

Dublin City Council Work Session
Monday, October 16, 2017
Council Chambers

Minutes of Meeting

~~Mayor Peterson called the Monday, October 16, 2017 Work Session of Dublin City Council to order at 6:19 p.m. at Dublin City Hall.~~

~~Members present were: Mayor Peterson, Vice Mayor Reiner Ms. Salay, Mr. Lecklider, Ms. Amorose Groomes, and Ms. Alutto. Mr. Keenan was out of town (excused).~~

~~Staff members present: Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Crandall, Ms. Goss, Ms. Readler, Ms. Mumma, Mr. Earman, Mr. Papsidero, Ms. Rauch, Ms. Puranik, Ms. Richison and Mr. Plouck.~~

~~Mayor Peterson clarified to those in attendance that this is a Council Work Session and not a regular Council Meeting. He also explained that Council would be making an exception to the normal rules of a work session and would be accepting public comment. He stated that there are two items on tonight's agenda: the Dublin Corporate Area Plan and the Historic Dublin zoning code changes for the area south of Bridge Street.~~

Dublin Corporate Area Plan

Mr. Papsidero referenced Council's briefings on this project, noting that this project builds upon the Legacy Office work that has been ongoing. He invited Jason Sudy, Principal with Side Street Planning to present the Dublin Corporate Area Plan.

Mr. Sudy introduced Steve Kolwicz of POD Design and Pete DiSalvo of DDA Advisors who are also working on the project. Mr. Sudy stated that this project addresses the following:

- repositioning the Legacy Office sites to adapt to future demands;
- create a walkable, mixed use environment while recommending infill opportunities;
- identify new markets for investment;
- develop a strategy to refresh the Frantz Road streetscape;
- recommend mechanisms for adding new development west of Frantz Road while not adversely impacting the neighborhoods to the east; and
- recommend zoning tools to ensure successful implementation of the vision and plan recommendations.

There are many office sites that are not as competitive and are not performing at the highest levels because they were developed in a different era using a different approach to site development. One of the major goals of the project is to bridge the time between now and into the future with an actionable short-term plan to reposition those sites with the understanding that a more larger scale development that may happen in the future. This is needed to capture the next generation of development. Having a more mixed use environment will allow this area to be more competitive with other sites that offer mixed uses and maybe open up new markets for investment. Refreshing the Frantz Road streetscape has become an important part of this study. He made the important distinction between this area plan and the subsequent process of zoning. The zoning process is being undertaken by a separate consulting group, but they are all working together because that process will codify the details that are recommended in the plan.

Mr. Sudy illustrated the public input process with the business community that had been completed to date, beginning in December 2015. Several public workshops were followed with

interactive polling and web-based information gathering. A large number of participants either lived or worked in Dublin.

The Market Analysis identified three areas with redevelopment potential with retail/restaurant site characteristics. They are:

- Frantz/Metro Center;
- Frantz/Rings Road; and
- Emerald Parkway/Parkwood Place.

The analysis consisted of looking at marketable site locations, consumer types, spending power and market supported opportunities. Council's packet included some drawings of the Metro area intended to illustrate what could be there; the drawings are not specific site plans. In examining the spending power in each of these areas and the users, it was discovered that there is an immense number of hotel dollars not being captured. The users staying in the hotels have no places to walk to and few places for a short drive. There is market supported development for 50,000-60,000 square feet at the Frantz/Metro area, 50,000 square feet in the Frantz/Rings area and 20,000 square feet in the Emerald/Parkwood area. Restaurants, special-food grocery, and personal care service retail could be accommodated in those areas now. There is also ground that is generating tax dollars based on its commercial use, but it is underperforming significantly. This study suggested that housing should be integrated at key locations throughout the study area to bolster the economic potential of the other uses in the area.

Regarding land use, he stated that the one comment heard over and over in the public sessions was that there are not many amenities along Frantz Road. He noted the principles of land use are to encourage a variety of uses, focus on amenities, utilize open space as an organizational element and usable amenity, infill residential development in key locations and mitigate negative impacts on adjacent neighborhoods. He reiterated the difference between a land use plan and the zoning code. Land use designates what types of things can be in a given location from a suggested standpoint. A land use plan does not have the legal ramifications that the zoning code does. Therefore, what the consultants are aiming to do with this study is identify basic districts that can accompany a future zoning approach that allows a much more specific site by site stipulation to be put on all those properties for future development.

He introduced the basic districts as follows:

- MUR-1: Metro/Blazer area – appropriate uses include office, hotel, residential infill on key sites and neighborhood commercial along Frantz Road;
- MUR-2: Tuttle/Rings (North) – corporate office within interior of sub-district;
- MUR-2: Tuttle/Rings (South) – immediate interstate access, close proximity to mall;
Mr. Sudy noted that they are drawing a distinction between the east side of Frantz Road and the west side of Frantz Road. The west side could consist of many uses to make it function better such as a small-scale grocery, and other retail and restaurant possibilities, but the east side of Frantz Road is recommended for low intensity office uses.
- MUR-3: Emerald – continue to be freeway oriented office, specific uses in district subareas, office personal services and restaurant.

He provided an illustration of the 13 site specific policy areas in order to bolster the thinking in how those would apply to the new land use categories. These are land use suggestions and any

specific site development approach will only be assured with the zoning process. The proposed building heights were shown to be limited to one to two stories along Frantz Road. Taller buildings would be allowed along I-270 frontage and the heights between these two areas would be transitioned. He shared some pictures of potential development opportunities and how it might appear along Frantz Road/Metro Center and along Frantz Road and Rings Road.

Regarding connectivity, he noted that there are two opportunities, one of which is that there is already a robust trail system that could incorporate new connections and there is limited roadway connectivity. The roadway connections could function better by adding connections.

He stated that the current concerns along Frantz Road are the landscaping is overgrown, the interface of the building with the road, connectivity, signage and the overall look and feel. Altering the characteristics of the roadway and developing some outside space for dining, walking, etc. would improve the look of this roadway.

Next steps include any revisions to the draft document based on Council, resident and property owner comments; plan adoption in December or January 2018; and plan implementation in 2018. There are two immediate steps toward plan implementation -- the first is developing the new zoning district for the planning area and a comprehensive rezoning and the second is a design and implementation of Frantz Road streetscape improvements.

Mr. McDaniel stated that what drove this Legacy Office study is the desire to keep it competitive and vibrant.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that this area is due for rehabilitation. He agreed that one thing that was missed was providing restaurants and pocket places for the residents of that area. He believes the way this plan is mapped out is sensitive to the current residents.

Mayor Peterson stated that he asked the Clerk to pull the citizen comments from the August 28, 2017 meeting and to make a copy of the comments from the August 28 meeting and attach them to this meeting's minutes so it will all be together (comments attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit A). He noted that if those present already provided public testimony, it will be in the record.

Ms. Amorose Groomes clarified that Council will not be voting on any matters at this meeting.

Sven Christensen, 5765 Settlers Place, Dublin, requested the slide in the presentation illustrating the site specific policy areas be displayed. He noted that there was greater detail given regarding height and density since the last meeting, and he is appreciative. He stated that some Council Members came out to walk along the path to the school and along Llewellyn Park. There is no specific zoning that abuts that residential path. He would like to have a sub-district study on the area that is immediately adjacent to the residential area. The fact that this doesn't have a site specific direction is the main concern.

Mr. Papsidero pointed out that the text does give a list of uses specific to the area west of Frantz Road and not east of Frantz Road.

Mr. Sudy reiterated that these are suggested uses for the west side of Frantz; the zoning code will legally limit the uses.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested that because there is a list of uses for the west side, it would be helpful to have a list of uses for the east side.

Mayor Peterson stated that everyone is in agreement that this needs to be clarified.

Mr. Christensen reiterated that he believes a specific site study like the one that was done on Blazer Parkway would be helpful. He asked staff to take the opportunity to do better when it is right next to the neighborhood.

Ms. Salay stated that she agreed completely. She wants to nail down the future for these neighbors so that everyone is comfortable. The City does not need to develop or over develop. Neighborhoods are investing in their area and she does not want residents worrying about what is coming. We need to be very clear and make sure everyone understands what is going on. She asked staff if the vision is for a blanket rezoning or overlay districts.

Mr. Papsidero responded that the strategy is to do a comprehensive rezoning of the entire area. Much of this area dates back to PUDs, which lacked standards. From a process standpoint, the concept is to build upon the structure that is in place for the West Innovation District and then do a comprehensive rezoning that is based on this plan, but which will go into more detail.

Ms. Salay inquired about the process if a comprehensive rezoning were proposed and someone wanted to develop and can meet those standards, could they proceed without any additional public input?

Mr. Papsidero clarified that they are in the process of updating the West Innovation District and including more criteria, which defines when a project will go to Planning Commission. Therefore, it is more definitive, and the bar will be even higher in this area. It will be an open development approval process.

Ms. Salay inquired about a vacant lot near Llewellyn Farms and the fact that at one point, a senior housing development was interested in that land. Is that a possible use?

Mr. Papsidero stated that the vacant parcel Ms. Salay refers to was handled as all the other parcels. It is currently a Suburban Office use. The Plan supports only office with the height limit. It is a small parcel and therefore, two-story office is all that could be accommodated because of parking requirements.

In response to Ms. Salay's question regarding current zoning, Mr. Papsidero stated that the lot in question was strictly office use.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that when this was last discussed, she recalled that an area rezoning was appropriate for the West Innovation District because of the limited number of adjacent residents. Some valuable lessons have been learned in area-wide rezonings. She would not be in favor of area-wide rezoning in proximity to residential areas. There are triggers that would prompt review by the Planning Commission, meaning that some of these would not go to Planning Commission. She would not be supportive of proposals that could bypass the Planning and Zoning Commission process for development.

Mr. Papsidero stated that one of the triggers, for example, would be any land that fronts Frantz Road.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that triggers can change.

Mr. Papsidero noted that these would be spelled out in the zoning code, not reviewed by ART or staff.

Mr. Christensen summarized that a sub area study for what lies next to residential would help everyone feel more comfortable.

Mark Gray, 4786 Belfield Court, Dublin, stated that he and his wife have been residents of Llewellyn Farms for 28 years. One of the reasons they built there was because Dublin has a Plan. He was confident that his home value would be retained because of the Community Plan. He asked Council to make sure there is a compelling reason to change the Plan in some way that impacts home values and quality of life for the residents. He is an AEP retiree and understands design and design basis and the importance of having compelling reasons to change anything. Planning staff needs to understand what is there after 6 p.m., on the weekdays and on the weekends and help the residents retain and preserve the quality of life and retain their investment.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that Council and staff have much experience with what can happen and the impact certain development can have on residents, for example, banging dumpsters and noise.

Vicki Prescott 5805 Settlers Place, Dublin, described the increased foot traffic in her neighborhood currently. She believes that it will increase even more with this development. She is in favor of development, but is concerned about people walking through their neighborhoods.

Bernie Schlueter, 5716 Chatterfield Dr., Dublin, suggested more consideration be given to park space, gardens, or a creative and imaginative space for walkers. He believes Dublin could put in a wonderful place to attract people.

Clay Daney, 5775 Settlers Place, Dublin, stated that he has spoken previously and wants to reiterate a few comments. His neighborhood is an engaged group of people. There is a real opportunity to do something great in this area. If there was an opportunity to have a round table where ideas could be given, something excellent could come of this blank slate area. He suggested taking extra time and care to consider what could be done and the impacts that could still occur in some areas. The site specific areas are helpful, but some neighbors could still be impacted. He trusts that the City of Dublin will get the zoning right, but not really understanding what MUR means, it is still cause for concern. He thanked Planning staff and Council for being so open to hearing comments.

Jane Fox, 6193 Dublin Road, Dublin, stated that she is impressed with the engagement of the Llewellyn and Waterford citizens. They want to have something special in their neighborhoods. There is an opportunity to have great commercial attraction to the area. City planning has such a talented staff, but it hopefully is not just a commercial attraction, but will be something the residents agree with as well. The process is so linear -- the roundtable type discussion that brings creative thoughts is missing. It would be wonderful if in the early planning stages, people could come and share good ideas. It would then be a collaborative effort that everyone buys into. If the neighborhood does not support it, then it will never be successful because they will feel that their value has gone down. This much land is a grand opportunity to draw people to this area. Landscape architecture could be the key. Everyone loves beautiful spaces, so maybe the place to

start is with the landscape and build the commercial around it. Focus on making this the most beautiful place in central Ohio and there won't be any challenge in drawing people.

Mayor Peterson asked for the timeframe on the Plan.

Mr. Papsidero responded that they continue to gather comments from property owners. There are revisions to make to complete a final draft document. The final document is to go before the Planning Commission in November and then to Council in January.

In response to Mayor Peterson, Mr. Papsidero confirmed that there will be more revisions, based upon feedback that they receive. The final document will come forward as a submitted formal application to the Planning Commission. This meeting has focused on east of Frantz Road concerns, but there have been concerns expressed by property owners on Emerald Parkway as well that will be addressed.

Mayor Peterson asked if the Commission will have more than one hearing on this.

Mr. Papsidero stated it is up to the Commission.

Ms. Alutto clarified that there is additional opportunity for people to view the document and read it prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, and so they can attend the Commission meeting and testify if they desire.

Mr. Papsidero stated that was correct.

Ms. Alutto stated that this was envisioned to be a mass rezoning. However, she may not be comfortable with a mass rezoning. She asked whether staff would bring forward other options other than a mass rezoning.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the document purposefully does not go into that detail. As a result of some issues raised at this meeting, there may be more detail added about what the zoning code could address. The strategy of which approach to take could be discussed with Council and options could be provided, but there are challenges with the way this district is currently zoned. The parcels they are discussing tonight have straight zoning in place, and there is not much that could be done today to protect the residents. There are very few standards in place in these areas being discussed. Because of that, it serves as a disincentive for any investment because the rules are thin, there is not a lot of guidance and this creates hurdles. This brings back the idea of a comprehensive rezoning with all new current standards, a very clean process, new landscape standards and more efficient parking. It is for these reasons that this is being discussed globally.

Ms. Alutto stated she would like to have a clear understanding of the different approaches. It doesn't have to be part of the document and could be a conversation separate from this. It would be beneficial to the residents to have a better understanding of the process. She thanked Planning staff for being flexible and having more specificity around the neighborhood areas.

Ms. Salay stated it seems we are attempting to strike a balance, because Council's previous direction has been for redevelopment and to make this area easier for investment to occur. Due to the hurdles he described earlier, it is actually a disincentive in this area. On that front, the idea of a global rezoning is interesting. However, when it is adjacent to a residential area, there is a need for balance. That requires more thought and consideration. She suggested looking at global rezoning on one side of Frantz Road, but doing something different with the area that impacts neighborhoods.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that this has been her request since Council was first presented this document -- that this area is treated more like a community plan and not to rezone the areas adjacent to the residential components.

Ms. Salay stated that staff makes a good point because it is currently all straight Suburban Office zoning, and the City desires to get away from that.

Mr. Papsidero stated that it is a balancing act.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that if a rezoning occurred on the (McDowell) parcel, there is a desire to keep it residential.

Mr. Papsidero stated that was correct.

Mayor Peterson stated that the residents should be assured that this Council is unified in that this process should protect the borders of their neighborhood. However, something must be done because the current zoning is straight S.O.

Ms. Salay stated that she is hopeful that a meeting could take place between now and the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting that that everyone is to the point of being comfortable. She doesn't want the neighborhood to continue to come to meetings out of fear of what may happen.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that this was never about money. It was a project to rehab and upgrade the area that was in need of upgrading.

Mr. Lecklider stated that he personally has a history of protecting the integrity of neighborhoods and the Council that he has served on has a tradition of doing the same.

Mayor Peterson asked those in attendance if anyone else wanted to speak.

Mark Martin, President of Llewellyn Farms Civic Association stated that he respects the idea that they want to retain the approval of projects. The residents would like to see a "mass plan" so they don't have to worry about what can and cannot go in certain areas. Many residents missed the earlier meetings where this was presented. He doesn't want to have to watch the newspaper regularly to see what is going on and whether or not it affects him. He thanked Council for their work and complimented the services of the City of Dublin.

Historic Dublin Code and Area Rezoning

~~Ms. Rauch shared a map depicting the area south of Bridge Street, along South High Street. The directive to staff from Council in May of 2016 was: to look at the Bridge Street Code, specifically in this area on the south side of Bridge Street along S. High to see if there are some modifications that could be made to be more responsive to some of the development pressure the City is experiencing in this area, and to make sure that it is sensitive to the neighborhood and fitting in with the existing character, particularly as it relates to the residential on either side -- along S. Riverview and Franklin Street. The other part of this is looking at specific requirements related to commercial uses, how those are treated, specific building design details, building height, noise, density, etc. The directive was to look at the Code for these things and make some recommendations, providing opportunity for public comment.~~

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS • DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

August 28, 2017

Page 3 of 22

- **Dublin City School District Ranked as Number 5 in the "2018 Best School Districts in America" by Niche**

Mr. McDonnell, Director of Student Operations and Mr. Andres, Director of Student Services were present to accept this recognition from the City.

Mr. McDonnell stated that the website that awarded this designation searched all over the country for neighborhoods and schools to select. Recognitions such as this demonstrate the strong partnership among the community, the City, the students, the parents and the Schools. He stated they strive to provide a world-class education and continuously improve. The criteria for this recognition focuses on: academic performance; student and parent satisfaction; and diversity.

Mayor Peterson read and presented a Proclamation to the Dublin City Schools for this recognition.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Sven Christianson, 5765 Settlers Place, Dublin addressed Council regarding Llewellyn Farms and Waterford Village, noting they were developed at about the same time as Muirfield Village. The residents have had one-story, professional office development around them to date and this office development is tucked away and acceptable. The tools that have been utilized in the past to protect residential areas are the zoning guidelines. The pending Corporate Area Plan is disturbing to the neighborhoods because it removes the zoning protections that are in place today. During the open forum presentation sessions, the lead consultant implied that zoning concerns would be addressed at a later date. However, the Corporate Area Plan would guide and direct the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council, and if protections are not added now, they never will be. If this effort to protect neighborhood character is successful upfront, then it will save time for development requests or zoning questions. A residential overlay zone or sub district with respectful zoning guidance is a common sense approach. However, the neighborhoods are open to any approach that ensures that the constituents are a priority. When drafting the prudent planning petition that will be submitted, it was clear that the requests are clearly in line with the DNA of the City. They are optimistic that Council can help structure a favorable plan. The Corporate Area Plan covers 1.5 square miles, and their area of concern is a small 5% of that. They understand the overall goal, but the area east of Frantz Road is different. Waterford Village will eventually have development behind them on the existing cornfield. However, what comes in the future should enhance, not detract from the neighborhood. He is requesting a true collaborative effort among residents, Council and consultants.

Clay Daney, 5775 Settlers Place, Dublin stated that he moved to Dublin four years ago from the Short North. He chosen Llewellyn Farms because of the access to downtown Dublin, the river, Bridge Street District, etc. When he moved, he understood that he would have neighbors that were businesses and that was acceptable because these were one-story, modest buildings. However, that is now changing. He feels these changes are bringing uncertainty to the residents in his area. He expressed his faith in the planning team, the PZC, and Council that their concerns will be heard. However, to date, they have not seen it reflected in the Corporate Area Plan. The 5% of the Plan area east of Frantz Road would like to have site use limitations, site restrictions, set back restrictions, green space and landscape buffering. In the past 48 hours, they have gathered over 250 signatures, which reflects that neighbors are concerned. The Dublin Corporate Area Plan is needed, but the area east of Frantz Road needs to be done right and a middle ground needs to be found. He expressed gratitude for the openness of planning and the expectation of great development in Dublin.

Eric Kreidler, 5815 Settlers Place, Dublin stated that he grew up in Dublin and has been witness to the explosive growth of the City. He knows that growth is expected and must occur, but when it infringes on quality of life of citizens near that growth, it becomes a problem. The appeal of Dublin is the strong neighborhoods, quality of life, and responsible governance over factors that influence those who live in Dublin first, and

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

August 28, 2017

Page 4 of 22

those who work in Dublin second. His primary issue is with the validity of the input and results from the public meetings. The purpose of these meetings with the consultant team was to receive the input of employers, employees and citizens about what they want to see in the area. The analysis of research conclusions is based on the statistical data that is presented to support those conclusions. However, he has seen poor outcomes as a result of using poor data and wants to avoid that mistake in this Plan. He is not against development, but the extent that this is to be addressed is not clear. The analysis of the meetings is there were 198 total participants, 144 of those claim to be Dublin residents. If it is to be assumed that the residents only attended one meeting and did not double up, this represents .3% of the population of Dublin. Mr. Kreidler cited problems with graphs and statistics and how the view can change dramatically, depending upon the number polled. How did they verify information, such as demographics and definition of study area? There were further issues with the survey results and methods. There is data missing or data being omitted. A good business plan contains risk analysis, liabilities and responsibilities, cost benefit analysis and a plan on how to progress. Dublin needs to be concerned with infrastructure, traffic, school, police services, etc.

He reiterated that the public input is flawed or biased, and that the lack of explicit zoning regulations is disrespectful and irresponsible to the residents of the area. Dublin's neighborhoods and citizens are what make Dublin a desirable place to live. The voices of the residents should always be more important than the consultants' conclusions.

Mark Martin, 4211 Rings Road, Dublin introduced himself as the Vice President of Llewellyn Farms Civic Association. He noted that he agrees with the statements made. He lives across from the open cornfield. He has always believed that Dublin does a very good job of blending commercial and residential areas. However, he is surprised to see a plan with potential multi-story hotels and restaurants butted up against a residential area. He is concerned about the potential plan. He believes there is potential for compromise on a buffer zone between the corporate area and the residential area.

Mr. McDaniel thanked the residents for coming forward. He appreciates the positive comments about Dublin's history of planning and development. He asked Mr. Papsidero, Planning Director to comment.

Mr. Papsidero stated that this process began almost four years ago with early work on the Legacy Office Park research. Staff has been working on a plan update for the last year and a half, and there has been good turnout at workshops where most of the data has been collected. Currently, staff is working on completing the final details of the plan. They promised the neighborhood residents they would respond with draft material within the week. The goal is to provide the Planning and Zoning Commission with a complete document in late September or early October. They are working through the process and are near the end of it.

Mr. McDaniel stated that there is more opportunity for input, particularly at PZC. He invited residents to keep the exchange of information flowing so it can be provided to the consultants.

Mr. Papsidero stated that staff recently spent time with the residents walking the properties and viewing the perspective from their backyards, hearing their concerns and ideas about development.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she also spent time with the residents in that area and much of the conversation centered on the greenway and the connectivity with Cramer Creek, heading north into the historic core. She encouraged staff to look at the preservation of the creeks in the form of greenways. She is not sure of the need for an overlay district, because there is not a plan adopted yet. She wants staff to consider the creeks and the connections so all the residents can enjoy the area.

Ms. Salay asked Mr. Papsidero for his response to the resident concerns that have been expressed. She believes that their concerns are not unreasonable and can staff provide

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS • DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

August 28, 2017

Page 5 of 22

the residents with some assurance that there is not the desire to rezone the whole area to allow all these difference uses. She encouraged staff to make the plan more neighborhood friendly. She believes that much could be accomplished to satisfy the residents' concerns before the plan is sent to PZC.

Mr. Papsidero stated that, throughout the process, staff has been clear about the importance of safeguarding the neighborhoods up and down Frantz Road. Staff committed that more detailed information will be forwarded to the interested parties before the document is submitted to the PZC. The process has been delayed somewhat due to the number of vacant properties and the number of corporate owners involved.

In response to Ms. Amorose Groomes' question regarding whether or not area rezonings or individual rezonings will be done, Mr. Papsidero stated that the goal was to streamline the zoning process of the entire planning area. Building on the model in place for the West Innovation District, the goal conceptually has been to consider one comprehensive rezoning of the entire planning area and having subdistricts that speak to land use, density, design standards as well as adopting design guidelines.

Ms. Amorose Groomes cautioned staff that one of the reasons this works so well in the West Innovation District is the lack of adjacent neighbors. There was a lot more flexibility and freedom for that reason. Perhaps west of Frantz Road would be more appropriate for area rezonings, but she would not support area rezonings on the east side of Frantz Road. Sensitivity to adjacent neighbors is more important east of Frantz Road and she is concerned about the loss of control that can come with area rezonings. It is important to keep that control for residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Papsidero agreed with Ms. Amorose Groomes in that he is hoping to add more restrictions to protect the neighborhood. Those details will be explored more in the next phase of the process.

Mayor Peterson inquired about the timeframe for the PZC review.

Mr. Papsidero responded that it could be in October, dependent upon the communication with the stakeholders. Depending upon the PZC review timeframe, this plan could be before Council at the end of October or early November. PZC will also be reviewing the West Innovation District update at the same time.

Mr. Keenan inquired about the large parcel in Washington Township that lies adjacent to Waterford Village and how it is accommodated in the plan.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the western half of that parcel fronts on Frantz Road and will be in the planning area. Conceptually, staff has discussed the possibility of it being residential or lower scale office, perhaps retail use-- all with a two-story height limit.

Mayor Peterson thanked those who attended tonight's meeting and encouraged them to stay engaged as the process continues.

Jane Fox, 6193 Dublin Road, Dublin addressed Council regarding public engagement. There are many interested residents present, and she is asking that Council support the early engagement for these planning actions. She suggested that civic associations could be invited for brainstorming sessions. Sometimes, there are creative solutions from people who live in the neighborhood. The public meetings do not really offer the same opportunities to develop comprehensive solutions as does a roundtable discussion. She would like to change the flow of information from citizens to Planning staff to Council. She wants to bring people together to determine what they want. It could lead to a shared collaborative discussion. She believes this interaction will strengthen the entire community.

CONSENT AGENDA

- Approval of Minutes of Council meeting of August 14, 2017

Dublin City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission
Joint Work Session
Monday, April 17, 2017
Minutes of Meeting

Mayor Peterson called the Monday, April 17, 2017 Dublin City Council-Planning and Zoning Commission Joint Work Session to order at 6:00 p.m. at Dublin City Hall.

Council Members present were: Mr. Keenan, Mr. Lecklider, Ms. Amorose Groomes, Mayor Peterson, Ms. Salay, Vice Mayor Reiner and Ms. Alutto.

Planning and Zoning Commissioners present: Ms. Newell, Mr. Brown, Mr. Miller, Mr. Stidhem, Ms. DeRosa, and Ms. Mitchell.

Staff members present: Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Crandall, Ms. Readler, Mr. Papsidero, Ms. Husak, Ms. Rauch, Ms. Puranik, Ms. Gilger, Ms. Ray, Mr. Gracia, Mr. Earman, Ms. Richison and Ms. Burness.

Mr. McDaniel stated that because tonight's work session focuses on Planning-related items, Mr. Papsidero will guide the discussion.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the discussion will focus on four projects. The objective is to obtain Council's input and ensure that the projects are proceeding in the desired direction – particularly for the zoning projects because there are a few new components on which Council's feedback is desired. Those projects are:

1. West Bridge Street Framework Plan
Because this is a part of the Bridge Street District that impacts adjacent neighborhoods, significant public input has been obtained. A preliminary development concept will be shared tonight.
2. West Innovation District Zoning
This project relates to minor tweaks to the zoning that is already in place, which reflect the work to date on the West Innovation District Plan update. Council has seen much of the update previously. Tonight's presentation is an interpretation of that work in terms of recommended Code changes.
3. Metro-Blazer District Zoning
The City has been undertaking a significant amount of work in this district over the last three years, looking at Legacy Office developments and understanding the role of Planning on the marketplace. Some shifts may be necessary in order to ensure that area remains a very vital part of the City. A new zoning approach is proposed for that area, which is based on what has been learned to date with the West Innovation District.
4. Bridge Street District Zoning
This Code update was initiated six months ago. It has involved a significant amount of stakeholder interviews. With the consultant, they have looked at ways in which to improve that District both in terms of process and Code standards; these improvements are based upon experience over the last few years with project review and approvals.

The goal with all the projects is to ensure more consistency in the Code and process and the development of design guidelines for each of these areas. The intent is to better communicate the City's expectations to the development community, ensure that applications the City receives reflect the City and the public's values, and identify what the City sees as most important about

- **METRO-BLAZER DISTRICT ZONING**

Elizabeth Fields, McBride Dale Clarion, presented an overview. The major difference between the West Innovation (WID) and Metro-Blazer District is that the majority of the WID is undeveloped area, and new development is being proposed. With Metro-Blazer, the intent is to retrofit existing development and make it more competitive. Another firm has been retained to handle the land use plan for this project, and Jason Sudy with Side Street Planning is present. His firm is working on the Dublin corporate area master plan for this district. The zoning will be the implementation tool for that land use plan.

Goals for the Metro-Blazer Plan update are:

- Development regulations that coincide with the plan update and allow for redevelopment and new development that aligns with the City's vision for the Metro-Blazer district.
- A clear, concise, and user-friendly set of regulations that identifies the standards and guidelines that apply to development within the District.
- Clear distinction between the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, Zoning Code, and Design Guidelines.

The plan will focus on the overall design principles, goals and objectives for the District. The zoning code will focus on the non-discretionary and quantitative standards (uses, setback, development standards, process). The design guidelines will focus on discretionary guidelines that will concentrate on the character of both the overall District and the individual buildings.

Current Zoning/Proposed Zoning:

- The existing zoning for this District is a mix of: Restricted Suburban Residential; Suburban Office and Institutional; Community Commercial; Tech Flex; Office, Laboratory and Research; Planned Unit Development; and BSD-Commercial. Much of the District is Planned Development.
- A draft land use plan has been proposed for new districts. The Tech Flex and Bridge Street Districts would remain. Four new districts are proposed: Metro/Blazer; Emerald; Tuttle/Rings North; and Tuttle/Rings South. The Land Use Area Plans will describe the City's intent for each of those four areas.
- The Code update will be the implementation tool for the Land Use Study. Rezoning this study area from the existing zoning districts to an overall Metro-Blazer zoning district will be a similar tool to the existing West Innovation districts. The Metro-Blazer districts will have their own list of Permitted Uses and Standards. The current proposal is to leave the existing PUDS as is, but the owners will have the discretion to re-develop to the existing plan development standards or develop under the new zoning standards. The plan allows them that flexibility. Minor changes would probably occur according to current standards, but a complete redevelopment would follow the new regulations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if percentages have been assigned related degrees of modifications.

Ms. Fields responded that has not yet been discussed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that this is different and probably easier than the Bridge Street redevelopment.

Mr. Papsidero stated that they would be looking at that. They were trying to follow the Bridge Street model.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it created some difficulties for property owners wanting to make modifications.

Ms. Fields stated that the intent is to provide incentives for property owners to follow the new regulations. Those details will be worked out.

The approval process in the Metro-Blazer District would replicate that in the West Innovation District. The Code sections would be organized in the same manner, focusing on measurable standards. There would be unique uses and standards for each of the four subareas. The design guidelines would focus on the look, feel and character items.

The Major Changes Proposed are:

- New zoning districts for the Metro-Blazer district that are allow for more development options than what currently is permitted
- Existing PUDs will be able to continue under their current regulations or develop under the new regulations
- Defined criteria for "Kick-up" provision
- Similar process and development standards to WID

The Next Steps are:

- Finalize Dublin Corporate Area Plan - review and approval by Fall 2017
- Public outreach for the zoning
- Draft zoning changes for review by staff and PZC with approval by City Council
- Area rezoning process following the Code adoption

Council/PZC Questions:

Ms. Salay referred to the football-shaped piece of land at the corner of Woerner-Temple, Rings Road and Emerald Parkway -- Emerald Town Center is located there. Could that Town Center be removed from the Emerald District? The neighborhood fought hard for that town center, and it is working well, at this point. On behalf of those neighborhoods, she does not want to have to go back to the drawing board with that. When that section of Emerald Parkway (Thomas Kohler) developed, the intent was for a 10-pump gas station and UDF on the corner, where the Chinese restaurant current sits. The neighborhood strongly objected, and the UDF project was eliminated. She prefers to remove that section from the Emerald District and make it part of the neighborhood.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that her rezoning and process comments remain the same as on the previous plan.

Mr. Reiner inquired if there is a master plan that addresses some areas separately. In addition, the landscaping and streetscape in this area has declined over the years. It was done in the 1980s and needs to be refreshed.

Ms. Fields responded that the Dublin Corporate Plan on which Mr. Sudy's group is working will have concept plans for individual areas and address the mix of uses and landscaping. Council will have the opportunity to review those concept plans. She will not begin to work on the zoning code until Council has worked out the details of the concept plans in the Land Use Plan, including the ultimate goals, uses, setbacks, building heights, etc. desired in this area.

Mr. Reiner stated that developers will want to know which areas are still open to them. That should facilitate more rapid development in this District.

Ms. Salay stated that all three of these plans provide for a significant public process. She would like to have a copy of the public feedback that is received, so Council can be aware of the neighborhoods' perspectives on the proposed changes.

Mr. Papsidero responded that a detailed copy of the input would be provided to Council.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if staff input were needed on the conceptual concepts.

Mr. Papsidero responded that it is not. The question tonight is if this is an approach on which staff should continue to work. The details will be addressed at a later date.

- **BRIDGE STREET DISTRICT ZONING**

Donald L. Elliott, Clarion Associates, stated that:

1. ~~Their team has written codes for many communities around the country, and most codes are hybrids. The Bridge Street Code is a success, not a failure; it was just difficult to do. Much development actually has happened here in the five years this Code has been in place. The amount of walkable, sustainable, urban development that has occurred within this adopted framework is unusual to find. There are now many buildings in place.~~
2. ~~When the Bridge Street Code was developed, it followed a technical approach to form-based codes. That turned out to be a poor fit for Dublin, and there have been attempts to change the programmatic approach to make it work better for this community. With five years of experience, there is the ability to evaluate and update the Code, and Council has asked them to do so.~~

Clarion's contract had three tasks:

1. ~~Identify why the sign regulations were problematic for existing development. Those findings have been finalized and approved by Council. The change permits improvements or changes in existing buildings to continue under the previous signage requirements. Only a new building developed under the new code need follow new sign guidelines.~~
2. ~~Determine if the Historic Core protections are sufficiently strong or if changes are needed. That review is being conducted by Leslie Oberholtzer, their technical form-based code specialist.~~
3. ~~Provide general updates to simplify the review process, provide greater flexibility and design guidelines.~~

~~Since last fall, work on general updates has been underway, working with stakeholders and the public. Many interviews have been conducted with builders and developers who have invested or tried to invest in the Bridge Street area. They have found that there are substantive challenges with the Bridge Street Code and there are process challenges.~~

Substantive challenges were: (1) the Code's Building Design Standards lacked flexibility and created monotony; (2) some of the Site Development Standards inhibited good design; and (3) some don't work for existing buildings/development. One of the key changes is to re-visit the applicability thresholds.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Conditional Use with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

3. Avery Road CrossFit 16-110CU

5725 Avery Road Conditional Use

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for an indoor recreational facility within an existing building in the Technology Flex District. She said the site is on the west side of Avery Road, approximately 710 feet south of the intersection with Woerner-Temple Road. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown motioned, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the Conditional Use with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to provide the one loading space required by the Code to be verified at permitting.

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

Planning Items

Vincent Papsidero said there are three current projects interrelated that include the West Innovation District, Metro-Blazer area, and the Bridge Street District. He said plans are in place to update the first two areas just mentioned. He said staff does not intend to update the plan in the BSD but in each area they are updating the Code and developing Design Guidelines.

Mr. Papsidero presented a map highlighting the three areas as well as the overriding intent of Code versus Design Guidelines:

- Code and process improvements (Code)
 - Focus on dimensional standards + “absolutes”
 - Consistency among review steps and application requirements
 - Process improvements that do not compromise outcomes
- Strong emphasis on outcomes (Design Guidelines)
 - Emphasize creativity and originality in urban design consistent with City values and expectations
 - Avoid monotonous outcomes
 - Guidelines to focus on intent (do this/don’t do that)
 - Answers the applicant’s question “what do you want from us?”

Bob Miller said most of what Mr. Papsidero just said is extremely logical. He asked if Mr. Papsidero sees a risk with these changes. Mr. Papsidero answered he does not see a risk. He explained he has written and used guidelines in other communities of Columbus with quite a bit of success. He indicated Design Guidelines will provide more leverage than what a Code in some cases.

Mr. Papsidero presented qualities of effective Code language:

- Language should be clear
- Easily interpreted (as “black and white” as possible)
- Measurable and dimension able
- Objective and not subjective
- Legally defensible

Mr. Papsidero included a good example:

“Lots shall be a minimum of 60 feet in width at the public right-of-way.”

Mr. Papsidero alternatively provided poor examples of Code language as they are too subjective:

- “forward looking”
- “thoughtfully designed”
- “intentional and carefully thought through”
- “unique and diverse”
- “look and feel”
- “design expression is of a modern application”

Mr. Papsidero said the above comments are excellent examples of Design Guideline language.

Chris Brown said the Design Guideline language examples are very subjective and he questions what is enforceable. He said when someone brings forward a great looking project, no matter the transparency percentage or primary/secondary materials for example, the Commission looks at it and states “Wow, that’s nice” or “oh, that looks bad”.

Mr. Papsidero said the Commission’s role is to represent the community’s values and merge them with the technical piece. He said subjective language in Design Guidelines is enforceable, if adopted by Council after the Commission’s recommendation and linked by Code to the actual development steps in the process.

Steve Stidhem said this is an opportunity to be forward looking, to consider more renewable energy options, and add to the Code. He said there is a lot of material written on the impact of self-driven cars in city planning. He indicated there may be more cars or could be less cars, we do not really know. But we do know there will be less parking requirements near where people are actually doing their work. He asked to be very specific about the language.

Mr. Papsidero said language for this topic could be specific but for subjects that are in an early stage like autonomous vehicles; that is a perfect topic for Design Guidelines. He indicated we could state that an area designed for a garage now could be at least partially converted to other uses in the future. He suggested this should not be mandated in the Code but a lot of guidance could be provided.

Mr. Stidhem agreed for the subject of autonomous vehicles but for renewable energy (solar power or windows) that could be stated in the Code. Mr. Papsidero said that subject matter is very detailed and Planning would probably do that as a separate project or add-on because that gets into a lot of requirements to think through as a community. He used turbines on a single-family lot, as an example. He said that would become a community dialogue under the direction of Council.

Mr. Papsidero said as a Code standpoint, the following topics would be addressed:

- Land Uses
 - Dimensional standards
 - Height
 - Setback
 - Density/Intensity (du/ac, sf/ac, FAR)
 - Parking and loading
 - Landscaping/open space quantities
- Process
 - ART + PZC/ARB + Council
 - Administrative approvals
 - Provides legal justification for applying Design Guidelines

Mr. Papsidero explained Design Guidelines are:

- Explanatory in nature
- Provide insight into acceptable ways of meeting Code requirements and City values, expectations (as defined in policy)
- More subjective, less objective
- Illustrative (do this, don't do that)
- Implemented by staff (report and recommendation) and Boards/Commissions (analysis and decision)

Mr. Stidhem asked if cell towers are considered as 4G capability moves to 5G. Mr. Papsidero said the state has determined that the City has no authority over the regulation of these new cell towers. Mr. Stidhem asked if we could insert fiber optic connectivity into the Code. Mr. Papsidero said that might be included in the Building Code. He indicated we would need to determine where it would fit from a regulatory standpoint. Mr. Stidhem said in anticipation of what could be to come, that sort of thing is inexpensive to incorporate while construction is going on versus retro fitting it later.

Mr. Papsidero said staff is looking for a strong dialogue with the Commission as we work through this.

Mr. Papsidero presented pictures of Design Guidelines from different places around the country that include the guideline language to illustrate the goal. He said as we work through these specific issues, we can be as detailed as we need to be to provide additional guidance.

Mr. Papsidero said guidelines support policies; they focus on outcomes such as architecture and materials; site design; landscaping/open space design; and signs. He said they provide examples of best practices and would need to be adopted by Council.

Amy Salay said they went through years of the PZC process from staff level to PZC and Council to negotiate this PUD back and forth. She said it was so fine-tuned and so negotiated they were criticized by the development community for making it impossible to work with. Now, she said we have adopted a form-based Code with intent in other areas like the WID to be more user-friendly from a developer's standpoint. She said now we have come to this most recent proposal, which she likes the pattern book, more illustrations, and explaining what we want, to enable the professionals in the development community do their work. She asked how we keep from falling back into everything by negotiation.

Mr. Papsidero said by doing these Design Guidelines, walking in the door, the developers will have a clear picture of what the City's expectations are. He said it would be up to staff and the Commission to be consistent with those guidelines. He said now, the developers get hearsay and talk from clients or

competitors to gain their feedback about their experiences with the City of Dublin's process. With BSD in particular, he said the form-based Code is a hybrid. He said we are suggesting to streamline the process by limiting the ART to just the really minor approvals and go back to the traditional process where staff creates and presents the report to the Commission and the Commission then deals with the applicants directly. He said the ART has been an additional step to jump through and does not add much to the process. At the same time, he indicated staff wants to streamline the submittal requirements and go back to a simpler system. He said they want to take some of the standards in the BSD and turn them into guidelines so staff is spending less time as accountants, measuring transparency and all other items, which at the ground level is important. He said we might want to have a minimum standard for the ground floor and maybe use a broader goal for the upper stories. He noted a hotel would be very transparent whereas an apartment building would be less transparent because privacy is needed for the units. He said measuring 63% when 65% is the standard does not help anything. He said staff wants to talk to Council about the mandatory Basic Plan going to Council first and then being recommended down. He said now we do Informal Reviews at different levels and applicants are bouncing around quite a bit, negotiating three, four, and five times. He said investors are using that against the City when it comes to Economic Development.

In summary, Mr. Papsidero said a Plan establishes policy foundation and community expectations. He said Design Guidelines explain how to accomplish community expectations and provide a bridge between policy and Code. He said Code establishes regulatory controls and process, and dimensional standards such as bulk, mass, and height, etc.

To be more specific, Mr. Papsidero said for the West Innovation District:

- Building upon updated concept approved by Council
 - Plan update
 - Code update to reflect changes in geography, policy
 - ✓ Sub-district boundaries will be modified (uses + standards)
 - ✓ OU Master Plan incorporated by reference
 - ✓ No process changes expected (With the ART, there is a kick-up provision to the PZC we would like more specific as this could impact adjacent neighborhoods, especially in Metro-Blazer area. We would like this mandated instead of discretionary)
 - Design Guidelines created
 - ✓ Consolidates material from existing Code and Plan
 - ✓ Builds upon new concept
 - ✓ New material

Mr. Papsidero presented a map of the new sub-districts in the WID.

Mr. Papsidero said for the Metro-Blazer area:

- Dublin Corporate Area Plan
 - Issues/goals completed (phase one)
 - Draft plan nearing completion (phase two)
- Code update to be initiated, building upon WID process
 - Consistent with WID
 - Comprehensive rezoning
- Design Guidelines to be initiated
 - Special focus on parking lot landscaping/screening
 - Infill/redevelopment

Mr. Papsidero presented a map of the Metro-Blazer area to be rezoned, built upon the WID approach. He indicated this would streamline reinvestment. He suggested the surrounding property owners would be

supportive. He reported this area has not been competitive because of a lack of amenities, the aging of the buildings, and inefficient parking lot layouts.

Mr. Papsidero said for the BSD:

- No changes to plan
- Code update initiated, significant engagement with stakeholders, users
- Code and process to be simplified
 - Reduce number of approval steps
 - Reduce role of ART
- Design Guidelines to be prepared
 - Move some standards to guidelines

Mr. Papsidero presented a map of the BSD and said the next steps are:

- PZC to review draft material between now and April
- Council-PZC joint workshop in April
- Revisions will be made following the workshop
- Adoption

Cathy De Rosa said since the Code changes require Council's approval, she asked what happens to the Design Guidelines changes. Mr. Papsidero answered it would be the same process for both. She then asked what the approach would be for changing illustrations. He answered staff would want input from Council.

Mr. Papsidero said the intent is to write the Design Guidelines separately for each of these three areas but in fact a certain percentage would apply across the board. He said future chapters could then get more specific on solar or other issues that are not ready to be addressed now. He said the final would be one book as opposed to three.

Ms. De Rosa said with visuals (like with sign designs) a picture is worth a thousand words. She said 'they know it when they see it'. She suggested being able to be flexible and add more pictures as we find great examples as they arise without making the process terribly onerous. She indicated that helps applicants.

Mr. Papsidero indicated staff would like to eventually address Parking, outdated Land Use Designations, and issues within the Sign Code.

Mr. Brown asked if there are inspirational pictures, something totally unique that does not fit illustrative criteria that could be provided to the public to assist with the library design. Mr. Papsidero encouraged the Commission to share pictures worth promoting with staff that they have found remarkable through their travels.

Mr. Papsidero said staff has completed two Kaizen events that facilitated the application intake process and the internal case review process. He said this has resulted in creating more efficient processes. He said staff is also in the process of reformatting all the Planning Reports to make them more consistent and less redundant and more valuable to the Boards, Commission, and Council.

Claudia Husak asked the Commission to alert staff by sending an email if there is information they would like to see that is not incorporated currently, or need to see more/less of.

Victoria Newell suggested including existing site photographs into the Planning Reports, even though most of the Commissioners visit the sites as well. She explained it is helpful to have pictures while

reading the report. Ms. Husak said having an electronic format makes that easy because then quality is not lost that may be lost when printed.

Communications

~~Claudia Husak said staff is seriously considering cancelling the first Commission meeting in February and place the focus on the second meeting on the 16th.~~

~~Ms. Husak said the National Planning Conference in New York City, NY is scheduled for May 5 – 9, 2017. She said registration starts in early February but hotels are filling up quickly. She recommended interested members contact Flora Rogers for hotel accommodations in the next two weeks.~~

~~The Chair indicated Leadership Dublin attended the full meeting this evening and adjourned the meeting at 7:24 pm.~~

~~As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on March 2, 2017.~~

- 1) ~~That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.~~

~~The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes.
(Approved 4 – 0)~~

Planning Items

Vincent Papsidero said the following Long Range Planning project updates would be presented:

- Dublin Corporate Area Plan
- Historic and Cultural Assessment
- Shier Rings Roadway Corridor Character Study
- Mobility Study (Introduction)
- W. Bridge Street Framework Study

Dublin Corporate Area Plan was presented by Devayani Puranik.

Ms. Puranik explained this was previously known as Metro-Blazer-Emerald-Frantz. She said this is a brand new planning process initiated to review the legacy office development within the City. She presented a map that defined the ±1,000-acre area. She explained the northern boundary is SR 161, the eastern boundary is Frantz Road including offices located east of Frantz Road, the southern boundary is Dublin's Corporate boundary, and the western boundary is Emerald Parkway. She showed the study area within the context with the City of Dublin.

Ms. Puranik presented a map showing Dublin's seven business districts. She said the Bridge Street District is located to the east with development standards that cater to mixed-use development. She said the West Innovation District located to the west caters to research and development facilities and institutional facilities like Ohio University, whereas Metro Blazer and Emerald Districts focus mainly on technological jobs including Dublin's Entrepreneurial Center. While the study area houses several technology oriented jobs, she said the built environment is outdated.

Ms. Puranik presented the map highlighting the Metro-Blazer-Emerald-Frantz area. She explained existing zoning in the area is very diverse with inconsistent development standards making this area somewhat less attractive for location of new businesses and development. She said some of the specific issues include:

- Diversity of Zoning Districts including PUDs
- Varying Development Standards
- Outdated Built Environment
- Lack of Amenities
- Overgrown Landscaping
- Underutilized Prime Land

Steve Stidhem asked if any new construction is planned for this area. Ms. Puranik answered there is not a huge amount but based on their market research, there are great opportunities.

Mr. Papsidero said Economic Development Staff have found challenges in the marketability of some of the older properties.

Ms. Puranik said some of the land that is used for stormwater management ponds within the Upper Metro Center represents prime land approximately five acres in size.

Ms. Puranik said the purpose of the Plan is to understand the shifting office and employment demographics and its effects on old suburban office parks in this very competitive market. She explained

approximately 87% of Dublin's office inventory was built in the 70s, 80s, and 90s and approximately 12% of that space is currently vacant. She said several factors have contributed to the vacancy rates:

- Lower parking ratios
- Lack of walkable amenities
- Building age
- Visibility/Wayfinding
- Lack of public transit
- Lack of sustainable practices to gain maximum benefits of the land
- Location
- Floor plate size and building size
- Lack of basic curb appeal

Ms. Puranik presented a chart that showed the percentage of total office square feet built in Dublin by decade and noted 80% of the office space (almost 7 million square feet) is between 17 and 45 years old. She presented a map to show where the specific development occurred by decade.

Ms. Puranik reported that through discussions with developers, business owners, tenants, and others trying to locate in Dublin, two contradicting factors emerged:

1. A shift in the perceived and actual parking demand - a much higher employee per square foot ratio; and
2. Increasing employee desire for nearby convenience and entertainment amenities, ideally within a walking distance.

Mr. Stidhem said he had hoped Home2Hotel would offer public services. Deborah Mitchell said there is not even a coffee bar in there. Cathy De Rosa noted the only other restaurant in the area is Max & Erma's.

Ms. Puranik said a public workshop is planned where they plan to display these market research maps.

Ms. Mitchell asked if this came from focus groups or surveys. Ms. Puranik said the Economic Development Division speaks often with businesses and there was a stakeholder meeting held in December of last year, which included 35 people.

Ms. Mitchell explained she asked because she has an office in the area and when she tries to get more food trucks to come due to the lack of restaurants, it is hard to get people to come out to the trucks. She said it seems people say they want to have restaurants within walking distance but they all end up driving.

Ms. Puranik said part of it might be that the offices are surrounded by huge parking lots so just getting from the door of their office to a site is challenging. She said 600 feet seems to be the magic number for an accepted walking distance.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the parking ratio. Ms. Puranik explained the current Code requires 4 parking spaces per every 1,000 square feet of office space. She said companies are asking for 7 parking spaces per 1,000. She said companies are trying to fit more employees into smaller office areas.

Mr. Papsidero said trying to accommodate more parking comes into conflict with the landscaping requirements so staff is looking at ways to creatively meet that Code.

Victoria Newell said she likes to walk at lunch and a lot of people in her office park walk.

Tammy Noble said people might not be going to a certain location even if an amenity is provided because of how the space feels. She indicated they may not feel safe or have a place to sit and really enjoy the experience.

Ms. Newell said little plazas are inviting and they can accommodate music on certain days to entertain people.

Mr. Stidhem said he likes the idea of food trucks as long as there is a place to go eat the food. He indicated that he sees the demand for parking diminishing over the next 10 years and so he is hesitant if someone is proposing a parking garage.

Ms. Puranik said staff is studying both short and long term approaches. She said as Phase 1, they are focused on parking as companies are leaving (Nationwide as an example). She said the process for Phase II will include:

- Development strategies
- Site retrofit strategies
- Capitalization on market opportunities
- Detailed Code updates
- Frantz Road Corridor (streetscape and design)

Mr. Stidhem asked if there were specific plans for significantly updating Frantz Road. Mr. Papsidero said currently there is a design study underway for that intersection. He said a new planting scheme for the median could be an option as trees have struggled to thrive there.

Ms. Puranik said the first public workshop is scheduled for August 31, 2016, at IGS Energy but it will also be posted online. She said for the next couple of months, staff will work on the physical development concepts and the zoning and development standards. She indicated the second public workshop will be in October so the plan adoption process should be in December – January. Mr. Papsidero added that in addition to the public workshops, Staff is reaching out to all the neighborhoods to the east of Frantz Road to engage the residential community along with the business community.

Ms. De Rosa asked if there are examples presented in these workshops of other communities that are doing this well. She said every suburb in America is having this same discussion. Ms. Puranik said the consultants working with staff have experience nationwide.

Historic and Cultural Assessment was presented by JM Rayburn.

Mr. Rayburn presented the Study Area Grid that encompasses the City of Dublin as well as townships in surrounding areas that included ±860 structures that were surveyed. He stated the purpose of the project is to create an inventory of historic properties and assets within the City of Dublin, which will include an assessment of whether the buildings and assets are contributing or non-contributing to the historic character of the City of Dublin. He said the assessment will also help identify funding strategies for historic preservation efforts for property owners. He said additional tasks may include assistance with an update to the existing *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Rayburn said to engage the public they have focused on stakeholder interviews with members of the community and he presented a list.

Mr. Rayburn said the architectural survey was completed August 4, 2016, and highlighted some of the initial findings. He said the next steps will include a complete landscape/archaeological portion including mill ruins, quarries, cemeteries, stone walls, and recorded archaeological sites. He said staff will finalize data for the GIS layers and the consultant will complete the final report. He said they will compile a list of