CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Peterson called the Tuesday, July 5, 2016 Regular Meeting of Dublin City Council to order at 6:15 p.m. in Council Chambers at Dublin City Hall.

ROLL CALL

Present were Mayor Peterson, Vice Mayor Reiner, Ms. Alutto, Ms. Amorose Groomes, Mr. Keenan, Mr. Lecklider and Ms. Salay.

Staff members present were Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Mumma, Ms. Crandall, Ms. Readler, Ms. Goss, Ms. O'Callaghan, Mr. Foegler, Chief von Eckartsberg, Mr. Earman, Mr. Papsidero, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Hammersmith, Mr. Tyler, Ms. Richison, Ms. Puskarcik, Ms. Kennedy, Mr. Shawn Smith, Ms. Husak, Ms. Martin, Mr. Poland, Mr. Plouch and Mr. Kangawa.

ADJOURNMENT TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mayor Peterson moved to adjourn to executive session for discussion of personnel matters related to the appointment of a public official and for conferences with an attorney for the public body concerning disputes involving the public body that are the subject of pending or imminent court action.
Vice Mayor Reiner seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

The meeting was reconvened at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Salay led the Pledge of Allegiance.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

- **Update from Dublin Convention & Visitors Bureau – Scott Dring, Exec. Director**
  - Visitor Perception Study

Mr. Dring provided results of their recent Visitor Perception Study, which is conducted every five years. This year, they added components to learn from where visitors were coming -- this information would enable them to use their regional marketing dollars more efficiently. First-time visitors were asked several questions following their visits. Survey results indicated that their perceptions of Dublin were very positive, many of which were attributed to safety, people and infrastructure. The survey, which was completed last winter and spring, did not receive any negative comments about the City infrastructure. In terms of where visitors were coming from, more visitor traffic came from Cleveland, Akron and Cincinnati. Survey results indicated key out-of-state markets of Pittsburgh, Detroit, Ft. Wayne, Indianapolis, Charleston and Huntington. Data from 2011 versus 2016 indicated an improved level of positive perceptions -- on a scale of 1-10; visitors indicated a 9.08 likelihood to recommend a visit to Dublin. Northstar Strategies of Nashville, the survey company, stated this is one of highest numbers they have seen -- well above the U.S. average of 7.615. In evaluating marketing effectiveness, 60% indicated that marketing had influenced them, compared to 45% in 2011. Overall positive visitor perceptions of a visit to Dublin was 96%.

  - Sales and marketing results

In March, DCVB presented to Council their strategic plan on use of the increased funding the City had allocated to DCVB last fall. DCVB is a sales and marketing organization. In response to three goals, the following advances were made:

1. Hired first national sales manager – Pat King, who has more than 40 years of experience, the last 19 at the Marriott NW in Dublin. In two months, she has already generated 21 qualified leads for new business.
2. New Business Shows – added several new shows targeting regional and national meeting planners.
3. First regional marketing campaign targeting, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Indianapolis, Charleston/Huntington and Fort Wayne. Efforts include interviews with travel writers, television segments, and a marketing collaboration with Columbus Zoo.
4. Historic Dublin/Bridge Park Marketing – aggressively marketing the Bridge Street District and continuing to market the Historic District.
5. Exploration of a need for an athletic complex in Dublin, leading the discussion with local organizations -- Dublin Schools, soccer leagues, football league, etc. Bureau has presented initial results to Dublin staff. A market analysis study may be next step.

Mr. Dring stated that these are the current results, but if there are other metrics Council would like to see in regard to how the additional funding is being used, they can provide that information in a future report.

- Big Business in Dublin within next week

1. National Archery Championship – August 26-28, 2016 at Darree Fields.
2. National Volleyball Tournament – July 12-16, 2016 at Flannagan's Dublin.
3. International JSU Softball Tournament – in 2017. Their last venues have been in Las Vegas, Chicago and Detroit.

[He showed the Bureau's marketing video.]

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Peterson inquired if any Council member requested removal of an item from the consent agenda.

Hearing none, Mayor Peterson moved approval of the action listed for the one item on the consent agenda.

Vice Mayor Reiner seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes.

- **Resolution 40-16 (Introduction/vote)**

Accepting the Lowest and Best Bid for Parking Lots/Shared Use Path Maintenance.

SECOND READING/PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCES

Ordinance 24-16 (Amended)

Amending the Annual Appropriations for Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2016.

Ms. Mumma stated that this ordinance has been revised since the first reading. The amount in Section 5 has been reduced from $4,863,000 for Bridge Street District improvements to $4,481,500 – a reduction of $381,500. That reduction is based on actual bid results received at the end of last week. A number of questions were asked at the first reading, and staff has provided a written response to those questions in this meeting packet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked staff for the detailed information, and noted her additional questions:

1. The $9.9 million amount in Section 5 is $2.1 million over budget for Blocks B and C roadway improvements. Staff's memo indicates that:

"Some of the escalation occurred because of increased material and construction costs that occurred since the preparation of the original estimates, some due to higher project coordination costs associated with building the roadways in the midst of an extraordinary volume of nearby, ongoing building construction activity (not typical in a suburban setting), and some due to the addition of underground facilities like Dublink."

For the balance of the projects occurring in Bridge Street, have adjustments been made to the budgeting process to reflect changes?

Ms. Mumma responded that with any City projects, whether within Bridge Street or throughout the entire City, when dollars are programmed in the CIP or any other budget, as time proceeds and the design progresses, more accurate costs are obtained. Whenever the CIP is updated or information is provided to Council, staff brings the most up-to-date information. When the Development Agreement with Crawford Hoying was approved and entered into last July/August, the design was at a much earlier phase. The design has developed over time, and the costs better reflect the cost of the actual roadway improvements.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the memo indicates that some of the additional costs were due to "*ongoing building construction activity (not typical in a suburban setting).*" The costs are already 21 percent over budget. She wants to ensure that in the future, as numbers are reviewed, particularly in the District, that is considered. A 10 percent increase factor is typical, not 21 percent.

Ms. Mumma stated that staff would make every effort to ensure that the estimates provided are the most accurate available at the time they are provided to Council.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that her understanding is that these appropriations are for money that has already been spent – and that this transfers money to cover the expenses incurred. It is not approval of the expenses.

Ms. Mumma responded that it is to cover expenses already paid or encumbered to pay out, per the Development Agreement.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Alutto, yes; Vice President Reiner, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

Ordinance 25-16
Adopting the Crossroads Area Plan.

Mayor Peterson stated that this ordinance is scheduled for public comment. [He invited public comment.]

There were no public comments.

Mayor Peterson moved to postpone consideration of Ordinance 25-16 indefinitely.

Mr. McDaniel stated that staff would keep residents apprised of the process going forward, and they will have future opportunity to comment.

Ms. Salay stated that she was out of town and not present at the previous Council meeting. What is the reason for the postponement?

Mayor Peterson responded that it is to allow opportunity to observe the progress and action of the other jurisdictions related to adoption of the Plan. The City of Dublin is the first entity to introduce legislation adopting the Plan.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the intent was to have the Plan before Council as an ordinance to permit Council opportunity to review what is nearly the final draft of the Plan. There are other jurisdictions that have not yet completed their review and comments. However, he wanted to make sure that Council and the public were familiar with the Plan, which was anticipated to be postponed.

Ms. Salay inquired if the City is aware of the timeframe for the other cities to consider the Plan.
Mr. McDaniel responded that he does not have that information, but will keep Council apprised during their July recess.

Mr. Lecklider seconded the motion to postpone consideration of Ordinance 25-16 indefinitely.
Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes.

INTRODUCTION/PUBLIC HEARING/VOTE – RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 41-16
Waiving Competitive Bidding Requirements, Pursuant to Section 8.04 ("Contracting Procedures"), Paragraph (C) ("Waiver of Competitive Bidding") for the Purchase of Replacement Firearms and Associated Equipment for the Police Division.
Mr. Peterson introduced the resolution.
Chief von Eckartsberg stated that this resolution will approve waiving of bidding requirements for the procurement of handguns and associated equipment. The manufacturer recommends replacement or refurbishment of the handguns every 10 years. They have determined that it is less expensive to trade in the old handguns than to refurbish them. Their request is to use Vance's Supplies, the preferred vendor with whom they have a longstanding relationship. They are the only distributor for Sig Sauer handguns within the area, which would eliminate shipping costs.

Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.

Resolution 42-16
Reaffirming Appointments of Various Current Members and Appointing New Members to the Community Services Advisory Commission of the City of Dublin.
Mr. Keenan introduced the resolution.
Per the recommendation of the Administrative Committee, he moved to reaffirm the following appointments:

- Current appointments of Marilyn Baker, Ann Bohman, Stephanie Hall and Kelli Lynn to terms that expire on March 31, 2017;
- Current appointment of Mindy Carr to a term that expires on March 31, 2018;

and make the following appointments:

- Vladimir Kapustin to a two-year term that begins immediately and expires on March 31, 2018;
- Christine Gawronski to a three-year term that begins immediately and expires on March 31, 2019;
- Thomas Strup to a three-year term that being immediately and expires on March 31, 2019.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes.

Resolution 43-16
Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Agreement with The Club at Corazon for Shared Recreation Services.
Mr. Earman stated that the Recreation Center will be entering a two-month shutdown period, during which the aquatic area lighting, decking and drainage systems will be

renovated. They are attempting to identify ways to accommodate the Rec Center patrons during that interruption of service. The City was recently contacted by a representative of The Club at Corazon who offered free access to their facilities during that two-month period. They are currently working on the terms of an agreement to address the financial component – reimbursement of the additional costs Corazon would incur due to the City's use of their facility and liability insurance. A draft agreement was included in the meeting materials; the final agreement will be substantially similar.

Ms. Alutto inquired if statistics would be available later regarding how many Rec Center members used the Corazon facility during the shutdown period as well as their feedback.
Vice Mayor Reiner inquired if the process would be that a DCRC member would show their DCRC ID at Corazon to be permitted to use their facilities.
Mr. Earman responded affirmatively.
Vice Mayor Reiner commended staff. He anticipated the DCRC two-month shutdown to be a significant issue for some DCRC members, particularly those who regularly swim. He was pleased to see this opportunity available for DCRC members during that interim period.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if staff would have the associated cost information prior to fully executing this agreement, or would reimbursement be determined after Corazon provides their additional cost information.
Mr. Earman stated that this has been discussed. Reimbursement can be based upon a "not to exceed" amount, or upon the actual costs.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if the agreement to be entered into would include a "not to exceed" number.
Mr. Earman responded that it would.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if the costs would cover the additional lifeguards and pool maintenance.
Mr. Earman responded affirmatively.
Mr. McDaniel stated that, typically, a final agreement is available at the time of passage. However, the Corazon offer was received a few days ago, and there was insufficient time to prepare a final draft.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if there is an estimate of what the "not to exceed" numbers might be.
Mr. Earman responded that he has shared current usage data with them. There is a difference in the types of uses they would be able to accommodate, which is essentially only lap swimming in the indoor facility. Corazon is offering both indoor and outdoor pool space and is prepared to accommodate the numbers of patrons that staff provided to them. During certain days, the outdoor pool usage can be much higher.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired when Corazon closes their outdoor pool.
Mr. Earman responded that Corazon's timeframe is more weather dependent than fixed on a specific date like the City pools.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired the DCRC shutdown period.
Mr. Earman responded that the indoor pools are closed until September 18. The outdoor pools close on Labor Day.

Mr. Keenan asked if increased demand for the City outdoor pools is anticipated during the indoor pool shutdown.
Mr. Earman responded that the current pool usage statistics are not near capacity levels, and he does not anticipate any increase to an uncomfortable level.

Mayor Peterson inquired if there would be some cost savings reflected by the lack of need to chlorinate the pools during that time.

Mr. Earman responded that there would be, as well as the costs of lifeguards.
Mayor Peterson noted those costs would essentially be re-routed to Corazon.
Mayor Peterson inquired if there would be signage or information posted directing members to Corazon.
Mr. Earman responded that as soon as the agreement is executed, that information would be disseminated.

Mr. McDaniel stated that this is a great partnership opportunity. Much can be learned, and staff will have discussion about future potential use opportunities.

Mr. Keenan stated that there are statewide standards for lifeguard credentialing, so he assumes Corazon's lifeguard provisions would be in compliance with Dublin's standards.
Mr. Earman responded that they are all regulated by the State Health Department.
Mr. Keenan stated that it is important to ensure that, because if a problem should arise – that will be the first focus.
Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes;.

OTHER

- **Fee Waiver Request – Dublin Community Church**

Ms. Crandall stated that the City has received a request from the Dublin Community Church for a waiver of the Building Permit fees related to installation of automatic doors. This project was reviewed and approved by the Architectural Review Board in April 2016. It has not typically been the City's practice to waive these types of fees. In reviewing this request, staff was able to identify only two other permit fee waivers granted in previous years. Both had specific circumstances, which were the basis for granting the waivers.

- The first was granted to the Dublin City Schools in 2001 to waive 50% of a rezoning fee for their property at 62 W. Bridge Street (Administration Building). This was approved due to the fact that the Schools had previously applied for a rezoning five years earlier, paid the associated fees and then withdrew the application.
- The second fee waiver was also granted in 2001 for a sign permit for Indian Run Methodist Church. This fee was waived due to the fact that the City had pursued road and bike path work adjacent to the property that impacted where the church sign was located, resulting in the need for the church to move their main sign.

The applicant, represented by Barb Anderson, is present to respond to Council's questions.

Barb Anderson, 8952 Tartan Fields Drive, stated that a letter requesting the fee waiver has been provided to Council. The church houses the Dublin Food Pantry. A long-time member of the church, she also serves on the Food Pantry Board and is a volunteer at the Pantry. This request is made on behalf of the church, not the Pantry. The church is located in Dublin's Historic District, and they are pleased to have received approval of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for automatic glass doors as a replacement for the wood doors at the main entrance on Franklin Street. The doors will be installed once the church has raised the funds for the installation. Once they received approval from ARB, they were advised that they needed to acquire a building permit from the City. When she requested a fee waiver for the building permit application ($618), she was advised of the process for seeking a fee waiver – and the reason she is before Council tonight. They are a very mission-oriented church, one of which is the Food Pantry. They have extensive community outreach in addition to the Food Pantry. They provide meeting space for various groups, some at no charge. They are very judicious with Church funds for the purpose of outreach

into the community, so $618 is not in the current Church budget and would need to be found elsewhere. Dublin Community Church is the only church in the Historic District. Because they are in the Historic District, they have to pay fees for processing applications such as for ARB.

Ms. Salay stated that she is aware of the Red Cross Blood Drive held at the church, and it appears there are other groups meeting there, as well. The church has a large amount of visitors who come to the Historic District and to the church's activities. Approximately how many people or meetings are hosted per week?
Ms. Anderson responded that the meetings held at the church include:

- Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) - nearly daily meetings; they pay a small monthly amount;
- Food Pantry – involves many deliveries (stores, Mid-Ohio Food Bank, food drives, volunteers, clients (three client choice days per week);
- American Red Cross – once/month;
- Embroiderers Guild - once/month; pay nominal fee;
- Summer camps – some are charged;
- Indian dancers – meet several times/week; pay a monthly fee, which is forwarded to an orphanage in India.

Mayor Keenan inquired if Meals on Wheels uses the church, as well.
Ms. Anderson responded that Meals on Wheels uses the church daily as a drop-off and pick-up location.

Ms. Salay stated that Council does not typically waive fees such as this. However, the City has a grant program for activities in the Historic District, and businesses, institutions and groups, which bring visitors to the Historic District. This is a church, but it is also a significant generator of visitors to the Historic District. Could this request be addressed through a grant? There are grant funds available for the purpose of encouraging visitation to the District. This church does so much more than hold Sunday services. Although the amount is small for the City's budget, for the church it is substantial.

Mr. Keenan stated that it may not meet the criteria for the Hotel-Motel Tax Grant program. Setting a precedent with a church is also an issue. However, one important consideration is the Food Pantry. It is an important function within the City and, to him, a basis for approval of this request, if no other. It also avoids the appearance of a precedent being set. He has been present during times of delivery and has observed a significant amount of items coming in and going out. It has been difficult to operate with the current entrance. Dublin may be an affluent community, but there are many people in great need. The Food Pantry is utilized constantly.
Mr. Keenan moved to approve the Dublin Community Church request for a waiver of the building permit fee.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if there are any other grant funds available, other than the hotel-motel tax fund.
Mr. Keenan responded that he knows of no other grant funds.
Mr. McDaniel concurred.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if the building permit fee would be required if the Church were not located within the Historic District.
Ms. Crandall responded that it would be charged, regardless.
Mr. Lecklider stated that the information was somewhat confusing.
Mr. Crandall stated that due to its location, this is the only church that would need to seek approval from ARB for the door replacement. However, a building permit, including fee, would be required of any church within the City.

Mr. Lecklider stated that the permit is not unique to the fact that the church is in the Historic District.

Ms. Anderson stated that as she understands it, the ARB review fee was waived because the Church is within the Historic District. That is what she understood. Mr. Keenan stated that the information is slightly confusing.

Mayor Peterson seconded the motion to approve the waiver request.

Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes.

Mr. Keenan requested that the record reflect that the Food Pantry is a 501(C)(3), the primary basis for his comments.

- **Alcohol Waiver - Dublin Historical Society – Business After Hours to be held at The Coffman Homestead**

Ms. Crandall stated that the Dublin Historical Society DHS) has the opportunity to hold one of the Chamber Business After Hours programs at the Coffman Homestead. Tom Holton, the DHS Board president is present to respond to questions. This event would occur on Tuesday, August 16 from 5:30-7 p.m. Staff is working with the DHS on an event permit, and will be assisting with placement of the event fencing and some other DHS needs associated with this event.

Tom Holton, DHS President, 5957 Roundstone Place, Dublin, stated that DHS is hosting the Business After Hours event. It is held on the third Tuesday of the month and its location rotates. They have submitted an Event application, and will be working with the City to make sure the grounds are in good shape following their event.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that the event is a good way in which to create interest and broaden their base of support.

Vice Mayor Reiner moved to approve the DHS request for an alcohol waiver.
Mayor Peterson seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

- **Bridge Park G Block Basic Plan Review**

Ms. Husak stated that G Block consists of 2.29 acres of proposed development.

Background

- In 2014, Council made changes to the Bridge Street Code to require Basic Plan Review by Council, in cases where there is a development agreement in place. There is a development agreement with Crawford Hoying in place for the Bridge Park development.
- The Basic Plan review is the first formal step in the process. At the suggestion of staff, the applicant requested and received an informal review of the proposed Bridge Park, G Block development by the Planning and Zoning Commission on June 9, 2016. This was not a required, but rather a voluntary review. The minutes from that meeting were included in this packet.
- At the formal Basic Plan review, Council reviews the concept of the scope and character of the proposed development. Approval by Council of the Basic Plan is required before the plan can move forward.

- Tonight, staff is requesting three motions from Council: one on the waivers for the Basic Plan; one on the Basic Plan itself; and one to determine the required reviewing body for future applications related to this block.
- Council reviewed Block C, just to the west of Block G, in January 2015, and determined that the Planning & Zoning Commission (PZC) would be the required reviewing body for future applications. PZC approved the final proposed plan in June.
- Council reviewed Block B in January 2016, also designating PZC as the required final reviewing body. PZC reviewed the Plan and made their final determinations in August.
- The most recent Block approved was Block A, which is located at the roundabout and includes a hotel, parking structure and event center. That Basic Plan was approved by Council in December 2015. PZC conducted their review in February of that same year.
- In the meantime, Council and PZC have also approved preliminary and final plats for development, public street dedication, and the master sign plan, which currently includes G and C Blocks only.

Block G Basic Site Plan

- The application for Block G of the Bridge Park Development is a proposed development for 2.9 acres located north of Bridge Park Avenue and south of Tuller Ridge Drive between Mooney Street and Dale Drive.
- This is a request for two buildings: (1) G-1 is a new six-story, 75,562-square-foot mixed use (retail, office, residential) building, and (2) G2 - G3 is a five-story, 286,258-square-foot parking structure that is completed wrapped on all sides with commercial, office and residential uses.
- In total, the project proposes 11,428 square feet of retail, 10,769 square feet of office, 180 residential units ranging from micro units to three-bedroom units, 396 structured parking spaces, 0.33-acre of open space, and associated site improvements on the ±2.29 acre site.
- At mid-block, a plaza is proposed, which aligns with the plaza of C Block. One of the waivers requested relates to the provision of additional open space as part of the Scioto Riverside Park.
- G-1 Building is the smaller building – 75,000 square feet, six stories, and includes commercial and office on the first and second floors and 48 residential units on the remaining floors. There is also an elevated walkway to connect to the G-2 building.
- G-2 Building is the larger building – a parking structure comprises the interior of the building; 286,000 square feet; four or five stories, depending on which street it fronts; commercial and office on the first and second floors; 132 residential units of different sizes on the remaining floors.

The Administrative Review Team (ART) has reviewed the Basic Site Plan and recommends City Council take the following actions:

- Approval of Basic Site Plan Waivers for Block G:
  1. Open Space Maximum Distance
     This is the maximum distance an existing open space could be located from the main entrance of a building. In this Block, it exceeds the 660 feet that Code would permit.
  2. Parking Garage Entrance Location for Building G-2/G-3
     The Code does not permit parking garages to have entries on principal frontage streets, and Dale Drive is considered such a street. Due to the grading and street locations, as approved thus far, the applicant was not

able to provide an entrance on any of the other sides, other than Mooney. The waiver would permit a garage entry to be located on a principal frontage street.

3. Ground Story Height for Building G-1
   This waiver request is also due to site constraints associated with the grading. The request is to allow a ground story to be taller that the Code requirement of 12 to 16 feet. The proposed height is 20 feet.

- Approval of Basic Plan for Block G with two conditions:
  1. That the applicant continue to work with staff to detail construction of portions of Dale Drive to a public street standard appropriate for occupancy of the residential units, including construction design and cost sharing; and,
  2. That the applicant work with staff to determine appropriate locations for bicycle parking outside the parking structure.
- Determine the required reviewing body determination for future Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review applications (Council, PZC, or ART).

Council Discussion:

Ms. Amorose Groomes:

- Requested clarification of the location of the proposed greenspace that is located 715 feet rather than 600 feet from the main entrance.

Ms. Husak responded that the space is essentially the distance from the corner of the G2-G3 building to the Riverside Park.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if the greenspace they are providing is an existing public park.

Ms. Husak responded that is correct – it is an existing greenspace.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the Code states that each development is responsible for actually providing the open space, not that they can claim somebody else's open space as their provision of that requirement. It does suggest fee in lieu of, if that open space will not be provided. Code Section 153.064 states that:

> "There shall be a minimum of 200 square feet of publicly accessible open space for each residential dwelling unit. Required open space shall be located within 660 feet of the main entrances of the residential units or the main entrance of a multi-family building..."

It also refers to existing open spaces that can only qualify if approved by the required reviewing body. Has the City already approved designation of a City park as meeting the open space requirements for this developer?

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. This question came up when Council reviewed the Basic Plan for the entire Bridge Park development. That was one of the considerations --- that the park would be able to be used as open space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she did not see any notes on that determination in the materials.

Ms. Husak responded that if those minutes were not included, they can be provided. Beginning in paragraph 5, there is the verbiage that "the applicant shall either add to the existing open spaces, create new open space, or pay a fee..." It has been determined that they are providing additional open space as part of this Block.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if that is by providing the public park.

Ms. Husak responded that it is by providing additional open space also on site.

Ms. Salay stated that the greenspace depicted on the slide is open space that the applicant is providing.

Ms. Husak noted that there are three open space sections.

Ms. Salay stated that the applicant is providing those, and, in addition, they are in proximity to the City park.

Mr. Keenan inquired if provisions were made at the time Ballantrae was developed with respect to the golf course being considered as part of their open space area.
Ms. Salay responded that she believes it was. There are pocket parks throughout Ballantrae, but she believes the golf course was considered, as well.
Mr. Keenan stated that his point is that this case is not setting a precedent. Bridge Park is a dense project that the City is trying to accomplish with respect to Bridge Street in general.

Ms. Salay stated that there really is no other option. The City Park is located here, and she does not have a problem with considering it as part of the open space.
Mr. Keenan stated that it can also be argued that the park would not be here, if not for the development occurring.
Ms. Salay asked for clarification of the additional distance away.
Ms. Husak responded that ART's approval was for 715 feet.
Ms. Salay stated that it would need to be 660 feet to meet Code.
Ms. Husak noted that the site meets the 660 feet requirement, but it needs to be the maximum distance from the nearest entrance to the G2-G3 building.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired how many residential units are in that building.
Ms. Husak responded that the total of both buildings is 180 units.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if the City park is eliminated from the equation, how many square feet of greenspace is being provided for that number of dwelling units.
Ms. Husak responded that .333 acre is being provided of the required .8 acre.
Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that nearly a third of these units are two to three bedroom units. There may be pets associated with those units. That is a minimal amount of space for pets. She believes the City needs to require that there is sufficient space and in proximity. Those amenities need to be nearby for any good urban residential setting; it is a quality of life issue. She is skeptical about the number of residents who will cross Riverside Drive in the winter to take their dogs outside.

Mayor Peterson inquired if Council has any questions about the other two waiver requests.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if the applicant is precluded from having two entrances/exits on Mooney Street - one to the north and one to the south.
Ms. Husak responded that there is a distance apart requirement, which could potentially result in another waiver request.
Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she would be interested in seeing if both entrances/exits could be on one street, rather than have the disruption on a principal frontage street, as well as the side street on Mooney.
Mr. Keenan stated that he would like to see how the parking would work with that layout – it could change it.
Vice Mayor Reiner stated that he believes that if the vehicles are backing up, it is probably preferable to have them exit on a principal street and clear the space. He complimented the developer. Council asked them to wrap the parking garages. There were many inexpensive ways and materials to use, but this is a very comprehensive way in which to do that. The parking garages will not be viewable at all. It is nice, well-executed architecture. He asked if all the residential units would be rentals.

Mayor Peterson invited the applicant to speak.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, Ltd., 555 Metro Place, Dublin, responded that the block under discussion will contain all rental units. H Block, which will be discussed next, will contain for-sale condominium units. His response to the previous points made:

- Open space. The question of open space has been under discussion since the beginning of the project. It was recognized early on that the requirement of 250 feet square feet per unit would need to be adjusted, and that was determined before these projects began to roll out. Crawford Hoying has determined at this point that Bridge Park C Block would become one gigantic park under the current formula. With a 12-acre park right across the street, it is preferable to have that park activated with people, not lie empty. It is their opinion that -- by not ignoring it and embracing the fact that the park is there and counting it towards the open space -- it better facilitates people using it and activating that space. That will enable it to look activated 24 hours/day, 365 days/year. The open space that they are providing for these units was included in the comprehensive Master Plan for Bridge Park presented two years ago. Pocket parks were strategically located throughout the project and were interconnected. They were all thoughtfully laid out. They do understand that means a slight extension of the distance to the greenspace. The project engineer has clarified that the distance from the G-2 entrance is actually 770 feet – and that is the amount requested for the waiver tonight, not 715 feet.
- Quality of the open spaces provided. They are spending millions of dollars on the open spaces they are delivering. Concerning a fee in lieu of land dedication, they are investing significantly in these individual pocket parks and open spaces. A fee on top of that would make it necessary to remove a level of finish in a commensurate amount in order to maintain the budget for the project. It is preferable to deliver less at a higher quality that is thoughtfully planned and executed.
- Parking garage entrance off Dale Drive. That section of Tuller Ridge that would be entered is on a very steep slope, because there are two points to connect. Tuller Ridge and Dale Drive are already in place, and they would be connecting Points A and B, which has a significant slope. Introducing a curb cut on Tuller Ridge would require a flat area, so the remaining segments of street would become even steeper and less safe than they are currently. By having the entry location points on Dale Drive and Mooney Street, they can maintain a consistent grade between Dale and Mooney Street, east to west. That is steep, but those two points need to be connected. This also allows a Level 2 entry off Dale Drive and a Level 1 entry off Mooney Street. That works well for circulation and practicality.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if there would be internal circulation.
Mr. Yoder responded that there is interior circulation. From an entry at Mooney Street on the lower, southern end, the movement would be north and up an entire level before making the first turn – parallel with Mooney Street. That would be 9-10 feet on one continuous ramp. Then, the driver would head up the remaining 9-10 feet and heading south. It loops – everything interconnects.
Ms. Amorose Groomes clarified that she never suggested an entry on Tuller Ridge. The suggestion was perhaps two entry/exit points on Mooney, so that the exits would not be on a principal frontage street.

Vice Mayor Reiner inquired if renters would be permitted to have pets.
Mr. Yoder responded that, at this point, a limited number might be permitted -- ground floor units only in certain buildings. The goal is to maintain quality of living for everyone in the units above, and ground floor units tend to lend

themselves to that in terms of durability, finishes and elimination of sound transfer between the units. At this point, however, that is only a possible consideration. Per their current policy, their units are not yet pet-friendly. Some of the older residents have been requesting it, so they are looking for ways to include it in certain areas that will not affect the quality of life for people without pets. In the communities in which they do allow pets, there are also weight and size limitations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if those provisions are codified or general practice.
Mr. Yoder responded that the animal weight limits are codified and written into the lease agreements.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if they could change the terms of the lease agreements.
Mr. Yoder responded that they could do so. The leases are annual. If a policy change were made to which a current renter objected, they could accommodate them by moving them to another location or allowing them to terminate their lease.

Mr. Keenan inquired if the policy is the same, more, or less restrictive for the condominium units.
Mr. Yoder responded that at this point, there are no pet limitations for condominium units. The condominium units in Block H are individual townhomes separated by party walls on both sides, three to four stories in height. There is no risk of sound transfer between the walls. They are owner-occupied, and owners have fewer restrictions than renters.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if the construction is slab on deck or slab on grade.
Mr. Yoder responded that it is a combination of slab and stick. Some cast-in-place podiums are being poured as part of the project. The area on Mooney Street is slab, as well as the area above it. Then the construction converts to stick and wraps around the remainder of the project. Typically, the lower, more commercial floors – the first story on Mooney and wrapping around the open space, is concrete. In the purely residential units, it is stick construction.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if the stick construction is load-bearing or just interior finish.
Mr. Yoder responded that there are some load-bearing walls. The party walls would be load-bearing, as well as ¼ walls or exterior walls. Many interior walls would not be load bearing, simply partitions.

Mr. Lecklider stated that with respect to the comments that the Planning and Zoning Commission made -- he thought they were insightful, and, in general, he agreed with them. He has a skeptical view of the use of the cement fiber panels and metal. He assumes that the percentage will be minimal. He could be persuaded, but presently, these are of concern.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she concurs and would also include aluminum windows in that list of concerns.

Mr. Yoder stated that Mr. Hunter will give his presentation and address the architecture and materials, as well.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, Ltd., 555 Metro Place – Suite 600, stated that staff's presentation covered the details of the project well, so he will address how some of PZC's comments have been addressed.

- G-1 Building – Goal is for a unique building with a character of its own. It should not look like the building next to it. With the original design presented to PZC, the massing felt similar to the other buildings. There was much discussion about the volume in the middle. The buildings tend to get busy and ins/outs with balconies. The thought was that some relief was needed. Juliette balconies have been utilized to add that. Moody Nolan has done a nice job of articulating them in a unique way on both corners, which will be highly visible from Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive – the gateway into this project. There is a weaving of the materials, vertically and horizontally, that does occur on other projects. There may be different reactions to some of colors, and he believes that the use of colors needs to be further studied. Perhaps a bright yellow should not be used, but another contrasting color. However, the message they received was to develop the design further, and make sure it is unique. They architect has done a nice job differentiating the G-1 Building from the other buildings.
- G-2 Building - Discussion focused on the issue raised that "there was too much going on." There were double the amount of vertical balcony penetrations through the building, so that was revised. In place is a much more successful version of that design. This will be a transitional building, less contemporary than some of the other buildings on Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive. That is intentional, because there is legacy property to the east that does not match everything else that is occurring along Bridge Park Avenue. The building is wrapped around all four sides. That is intentional, because there will be residential units on adjacent blocks to the east and the west. The red color was discussed, which some PZC members liked; others did not. The color needs to continue to be studied – perhaps it should not be red, or if it is, it needs to be a different texture – perhaps a woodgrain, cementitious panel. The goal is that it be a relief that is woven through the building. In working with the three approved primary materials of brick, stone and glass, it is difficult to come up architectural variety – which is the goal. Cementitious siding and metal panel, to a lesser degree, provide flexibility in the texture of the building. A brick is 8" x 2" -- a hardi panel could be 12' by 4'. It is not recommended for an entire building, or even an entire façade, but it does allow some design flexibility. As long as it is installed properly, it can be effective. Metal panels offer something that hardi panel doesn't – sheen. As the designers look at all the elevations, they take all of that into consideration to create the best composition.

Mayor Peterson asked staff to explain the two conditions associated with the Block G Basic Plan approval.

Ms. Husak stated that the two conditions ART has recommended are:

1. That the applicant continue to work with staff to detail construction of portions of Dale Drive to a public street standard appropriate for occupancy of the residential units, including construction design and cost sharing. There is currently a ditch there that needs to be addressed in some manner; and
2. That the applicant work with staff to determine appropriate locations for bicycle parking outside the parking structure.

Both conditions can be resolved prior to the final site plan/development plan application.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that the younger professionals who will reside in these units tend to be very bicycle-friendly. Often, they carry their bicycle up the stairs and keep

them in their residences, so that they are not stolen. What bicycle accommodations will be made? Will there be an area inside the parking garages to secure their bicycles?
Mr. Hunter responded that there is a secured bicycle parking area inside the garages for the tenants, underneath the concrete podium. Additional bicycle racks are provided throughout the public spaces. Tenants do not necessarily want to provide their guests keys to the garage, but guests need to be able to secure their bikes to visit a tenant or a restaurant.

Ms. Alutto inquired why both the entrance and exit from the parking garage could not be located on Mooney Street. Is there a required distance issue or a design issue?
Mr. Hunter responded that the difference in grade from Mooney Street to Dale Drive is such that ramps are needed for both sides of those. In order for the parking structure to function, the ramping must begin immediately. The result is that the ramp is several feet above the level of Mooney at the other end – approximately 18 feet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that many of the balconies are Juliette balconies. How many of the units will have outdoor space versus a Juliette balcony?
Mr. Hunter stated that, typically, most of the units have balconies. It is just the ones along Bridge Park Avenue that are used to create architectural variety on the front.

Ms. Salay inquired if all the ground floor units have outdoor space.
Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively. G-2 has the typical balconies. However, on G-1, there are Juliette balconies on Bridge Park Avenue.

Mr. Lecklider inquired the reason for not having functional balconies on Bridge Street, but just a visual architectural element.
Mr. Hunter responded that balconies are inset six feet, taking a large portion of the building. Some visual relief was needed. In order to bring the elevation together, it was necessary to treat those balconies differently.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it was an important element in activating Bridge Street – having activity on the building, not a flat face.

Mr. Keenan said that it appears to be possible to have only one or the other, not both. It seems that putting those in changes the mass, and it was necessary to make that mass look different.
Ms. Salay stated that there are many units with balconies and outdoor space in all of Bridge Park. The Planning Commission and architects talked about the massing and the face of the building. Juliette balconies are one-plane buildings. Although, there is not the typical balcony, the space has a French door that opens inward. Although some people may prefer an outdoor space, others do not.
Mr. Hunter stated that, effectively, this increases the amount of covered living space. However, in every building, there will be amenity spaces, and renters at Bridge Park have access to all of them. For example, in Building C-1 -- which is just to the north of the office building – there is "cut out" in the middle and a terrace. That is an outdoor open space that is accessible to any resident of Bridge Park at any time. Therefore, for even those who would choose a larger living room and the Juliette balcony, they would be able to walk down the street, or upstairs in their building, to access an outdoor space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired how those spaces would be tied together if ownership of those buildings should change. Is it a binding legal arrangement that would transfer with the sale of the building to ensure that continued access?

Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively.
Mr. Yoder stated that Crawford Hoying is not contemplating selling these buildings. Their intent is to keep them indefinitely, because they are making a significant investment in Dublin. They are over-amenitizing the project. For the total number of units – 800, it has significantly more amenities than any other community in the area. They have the ability of leveraging everything that the City of Dublin is doing around the project, and, in addition, have added all these other amenities. If any one of the pieces was eliminated, as a stand-alone building – with the amenities that are in it and the surrounding mixed use, including restaurants and spas, it far exceeds any such building within the area.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if surrounding retail is considered an amenity.
Mr. Yoder responded that potential renters look at the "walk score," as well. What is around it is often one of the most important things that people look for when making a purchase. He noted that by introducing Juliette balconies, they are satisfying two needs: (1) PZC's request to make the massing look different; and (2) the market demand to provide something different. There will be a larger living space within and a Juliette balcony, which some people prefer. This will be beneficial when attempting to draw more renters to choose this environment over Grandview or the downtown area.

Ms. Salay inquired if Juliette balconies are permitted in the Bridge Street Code.
Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. There is a size requirement of six or eight feet width.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that he assumes that the deed or lease restrictions address what is restricted on outdoor balconies.
Mr. Hunter responded that restrictions are included in the lease agreements, and that is policed closely.

Ms. Amorose Groomes continued:
(1) The Bridge Street Code requires that all of the buildings are convertible, meaning that they can serve different uses over the course of time. Can these dwelling units be repurposed, such as office? Does their construction permit that level of flexibility?
Mr. Hunter responded that they do not. Stick built construction does not have that level of flexibility. There is a big difference between concrete or steel and stick built. That difference is not just flexibility, but also cost. Market-rate apartments in this region could not be built from a completely steel or concrete structure and be able to rent them for what people are willing to pay. The design team has come up with a way to create the best product possible out of that material.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that Council had asked previously about the possibility of converting rental units into condominiums. Does that remain a possibility?
Mr. Hunter responded that it is, as this would be essentially conversion of a residential use to a residential use. It is not possible with an office floorplate. On the G-2 building, there is concrete under the first slab. He noted that with the B-block garage on Longshore Street, there were originally residential units planned. Because the first floor was concrete slab, they were able to convert the first floor to retail.

Ms. Salay stated that the objective of Bridge Street was to have mixed uses throughout, including living, retail, restaurants, and entertainment.

In response to a question of whether millennium tile is being used on the top level of the G-1 building, Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if the reason the tiles are being used at the top of the building, instead of fiber cement board, is their lighter weight load.

Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively. There is a building code provision that the use of brick must end at a certain height.
Ms. Salay suggested that everyone Google search for examples of the application of millennium tile. It is a great-looking building material. It should make a difference in the appearance – a WOW factor – for this building.
Mr. Hunter noted that the Columbus Library is using it on some of their newest buildings, so there are examples of that application around the Columbus area.

Mr. Lecklider stated that his primary concern as expressed in his earlier comments regarding building materials is long-term sustainability. Although he does have a concern with the color choices, his primary concern is sustainability.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that he understands that they went to the extra length of changing the fasteners on the building, so there wouldn't be any corrosion. He believes some of the recently appointed PZC members caught that item, which is typically missed.

Block G Actions:
1. Open Space Maximum Distance – Site – Code Section 153.064(C)(1)-(2)
Mayor Peterson moved to approve the first Basic Site Plan Waiver.
Ms. Salay seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, no.

2. Parking Garage Entrance Location – G-2/G-3 – Code Section 153.065(B)(5)(a)(3)
Mayor Peterson moved to approve the second Basic Site Plan Waiver.
Mr. Keenan seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Ms. Salay, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, no; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes.

Ms. Amorose Groomes explained her votes, noting that this all began with a blank slate. We could have located it anywhere and not required waivers. Waivers are designed to meet a need that arises in a real pinch, such as is typical with the infill or the last pieces. With this, there was a lot of opportunity – it involved the whole site.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that there are elevation changes that are severe. They are simply asking for an adjustment related to those elevation changes.

Mr. Keenan stated that Council also knew that under Form Based Code, that there would be waivers requested.

Ms. Salay responded that is correct. It was expected and that is why a waiver provision was included in the Code.

3. Ground Story Height – G-1 – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b)
Mayor Peterson moved to approve the third Basic Site Plan Waiver.
Ms. Salay seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Ms. Salay, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes.

- Approve the Basic Site Plan with two (2) Conditions:
  1) That the applicant continue to work with staff to detail construction of portions of Dale Drive to a public street standard appropriate for occupancy of the residential units, including construction design and cost sharing; and,
  2) That the applicant work with staff to determine appropriate locations for bicycle parking outside parking structure.

Mayor Peterson moved to approve the Basic Site Plan with the above two conditions. Mr. Keenan seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes.

- Determine the required reviewing body determination for future Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review applications (CC, PZC, or ART).

Mayor Peterson moved to refer the review of the Development Plan and Site Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission.
Mr. Lecklider seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes.

- **Bridge Park H Block Basic Plan Review**

Ms. Husak stated that H Block is to the north of the G Block. It is adjacent to Sycamore Ridge Apartments and Vrable Health Care to the north. It has frontage on John Shields Parkway, which is to the north. South of the site is Tuller Ridge Drive.

Overview

- The proposal is for six buildings, totaling 73 for-sale condominium units. Each unit would have a private garage to the rear of the unit, which is accessed by an auto port.
- One new public street is proposed as part of this block – Larimer Street, which would provide access between Mooney Street and Dale Drive.
- The proposal also includes John Shields Parkway greenway at their northern property boundary. The Planning and Zoning Commission will be reviewing the proposed preliminary and final development plan for that lot on Thursday, which will not be for development, but for open space. There is a requirement of .34 acres open space. The provision is .45 acres – the John Shields Parkway greenway, which will be dedicated as a lot.
- There is also a mid-block crossing, as required by Code. It will be used as a more private open space. There is public access from Mooney Street to Dale Drive, but the intent is to have this open space be used by the residents of the condominium units.
- A swimming pool is proposed as a private amenity.
- At their June 6 meeting, the PZC expressed the need to ensure public access through this area.
- Given the height and the type of units proposed, the architecture is more contemporary than has been seen to date in the Bridge Park development. Towers are included, which will provide access to rooftop amenities, as well.
- There are one or two-car garages provided for each unit, which are accessed through interior courtyards. Each of those has an open space in the center, which will also provide stormwater management. There is bicycle parking within each of the private garages. In total, 153 parking spaces are proposed, which includes the garage spaces and on-street spaces surrounding the Block.

The Administrative Review Team has reviewed the Basic Site Plan and recommends City Council take the following actions:

- Approval of Basic Site Plan Waivers for Block H:
  1. Front Property Line Coverage – Building Type –Code Section 153.062(O)(4)
  2. Permitted Roof Types – Building Type – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)

- Approval of Basic Plan for Block H with four conditions:
  1. That the applicant submit a parking plan that includes location of all on street spaces that will count toward meeting the minimum parking requirement.
  2. That the applicant continue to work with staff to determine the width and location of the Greenway.
  3. That the applicant continue to work with staff to detail construction of portions of Dale Drive to a standard appropriate for occupancy of the residential units. This will include construction design and cost share.
  4. That the applicant work with staff to determine appropriate locations for bicycle parking outside of the individual units.
- Determine required reviewing body for future Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review applications (CC, PZC, or ART).

Waiver 1: Front Property Line Coverage.

There is a Code requirement for this particular building type to have 75 percent of the front property line covered with building. Given the Dale Drive frontage, the curvature in the road, and the fact that the buildings are stepped back and providing architectural relief and detailing, the 75 percent coverage requirement is not met.

Waiver 2: Permitted Roof Types.

Several towers are proposed as part of the buildings. The Code permits towers only at terminal vistas, at corners if there are two principal frontage streets intersecting, or adjacent to open spaces. These three conditions are not for each of the buildings. The towers provide the units access to rooftop amenities.

Basic Site Plan for Block H Conditions:

1. Request that the applicant work with staff and provide more detail on the parking that includes the location of all on street spaces to make sure that we have an inventory of which spaces are counting toward their requirement.
2. Request that the applicant continue working with staff to determine the location of the greenway and details. These will be known at platting or the Final Site Plan stage.
3. That the applicant continue to work with staff to detail construction of portions of Dale Drive to a standard appropriate for occupancy of the residential units. This will include construction design and cost share
4. That the applicant work with staff to determine appropriate locations for bicycle parking outside the individual units for residents and visitors.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, Ltd., 555 Metro Place, Dublin, presented a brief overview.

- The Block H discussion with PZC focused on the open space, where, originally, the pool was proposed. In that location, public access was an issue, so a couple of units were eliminated and the pool was moved. As a result, public access is available to all the units.
- Another issue was turning maneuverability. EMHT, civil engineers, have conducted studies and confirmed that ingress and egress of all the garages can be achieved with one move.
- Architecture. There are three basic plan types: small - two bedroom; mid-size -three bedroom; and large – three bedroom with a media room, or potential fourth bedroom. The large units are on the corners with patios; the mid-size units have the towers that provide rooftop deck access; the smaller units have outdoor space both on the ground floor and on the second floor. All owner-occupied units have outdoor space.

Council Discussion:
Vice Mayor Reiner inquired if the unit parking is one or two cars for all the units.
Mr. Hunter responded that the two larger units have two-car garages. The smallest units have one-car garages.
Vice Mayor Reiner inquired what is the square footage of the smaller units.
Mr. Hunter responded that they are approximately 1,440 square feet.
Vice Mayor Reiner inquired if having a one-car garage could be an issue for a couple. He recalls living in a 1,200 sq. ft. unit with a two-car garage.
Mr. Hunter responded that they do not anticipate a problem. They have provided more than two spaces per unit combining the garage and the on-street parking.

Mr. Keenan inquired if the on-street parking is all metered.
Mr. Hunter responded that he does not believe that the plan is for that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if the parking spaces are assigned.
Mr. Hunter responded that the on-street parking spaces are not assigned.

Mr. Lecklider requested clarification of the exterior materials.
Mr. Hunter responded that the materials will be a combination of two types of brick and metal panel accents. Sunshade devices will be used to create some architectural variety.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if trellising would be used on the roof to soften the appearance of the towers. They meet the definition of tower, but are not really functioning as towers. Their function is more for circulatory movement. Added trellising could soften their appearance and make them appear more integrated into the building.
Mr. Hunter responded that it could be studied. They want to be careful – if too much is added, it begins to look like a fourth story.
Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she likes the use of a rooftop garden as such, and she would like to see the appearance of the towers softened. Maybe it could be treating the wrap around the top of it differently, which could pull the eye downward rather than upward. She believes the towers are an appropriate use to provide access to the rooftop gardens; however, she is not satisfied with their finish, which draws attention to them, not away.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if the towers contain stairways in each case.
Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively. The tower is nothing more than a stairway to the rooftop, and it is inside an owner's unit.

Mr. Keenan inquired if there is also elevator access.
Mr. Hunter responded that there is not. It is not a public space, but confined to the townhome. There is a stairway for each unit, and it is completely compartmentalized.
Mr. Keenan inquired if the spaces are separated on the rooftop, as well.
Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively.
Mr. Keenan stated that the owner would therefore be able to put a garden or something of their choice in that location.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it would be a very unique space. Her concern is simply the visual – trying to draw the attention off it.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, Ltd., 555 Metro Place, Dublin, stated that when they did their parking calculations, they specifically did not include the Dale Drive parallel parking spaces. As they approached this project, the direction they received while drafting the Development Agreement was that Dale Drive would happen at the City's discretion. Their design approach with EMHT from the outset

was that because they were unsure when Dale Drive would occur, the project should be designed in such a way that it functions without Dale Drive being upgraded. Because it is a condition, he wants to state for the record that there have been no discussions to date in terms of cost sharing, although there has been close coordination with the City. They want to make sure that the location of the temporary sidewalk, location of the roadways and infrastructure they are installing now works in conjunction with the City's improvements on Dale Drive. They are working closely with City staff to that end. It would be a departure from the Development Agreement to have the developer and the development support any construction of Dale Drive. They are fine with the fact that could occur at a later date as that was anticipated from the outset.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she is sympathetic with the waiver request on this section of Dale Drive, because essentially the two points have to be connected – coming in on a curve and matching up on the other side. That is an existing condition. That roadway network was outside the developer's control.

Ms. Salay stated the color of the brick appears different than in a previous rendering. She asked for clarification.
Mr. Hunter responded that the bricks have not been selected. Renderings can appear different on different screens. The intent is for the brick to be in tones of black or gray.
Ms. Salay stated that it will be helpful when PZC reviews the building materials.

Basic Plan - Block H Actions:

1. Front Property Line Coverage – Building Type –Code Section 153.062(O)(4)

Mayor Peterson moved to approve the first Basic Site Plan Waiver.
Vice Mayor Reiner seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

2. Permitted Roof Types – Building Type – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)

Mayor Peterson moved to approve the second Basic Site Plan Waiver.
Mr. Lecklider seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Ms. Salay, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.

- Approve the Basic Site Plan for Block H with four (4) Conditions:
  1. That the applicant submit a parking plan that includes location of all on street spaces that will count toward meeting the minimum parking requirement.
  2. That the applicant continue to work with staff to determine the width and location of the Greenway.
  3. That the applicant continue to work with staff to detail construction of portions of Dale Drive to a standard appropriate for occupancy of the residential units. This will include construction design and cost share.
  4. That the applicant work with staff to determine appropriate locations for bicycle parking outside of the individual units.

Mayor Peterson moved to approve the Basic Site Plan for Block H with the four conditions as listed.
Ms. Salay seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.

- Determine the required reviewing body for future Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review applications for Block H (CC, PZC, or ART).

Mayor Peterson moved to refer the review of the Development Plan and Site Plan applications for Block H to the Planning and Zoning Commission.
Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that there was documentation in the packet about reviewing the Development Plan and the Site Plan simultaneously. Is Council approving that simultaneous action to occur for this case?
Ms. Husak responded that it is already a Code provision.
Mayor Peterson inquired if there are any issues related to that.
Ms. Husak responded that in terms of the details, it is typically expected that any applicant do those together.

Mr. Lecklider seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes;

- **Scioto River Pedestrian Bridge Follow-up**

Mr. McDaniel stated that the packet contains staff's follow-up memo to the June 20, 2016 Council workshop. The memo provided:

- Additional historical context for some of the key actions and decisions related to the pedestrian bridge, as well as the identification of the financial investments made or contracted for to date;
- An assessment of the likely cost and schedule implications for the design and construction of a taller main tower element within the suspension bridge portion of the bridge;
- Clarifications and recommendation regarding the bridge lighting;
- An identification and request for affirmation of key decisions associated with the pedestrian bridge and other recently finalized planning efforts for several Bridge Street District public improvement projects.

Mr. McDaniel stated that Mr. Foegler will recap the historical context; Ms. O'Callaghan will present the cost and schedule impacts of the higher tower, the lighting options and staff's recommendations. Mr. Foegler will then request affirmation of the key public improvements. This affirmation is needed to ensure that staff is proceeding in a manner to keep the project moving forward and avoiding unnecessary expenditures of funds in that process.

Mr. Foegler stated that the Council packet contained a comprehensive historical overview of some of the key actions and decisions related to the pedestrian bridge planning. In brief:

- Council had previously expressed interest in such a bridge after its visit to Greenville, South Carolina in September 2008. The Scioto River Corridor Framework Plan, which was initiated in early 2013, provided the first concept for a pedestrian bridge with Council. [He displayed an early concept for the pedestrian bridge and other connected elements from a spring 2013 presentation.]
- After approval of the Framework Plan, preliminary engineering was advanced to plan these projects to their next stage, prepare preliminary cost estimates, and position the projects to move forward to design once programmed within the City's Five-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The 2014-18 CIP, approved by Council in September 2013, included for the first time some of the preliminary engineering concepts for many of the capital projects in the Scioto River Corridor Framework Plan -- including the SR 161/Riverside Drive Roundabout, Riverside Drive realignment, the Dale-Tuller connector, and the riverfront parks and pedestrian bridge. Preliminary engineering efforts were still in their early stage at this time, so cost estimates were very conceptual, especially for the pedestrian bridge, which had a total cost allocation of $14.345 million programmed in the 2014-2018 CIP adopted by Council on September 9, 2013.

- During the remainder of 2013, there were significant public presentations, including a major presentation at OCLC in October 2013. On March 10, 2014 -- and as an outgrowth of its 2014 Goal Setting session -- City Council approved Resolution 17-14, which affirmed Council's direction to move forward as staff had requested with the key catalytic public projects within the River Corridor, including the Pedestrian Bridge. In this Resolution, Council reaffirmed its approval of the Pedestrian Bridge concept and directed the Administration to: *"Continue to evaluate and refine final design, costs and landing options for the Scioto River pedestrian bridge, and develop alternatives for consideration as soon as possible."* There were still challenges with establishing a yet-to-be determined acceptable west side bridge landing location, and cost issues were being evaluated.
- Planning and design issues continued to be addressed through 2014. Concept validation and refinement continued, and exploration of cost reductions. Details were provided in staff's report for this meeting.
- The west side bridge landing locations continued to be studied while the City was advancing and expanding its overall west side planning efforts. The first proposed concept of the bridge landing at North Street and North Riverview was not feasible for numerous reasons. Those reasons are outlined in staff's memo, including: accessibility issues, topography, impacts on future development and road designs, lack of good pedestrian connections to and visibility from any kind of landing plaza to High Street, and the negative impacts of projecting this kind of landing area into this steep hillside condition with a park.
- Council did reaffirm the inclusion of the pedestrian bridge as part of the 2015-2019 CIP.
- The west side bridge landing locations continued to be studied while the City was advancing and expanding its overall west side planning efforts. These west side efforts also related to studies associated with the new Dublin branch of the Columbus Metropolitan Library, the Bridge Park West project, needed roadway enhancements in the area, and the on-going west side River Park planning. The west side planning efforts did identify what eventually became the best and clearly preferred west side plaza location, which would serve as the landing area for the pedestrian bridge. The preferred west side plaza location for the bridge landing, located just east of the intersection of Rock Cress Parkway and North High Street:
  - is fully aligned with the proposed Rock Cress Parkway (and its cycle track) to provide seamless continuity to the Bridge Street District signature street system;
  - provides a fully accessible pedestrian approach, at grade with North High Street;
  - would have great visibility from, and interface with High Street, the new Library, its parking garage and Rock Cress Parkway;
  - is framed by active mixed-use developments, including upper story residential units and ground floor restaurants and outdoor seating;
  - would not protrude into or negatively impact the sensitive river park areas;
  - is sized and detailed to merge seamlessly with the fine-grained scale and quality of Historic Dublin while allowing for open views to the pedestrian bridge, park and river.
- A comprehensive update of that west side planning was provided to Council at its work session in May 2015. That planning effort affirmed the relocation of the pedestrian bridge and its landing point to align formally with North Street at this location. It shifted closer to the river, aligned with Rock Cress, the new library site, plaza and new buildings framing it on both sides.

- On May 23, 2016, Council affirmed some of that planning effort as reflected in the Scioto River Master Park Plan, which refined and brought together many of the planning elements.

Providing a Taller Tower Element - Cost and Schedule Implications

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that during the June 20, 2016 workshop, the pedestrian bridge cost savings analysis, performed in 2014, was referenced. The goal of that effort was to bring down the costs while preserving the original character of the unique, iconic pedestrian bridge.

- At the workshop, the tower height was discussed extensively, and Council requested that the tower height be re-evaluated with the T.Y. Lin International bridge design team. That team include Paul Andres, who has been the project architect since the concept was developed. They have taken a new look at the height, considering the landing point and other elevations that exist with the current design.
- The team is recommending an above deck height of 110 feet. The suspension span length would remain at the same 500 feet length. The engineers have looked at this proposed height and concur that this height is technically feasible. The entire team that has been working on the project concurs that this height is preferable and believes this height will enhance the experience for pedestrians on and near the bridge, as well as those who are viewing the bridge from afar.

In regard to what this change would mean in terms of cost and the construction schedule for the pedestrian bridge project:

- The additional cost to increase the height is estimated at $500,000 -- $350,000 for construction costs and $150,000 for design.
- The TY Lin team estimates it will require an additional two months of design. There will be another plan submission to the City, which will take another month for review.
- Because the tower would be taller -- more concrete, more steel, more work – an additional two months of construction time would be added to the project. There would be other impacts on the overall construction schedule; it is not as simple as adding a couple of months, if it should also involve another winter season.

Clarifications/Recommendations regarding Bridge Lighting

Council also received an overview of three different lighting level options for the new pedestrian bridge at the June 20, 2016 work session.

- The lighting levels are primary, intermediate and digital, and build upon one another. The more expensive, digital level includes the features of the primary and intermediate levels. The details of the lighting levels and maintenance information are included in attachment C of the packet materials.
- The architect, light designer and staff recommend the intermediate level of lighting. This level includes all the features of the primary level -- the LED lighting on the walkway, the tower eye, and the tower base uplighting. The additional features that the intermediate level provides is that the hanger cables would be lit and can be programmed to change colors. The underside of the girders under the walkway would be lit, as well.
- The intermediate level is estimated to cost approximately $728,000, which is $550,000 more than the primary level. [Examples of each lighting level were shown.]

Budget Implications and Moving Forward

- Design Budget – An additional $150,000 is needed to perform the additional design necessary to increase the tower height.
- Construction Budget – The estimate has been refined the last couple of weeks, to the extent possible based on 30% design. Beginning with $19.6 million at 30% design stage, that includes two construction seasons, the dampers, concrete piers, base lighting, and a nine percent contingency. She is presenting the costs a little different tonight, excluding the range and variables; this is more straightforward and understandable.
- The construction costs associated with increasing the tower height and the intermediate level of lighting total $900,000, including tower height increase - $350,000; intermediate level lighting - $550,000.
- The estimates shared tonight are the best numbers available at this point of the design age (30%). They are the best numbers to date and will continue to become more refined and more accurate as the design proceeds to 60% and 90%. Ultimately, bids will be received, which is when the true cost of the project will be known.
- Contingencies. Preparing for the CIP process, they have discussed the amount of contingency that would provide a conservative estimate. If it were a typical, steel girder bridge, as commonly seen throughout the state, there would be historical bid information to rely upon. Typically, a 10 percent contingency would be included. However, this project is unique, complex and challenging, and there is no historical bid information to rely upon. There are many unforeseen factors that will impact the cost and schedule of this project, including material prices – most significantly, steel. There is a large amount of steel in this bridge, and steel prices fluctuate. There are also unique bridge elements for which there are not that many fabricators in the country – the cables and dampers. Availability of experienced contractors for this type of bridge. An even more unpredictable factor is the competitive bidding environment. A conservative cost estimate should include a 20% contingency, versus the current 9%. As the design process proceeds to 60% and 90%, the amount of contingency in the estimated costs can be reduced.
- Total estimated construction costs would be $22.75 million.

Project Schedule

The schedule includes the additional time needed for the design and construction of the increased tower height. The project will potentially be bid a few months later than anticipated, into the spring, so some of the construction season will be lost. Depending on how the construction proceeds, the timeframe could extend into the winter of 2018 or spring of 2019. The environmental permitting is a significant factor that will impact that schedule. Much of that process is out of the City's control, as federal agencies issue those permits. Weather and steel availability are also variables. The estimate will continue to be refined until the time of bid.

Affirmation of Key River Corridor Public Improvements

Mr. Foegler stated that due to the recent re-evaluation of the pedestrian bridge that was done at Council's request and continued infrastructure discussions with Council, there is the need to tie some loose ends together related to infrastructure that were discussed in great detail at Council's goal setting retreat in March 2016. It is important to reaffirm the projects so that clear and consistent direction can be given to the teams. The items to be reaffirmed include: the pedestrian bridge alignment; the landing plaza location; the span width; the intermediate lighting package as was presented to Council; the increase in the bridge's tower above deck height up to 110 feet (which is about the height of the new AC hotel; and the design of all of these. This reaffirmation will provide the basis for staff to give clear direction to the teams

and would be consistent with the planning and design to date. (He summarized the items as outlined on the slide.)

Council discussion:

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she had asked for several items at the June 20 work session, including:

- Height of the anticipated tree canopy that would remain after construction of the elevated walkway.
- Dollars spent to date on the pedestrian bridge

Mr. Foegler stated that the information was provided in Exhibit B in the packet and includes what has been contracted for and what has been spent to date. With regard to the tree canopy -- they have spoken to the designers. There is not a good sense yet of which trees would be retained. They have been inventoried, and the question of which trees would be impacted by construction is still being assessed. Due to the elevation of the bridge, it should not be assumed that there would be a large, mature tree canopy there. A planting program will be assembled, and trees that can and should be preserved will be and worked around. The conceptual planting program in the Park Plan will move forward.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if the heights of the trees are known.

Mr. Foegler responded that they do not know the heights of the trees that will be retained. They have been inventoried, and retention plans are being assessed. The design team has been asked to move forward on this, but that information is not available at this time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that Attachment B does not contain in-house dollars spent.

Mr. Foegler responded that it does not include staff time. It is all third-party expenses.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that she was requesting a holistic number.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated in regard to the construction of Rock Cress, there was previous Council discussion about building this roadway due to its the proximity to the Grounds of Remembrance in Veterans Park. How necessary is that piece of roadway? She remains concerned about its proximity.

Mr. Foegler responded that at last year's work session, MKSK presented three-dimensional perspectives of that project. In acquiring the Rock Cress right-of-way, the agreement with the Schools and the Library will also provide the City an additional strip of land, in which landscaping or other features can be included to mitigate the impact. It was identified early as an item warranting special attention. There is a high level of confidence from the land planners and designers, and MKSK that the mitigation is possible. They have also been able to negotiate an additional one-third acre along that strip. As a design is developed with a combination of landscaping and architectural features to mitigate, it will be shared with Council for consideration.

Mr. Keenan stated that Rock Cress is essential to the movement of traffic on that side of the river. Council has discussed the importance of the road network in that area for the future.

Mr. Foegler responded that Rock Cress is a current feature of the City's Thoroughfare Plan. Council would need to amend the City's Thoroughfare Plan if it were not built. It is an important part of the circulation in that area.

Mr. Keenan stated that there has been involvement in some recent nearby land acquisitions that could facilitate that, as well.

Mr. McDaniel added that serviceability to the parking garage off Rock Cress was a critical component of that section.

Mr. Foegler noted that a key circulator in the Bridge Street District is Bridge Park Avenue, which becomes John Shields Parkway, and then Rock Cress. It is where the cycle track will go; it is the roadway along the park greenway. It is an important roadway for this area within the adopted Thoroughfare Plan. It is critical to make the circulation work well. It is good to move access points further north.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she does not disagree with having a greenway through this area, but there is a natural rock face along High Street and as it changes to Dublin Road. This is a significant part of Dublin's naturalized area – a place of quiet reflection. The City has expended significant time, energy and resources into the Grounds of Remembrance. To place a major thoroughfare adjacent to it may not necessarily be the best plan.

Ms. Salay stated that Council has always had that concern about the Grounds of Remembrance. Is it possible to have the renderings at an earlier point? She is prepared to support this, but viewing the renderings and current conditions would be helpful. There is a significant amount of vegetation between the north end of the Library and the Grounds of Remembrance, at the entrance of Dublin Road. Seeing a visible rendering could give Council some comfort.

Mr. Foegler stated that the roads and street system are now at 30% design. It was necessary to take the design to that point to be able to work with the various entities on their designs of their roadway improvements. It has been necessary to stop them, so that these efforts can catch up. It is now necessary to "catch up" the planning of this area. MKSK is a subcontractor to EMHT on the roadway designs, and they are under separate contract with the City specifically to identify strategies to ensure this area is mitigated. They could forward copies of the three-dimensional strategies they provided to Council in spring 2015.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that the change of grade should mitigate much of that. It might even lend a little dramatic effect to the Grounds of Remembrance. He and Mr. Keenan spent three years on the Grounds of Remembrance Committee, and it is important not to impact any of those efforts.

Ms. Salay stated that it is important to remain sensitive and aware of the surroundings.

Ms. Amorose stated that Attachment B indicates that the current expenditures incurred for the pedestrian bridge are $3.5 million.
Mr. Foegler stated that is primarily contracted dollars for design.
Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if it is possible for the City to cancel, or are they committed dollars.
Mr. Foegler responded that they are committed, unless the contract is terminated. That is the amount of the contract for delivery of the full design of the bridge.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she would like to see the pre-canopy information. It is very important. What was intended to be a suspension bridge will now be partially suspended, with a 35% elevated walkway. What happens around that elevated walkway is really important, particularly if there is not tree canopy. She believes the piers toward the eastern-most edge of the raised walkway were shown as approximately 50 feet tall.
Mr. Foegler responded that they are not 50 feet in height in that area. From the top of the pedestrian deck to where the largest pier hits the ground, which is the low point, is 49 feet. Therefore, everything would be less than that, moving further up the hillside.

Ms. Amorose Groomes responded that, as such, the eastern-most portion of the raised walkway would be the tallest tier, becoming shorter moving to the west. She is concerned about the "feel" of an elevated walkway and how the transition occurs from an elevated walkway with nothing overhead into a suspension bridge where the cables begin. She would like to see some detail on how that transition occurs, how it "feels." When this project began in 2014, the estimated cost was $12 million. Now two years later, it is nearly doubled. She wants to ensure that, in the end, the product is as significant as the investment made.
Mr. Foegler responded in regard to the canopy that there is no way to lengthen the span of the suspension bridge. There is no other landing point. The burden on them is to do as good a job landscaping and preserving trees as is possible. There is no alternate way in which to do that. It needs to be planned well to mitigate as best as possible. It is also important to create as accurate a picture of the "after construction" condition as possible. The designers believe it will be an extraordinary experience through that area. That does not mean there will be a full canopy created by mature trees. As that planning advances, they will share that information.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that when she was in the northern suburbs of Chicago last week she noticed that they have installed planters on their overpasses. They really soften the "feel" of many of the overpasses. Maybe Dublin should consider what amenities could be added to the raised sidewalk portion to make it feel softer, so it is not just a walk along an elevated sidewalk. There is a need to be creative, because it is a long walk – 250 feet or more, just in the raised sidewalk portion.
Mr. Foegler responded that the raised sidewalk has the same rail systems, the appearance of the structure underneath – in all respects, but for the cables overhead.

Mayor Peterson stated that his issue with the bridge since the last work session was the height of the tower. He was not aware of the date when the height of the tower was reduced or when those changes were made. He did not appreciate the visual impact that would have. The visuals displayed at the work session highlighted the difference between the two and that was the first time that he appreciated the significance. It had a totally different feel. He sees this more as returning to the original concept, as opposed to now increasing the height of the tower. Building this bridge is a significant investment for this community, and for many of the people in this room, it will be the mark that is left on Dublin from this project. Therefore, it is important to "get it right." He is willing to support returning to the original concept; he believes that was the right concept. He is mindful of the money that is being spent to build this bridge, but he wants to make it clear that, from his perspective, it is returning to what he thought it always was. It is not deciding at the last hour to add more "bells and whistles."

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that he believes Mr. Foegler is correct. The difference between the suspension portion and the supported portion will be unnoticeable. This will be a dramatic walkway across the river! He thanks staff for bringing back a modified version with the added height, which he anticipates will make the bridge iconic within the region. He also appreciates receiving the modified construction schedule, and it does not look as onerous as was initially a concern. He appreciates this information being provided so quickly.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he would like to clarify the $12 million, that has been referenced a couple of times. At the time of the earliest concept of this project, an initial number of $12 million was programmed in the CIP as a placeholder. However, it was known that design would follow and it was fully anticipated that number would increase. The budget was likely benchmarked off the Greenville, SC project. It is not a surprise to those involved that the costs have increased significantly. Design at

30% level is the industry standard at which a check-in occurs for an iconic project such as this. As such, it is also the point at which staff would check in with Council. This check in with Council does not occur on typical roadway or building projects. However, it does occur with some of the major, more iconic projects. Staff will continue to check in with Council, because this project is so unique.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that he viewed the original number as just a placeholder. He still believes the costs have been contained for this iconic project.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that her information about the costs of the pedestrian bridge came from a fact check portion of the City's web page.
Mr. McDaniel responded that he was simply providing the history of the project costs and how they have evolved through the design process.

Mr. Lecklider stated he does not believe the City could have estimated costs such as the lighting a few years ago. These are options that are worth considering, even though the costs are not insignificant.
Mr. McDaniel commented that he is aware of the number of decisions staff is asking Council to weigh in on, but it is important to check in throughout this process. This project will be in the CIP, and staff believes the capacity to do the project exists in the budget. This will be demonstrated at the capital budget workshop in August.
Mr. Lecklider echoed Mr. Reiner's comments, thanking staff for quickly turning around the response to the information requested by Council.

Ms. Alutto thanked staff for providing this check-in regarding this important project. In regard to the reaffirmation being requested tonight, is the intent to reaffirm the general direction – and not preclude future changes at some point, correct? For example, the concerns were expressed about Rock Cress. If it is determined the proximity to the Grounds of Remembrance cannot be mitigated in some way, will there be opportunity to change that direction?
Mr. Foegler responded that the presentation to Council in 2015 to reaffirm that roadway network resulted in direction to move Rock Cress as far south as possible, still leaving a reasonable building pad and appropriate distance between the intersections there. The Parks Director, Fred Hahn, indicated he was confident that any impacts to the Grounds of Remembrance could be mitigated. Locationally, this is 30 percent designed and staff is working on finalizing agreements with parties that want to move forward with projects. Where the flexibility comes in is in terms of what is done with the landscaping. The architect's presentation last year indicated that something architectural may help mitigate that further. These things are moving very quickly toward design and construction. The elements of finishes and landscaping mitigating measures are very open. Staff needs affirmation on these projects in order to finalize agreements. Absent such affirmation, staff will need to return and renegotiate agreements and stop design on some key elements.

Vice Mayor Reiner complimented staff for securing the designer of the bridge from San Francisco. He has a great reputation, and this is a very complicated structure. The idea of an S curve suspension bridge is no easy task. It will be an iconic symbol for the City and the costs are not surprising to anyone familiar with construction.

Mayor Peterson suggested that Council move forward to reaffirm the direction to staff.

Ms. Salay moved to re-affirm the following:

1. The current pedestrian bridge alignment, the landing plaza locations for the bridge, the 500 foot span length, the Intermediate lighting package as

presented, and the increase in the bridge's tower above-deck height to 110 feet are approved, and the design for all of these should move forward.

2. The alignment and location of the North Riverview extension from North Street to North High Street (opposite Indian Run Drive), as depicted in the recently approved Scioto River Corridor Park Plan is affirmed and its construction should move forward immediately.
3. The general alignment of the new roadway system which creates the new "block" where the new library facility and parking garage will be constructed (see Attachment D); consisting of Rock Cress, Franklin Street, North Street and North High Street; and the general location of the new library and the parking garage facilities on that block; with the timing of the design and construction of these facilities to be coordinated and advanced in tandem with the agreements and collaborative efforts finalized with the Columbus Metropolitan Library and the Dublin City School District.
4. The need to advance the design and construction of a retaining wall for the new west side landing plaza in order to better accommodate the future construction of the pedestrian bridge, the plaza itself, and the private projects being planned adjacent to the plaza.

Mayor Peterson seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes.

Ms. Amorose requested information on the height of the retaining wall on the west side of the river, on the eastern portion.
Mr. Foegler responded that he would forward that information to her.

STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. McDaniel:

- Thanked staff for the efforts on the July 4th events. Everyone seemed to have a good time, and he thanked the public for attending and supporting the events! Congratulations to Tom and Gayle Holton as Grand Marshals for the parade!
- Noted that, as promised, the CIP report was included in the packet. He suggested that Council provide any feedback on the documents by July 19. This would allow time to review and consider the changes at staff level prior to presentation of the proposed CIP. A CIP workshop is scheduled on Monday, August 15. At the Wednesday, August 10 Council meeting, an ordinance adopting the CIP will be introduced together with the Administration's proposed Five-Year CIP. Council will then review the proposed CIP on August 15.
- Noted that the Dublin Irish Festival will take place on Friday, August 5 through Sunday, August 7. Information regarding the Festival will be shared with Council very soon.
- Announced that a delegation from our Friendship City, Mashiko, Japan will be visiting Dublin August 6 through 10. The delegation will consist of the Vice Mayor, the Superintendent of their Schools, a ceramic artist and his wife. Plans are being formulated for meetings for Council with the delegation during their visit. They will also meet with Dublin Schools and the Dublin Arts Council.

Staff is working on the organization of a community committee for Friendship Cities. Council Member Alutto is representing Council on this committee.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Keenan, Administrative Committee Chair welcomed the newly appointed members of the Community Services Advisory Commission.

There were no other reports.

COUNCIL ROUNDTABLE

Ms. Salay:

Thanked everyone for their hard work on the July 4th celebration. It was amazing that the rain and storms held off! Everyone watching the fireworks in her vicinity of the venue said that the fireworks were the best ever! Kudos to all involved! The community appreciates the enthusiasm and positive spirit of staff and volunteers.

Thanked her colleagues for "holding her place" for the past few weeks, which enabled her and her family to take the trip of a lifetime. They were able to visit many iconic sites outside of the U.S., which provides a new perspective on your own home. Truly, there is no place like home, and it is great to be back!

Mr. Lecklider echoed the positive comments regarding the July 4th celebration. Mayor Peterson obviously deserves some credit for the great weather!

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked all of the community members who came out for the July 4th parade despite the threat of rain. It was fun to see all of the folks and the excitement about the July 4th holiday! The fireworks were some of the best she has seen, and she appreciates that as well.

Ms. Alutto remarked that she learned that she will need more candy to distribute in next year's parade, given the turnout!

Mr. Keenan stated that from his perspective of watching the fireworks with his family at home, there was lots of smoke and ash generated, likely due to the high humidity. The parade was wonderful, and he is always amazed at the numbers of children lining the parade route! Thanks to staff for all of their hard work on the events!

Vice Mayor Reiner:

Echoed the positive comments about the July 4th events, which were awesome! The luck of the Irish prevailed during the parade and throughout the evening events – the predicted storms did not occur!

Reminded everyone of the upcoming Arthritis Auto Show this weekend, which is a great charity event. In addition, the d'Art Dash will take place this weekend – a run through Historic Dublin. He encouraged all to participate.

Mayor Peterson:

Thanked staff for their support and assistance during the July 4th events. The fireworks were also phenomenal! After the event, a citizen told him she had lived in Washington, DC for 25 years and that she would sit on her office building roof and watch fireworks each year. But they never came close to the quality of the fireworks Dublin displays.

Expressed appreciation to his colleagues for allowing him to represent them. Serving as Mayor is one of the greatest honors he has had, and he is very grateful to represent the community and to work with such a phenomenal staff and Council. Echoing the words of his mother, "It is truly a beautiful life!"

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 p.m.

_____

Mayor – Presiding Officer

_____

Clerk of Council