of the code and process. This analysis is summarized in a memo.
- Facilitates a one-day workshop with staff and interested members of Council, PZC and ARB to review the previous findings and the consultant's suggested approach to address the major issues, and to arrive at general consensus regarding the direction to take in drafting code amendments.
- Following the meeting, the consultant prepares the draft amendments. These are posted on the web and mailed/emailed to interested stakeholders. One to two public meetings are held to review the proposal and gather feedback, which is summarized in a memo and shared with Council, PZC, and ARB.
- Initiate the formal code amendment through preparation of an application. Schedule review with the Administrative Review Team (ART). Schedule presentation with PZC and ARB. Schedule presentation and action with Council.

#### Timeframe

- 6 to 9 months

### **Administrative Review Team**

ART Role within the BSC Process: As part of the BSC update, the role of ART will be evaluated along with the entire development review process. Consensus issues will be identified and code amendments recommended for adoption.

Bylaws: A set of operational bylaws for the ART will be developed by staff and submitted to City Council for adoption by resolution. This will occur within the next 60 days.

Reporting of ART Decisions: The Monthly Planning Report will be expanded to include all decisions by the ART and Planning Director (see below). A database will be maintained with the information (this will be addressed comprehensively in the future if the City moves forward with a new software for the development process).

ART Web Identification: It was noted that the ART is not a body comparable to the PZC or ARB, and therefore should be clearly defined as a non-resident body and placed in another location on the City web site. Staff will consider how best to define the ART and will consider placement of ART on the web that best meets the needs of the public, so that it is clear that while separate from other bodies, it is still part of the development review process with legal authority provided by code.

Administrative Departures vs. Waiver Review vs. Minor Modifications: Questions were asked at the Joint Work Session regarding the approvals of the ART, as provided under the BSD code. In addition, there are Minor Modifications permitted to be approved by the Planning Director under the code. Specifically, the BSC (153.066) provides for three means of varying the code as part of a plan submittal, as summarized below.

- Administrative Departures: The ART may approve minor deviations from the strict application of the code requirements caused by “unusual site or development conditions or conditions unique to a particular use or other similar conditions that require reasonable adjustments, but remain consistent with the intent of the Code.” Examples include minor adjustments to building setbacks, parking requirements, landscaping, building materials, or other similar features or elements. Decisions on administrative departures are to be reported to the reviewing body when approving a development plan, etc. There are four criteria that must be applied by the ART in rendering its decision, including to ensure that the development is of “equal or greater development quality”. If the ART denies an administrative departure, the applicant may request a waiver.
- Waiver Review: Waivers are deviations from code requirements that do not qualify for an administrative departure. The ART reviews waivers and provides a recommendation to the required reviewing body. Criteria for evaluating waivers is provided in the Code. Recent examples include the AC Dublin Hotel that required 34 waivers as part of the development plan review.
- Minor Modifications: These are approved by the Planning Director and apply to approved development plans, etc. to “correct any undetected errors or omissions, address conditions discovered during the permitting process or construction, or that are necessary to ensure orderly and efficient development.” Minor modifications to existing structures and site improvements may also be authorized to complete ordinary maintenance, refurbishment or code compliance. Ten categories of minor modifications are defined in the code.
- Minor Project Review: Separately, some questions were raised regarding Minor Project Review (MPR). The code provides a process for MPR by the ART [153.066(G)]. Questions were raised as to the decisions made by the ART and whether they were reversing decisions made by the required reviewing body. Several ART decisions were identified at the workshop, below are responses regarding those individual actions (It should be noted that Code allows the ART to “kick up” to PZC a Minor Project under certain circumstances; ART will liberally apply those circumstances and has to date suggested such an outcome to various applicants, who later chose not to pursue a MPR).
  - Tuller Flats Maintenance Building: The ART approved a maintenance building and

site improvements as an Accessory Structure, as provided under the code. ART ensured the proposed building was compatible with the project architecture and materials. All applicable code provisions were met.

- Bridge Park Block B, Building B4, Change of Use: Crawford-Hoying requested a change of use for 5,671 square feet along the ground floor, west elevation of Building B4, exchanging residential for retail uses. The ART approved this MPR because it will enhance the pedestrian experience along Longshore Street, it is consistent with the EDA, it provides for smaller tenant spaces that would support “mom and pop” businesses and “pop up” retailers, and it would not trigger additional parking. Approval of the façade changes are to be submitted at a later date and meet the Minor Project Review criteria in the Code.
- Bridge Park Blocks B and C, Changes to Open Space Materials: Crawford-Hoying has requested changes in the type, quantity and location of materials in the pocket plazas. ART has expressed willingness to modify certain materials in response to final details regarding storefront doors and sidewalk patios, but ART has not expressed support for changes in the quality and quantity of these materials. ART and staff have responded to the applicant that overall quality and quantity of the plaza areas need to be maintained with the proposed changes.

### **Miscellaneous Items**

Exterior Material Specifications: Staff was asked to look into specifications for exterior building materials (e.g. vinyl siding, windows, etc.). The Ohio School Facilities Commission was noted as an example of an agency that adopted such standards. Staff will conduct the necessary research and report back to the PZC and Council.

### **Recommendation**

For information only to capture the key discussion points and direction to staff.



**To:** Members of Dublin City Council  
**From:** Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager  
**Date:** June 17, 2016  
**Initiated By:** Vince Papsidero, FAICP, Planning Director  
Devayani Puranik, Planner II  
**Re:** Info only - Legacy Office Competitiveness Study (Metro Blazer Emerald Area Plan)

## Background

The summary of the Legacy Office Competitiveness Study was presented at the Council work session on February 29, 2016. The first phase of the study focused on the specific legacy office sites in the City to understand various aspects of office setting preferences by companies in the competitive market and short and long term solutions for the issues.

In order to dig deep and understand the existing conditions, market conditions, stakeholder requirements, and effects of the changing work spaces on older suburban office complexes, Economic Development and Planning have initiated an area planning process focusing on office developments. The consultant team for this project includes POD design, Sidestreet Planning, and DiSalvo Development Advisors.

The planning area is approximately 888 acres and includes all legacy office complexes within Metro, Blazer, and Emerald centers, and Frantz Road corridor. Frantz Road is an especially important north-south corridor with older offices along the west side including a diverse range of businesses and residential neighborhoods along the east side. The corridor currently lacks a number of amenities that would serve businesses and neighborhoods within a walkable distance. It is also a challenging corridor for pedestrian movement and the landscaping requires attention.

At the last Council work session, Council members expressed interest in discussing their individual vision for the area during the initial phase of the planning process. Staff can schedule one-on-one meetings with the consultants. Please contact Vince Papsidero at [vpapsidero@dublin.oh.us](mailto:vpapsidero@dublin.oh.us) or 614-410-4682 with potential dates and those will be shared with the consultants to coordinate calendars.

In addition to these meetings, a webpage will be created including comment boxes to gather public input. Staff is also exploring ideas to create an "app" for additional online engagement. Regular updates regarding the planning process, community engagement, and recommendations will be provided to Council and Planning and Zoning Commission and area stakeholders.

## Recommendation

Info only.