

**DUBLIN CITY COUNCIL
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 28, 2022 – 5:00 p.m.
5555 Perimeter Drive**

Council Chamber

Meeting Minutes

Mr. Keeler called the September 28, 2022 Community Development Committee meeting to order at 5:09 p.m.

Members present: Mr. Keeler and Ms. Amorose Groomes. Mr. Reiner arrived at 5:23 p.m.

Staff present: Mr. Ranc, Mr. Earman, Ms. Goliver, Ms. Rauch, Ms. Willis, Mr. Krawetzki

Minutes of the June 21, 2022 Meeting

Ms. Amorose Groomes moved to approve the minutes of the June 21, 2022 CDC meeting.

Mr. Keeler seconded the motion.

Vote: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes

West Bridge Street/161 Streetscape Enhancements/Shared Use Path Project

Mr. Earman provided an overview of the project including background. The project was initiated in 2017 from the Community Development Committee and is scheduled for construction in 2023 with a budgeted amount of \$675,000. The shared use path on this section completes the pedestrian and bicycle network between Frantz Road and Historic Dublin. It provides connectivity on the western Bridge Street District. He shared design challenges. Most of the section is in the Ohio Department of Transportation's (ODOT) limited access right of way. Concept plans have been submitted to ODOT for preliminary review. It is a recessed stormwater ditch system currently. It will encroach CASTO property to the south creating the need to work with that developer as well. CASTO is verbally supportive of the retaining wall needed to support the shared use path as long as the parking lot footprint and signage do not have to change. Final design will require approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). The preliminary design is without review and approval from multiple entities. This is a concept design at this point. (Existing condition images were displayed). This area is in need of improvement and offers many challenges (slope, ditch, utility lines, vegetation).

Mr. Krawetzki spoke about a preliminary landscape plan. Shared use paths are 8 feet wide. We want to bring those up to the level of the roadway. That brings in fill and

grading considerations. The entire parking lot area drains to the existing drain. That parking lot as well as the south lanes of Bridge Street drain down to that pipe so that stormwater will have to be managed some way. The project includes getting a wall built to support the path, dealing with stormwater, and making a structure that is safer than a pipe sticking out of hillside. The enhanced landscape is more of a replacement of what has to be removed in order to create the grading.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that her concern was not about the plant materials selected but was the location of the retaining wall. She understanding that there are limitations. It appears that the wall is closer to the road and plantings are taking place on the downside. She asked if it would be possible to put the retaining wall on the easement and relocate plantings to the high side adjacent to the sidewalk. She is thinking that the wall will be a poured concrete, reinforced, 12-inch retaining wall. The entire snow load is placed in this area creating stormwater nightmares. Getting something to grow there will be very challenging. She suggested pouring a wall closer to the parking lot and planting on the high side and on the low side, installing drain tile and a catch basin and tying that into the existing exit body. She does not have interest in planting adjacent to the parking lots.

Mr. Keeler stated that he envisioned what Ms. Amorose Groomes described. It seems that it would be more attractive from the street. He could make an argument that increasing walkability improves the outcome for tenants in that mall. Encouraging walkability is a good thing. That parking lot is seldom full. He asked what CASTO is open to. He agrees with Ms. Amorose Groomes. It would make more sense to elevate. He ODOT is in agreement with the distance between the shared use path and the street. Mr. Krawetzki stated it is a maximum of 12 feet from the edge of pavement. There is a shoulder there so the shared use path comes back a good amount. There are existing lights and ground boxes that had to be avoided with the path. As far as moving the wall, one of the constraints is the existing pipe. It is coming across to Indian Run at a specific slope and if the intercept is moved up, it would be raised above the parking lot. Mr. Keeler stated that if the pipe is flush with parking lot so water flows into the pipe, a screen could be placed over that opening build the retaining wall around it so the pipe is not being altered. Mr. Krawetzki that the wall section would have to cross over the pipe. It could probably be done. Staff also needs to talk with ODOT because currently the shared use path becomes a recovery zone that improves the condition today. They are really hung up on plants being in that zone. Staff is pushing back on that. With regard to plants on the downside, we are grading up to the wall because we do not want the wall being more than 30" exposed on the parking lot side because we do not want to put a handrail there. The soil is being ramped up so water coming off the parking lot will go into the pipe.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that staff can do 30 inches of planting or a handrail. If the wall could be further back, planting could be on the high side of the wall. This is becoming quite a valuable piece of land and if it were to redevelop, the first thing they would be told would be that they would have to make connectivity. At that point, this

path would be their financial responsibility. The fact that the City is willing to do it for them has to be a huge savings. The fact that they would now be compliant in terms of pedestrian connectivity when they are ready to redevelop should be a good bargaining chip. Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested planting groundcover on the low side of wall. Mr. Krawetzki stated that the wall will likely be a limestone (natural stone facing). Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that cut limestone walls do not perform well for retaining. She envisioned a taller wall. Mr. Earman stated that staff understands the guidance and can further refine. CASTO is interested in the project. The investment of City dollars to advance any project they would do is a great point. Mr. Krawetzki stated that they have been very receptive on connectivity. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it may be nice to have a stairway at some point in that wall. Mr. Krawetzki stated that closer to McDonald's the grades come up enough that a stairwell may not be necessary. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that eventually this will redevelop and all of the plantings on the low side would be lost.

Mr. Reiner asked if redevelopment of the center has been discussed. Ms. Rauch responded that she is not aware of any movement on that. Staff does want the conditions set up so that it all seamlessly fits into the vision for Bridge Street. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it is so wet where the plantings are indicated on the plans, she does not think anything would grow well there. Salt runoff is also a concern along with the constant moisture.

Mr. Earman stated that staff will continue conversations, further develop the plan, and bring it back to the Committee.

Residential Development Standards

Ms. Rauch provided an overview neighborhood design guidelines. The goal was to take information from conversations with City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission regarding single-family residential and come up with ways to help guide development projects as they come forward to the City and to help facilitate conversations with developers. Staff was before City Council in April to present the initial structure for the guidelines. Since that time, the project has been organized into this graphic design document.

Ms. Rauch stated that the priority areas of concern. She stated that the biggest conversations have been regarding open space and how that is being accommodated. It should be intentional part of a neighborhood and not leftover space. They also looked at density and intensity of lots. Streetscape is a focused part of this including the orienting homes, how garage doors are addressed, diversity of architectural materials, etc. Individual lot standards covers conversations that have been had about side yards and rear yards and what the buildable area looks like.

The goal of the guidelines is to provide a supplement to the Zoning Code and Conservation Design Standards to help promote high quality single-family residential development. The structure of the guidelines is a three-level hierarchy from broad to specific: public realm (macro), public realm (micro), and private realm. The draft

document in the packet is broken down with much more information with what falls into each of the realms.

Ms. Rauch shared that the guidelines state that Conservation Design principles shall be incorporated on appropriate sites - larger sites with significant natural features. As part of a Concept Plan, staff has the ability to work with the applicant to make a determination about how conservation design is incorporated.

Mr. Reiner stated developers may skip over the conservation design because in reading this, it is interesting but it is not really conservation design. Conservation design was proposed by the City in 1998. It was explained to developers as the least expensive way to develop. He is not sure these guidelines encapsulate that idea. Conservation design is where there several acres of forest and houses are placed in pods around the forest, protecting it. Dublin proposed that there is no curbs. There are cost savings in developing in this manner that entices developers. It provides more interesting project. This document is missing conservation design. Ms. Rauch stated that conservation design is not applicable in every instance. Staff is proposing looking at open space framework and how to provide a larger framework of open space so it is not just leftover land. Mr. Reiner stated that this needs to include why someone would do this.

Ms. Rauch stated that the goal is when a development comes forward, they are providing the open space framework. The prioritization of natural historic features and making sure open spaces are distributed equitably throughout neighborhood is an additional goal. Mr. Reiner stated that conservation design removes the tree replacement cycle as well. Ms. Rauch stated that the topic of stormwater was one raised by Council. Retention basins should be amenities and how/whether they are counted toward open space requirements still needs decided.

Mr. Keeler stated that developers want to pack as many houses into a neighborhood as possible and they want to do with the cheapest materials. They might be surprised at return on investment if they used better materials and laid it out in a more creative way. They could then charge more. We need to decide what we want instead of developers deciding what they want. Mr. Keeler stated that he does not necessarily want any additional single family housing in Dublin because it does not generate income to support the services required. He would rather push for larger lot sizes, more creative design, and more green space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what the problem is that we are trying to solve. She asked if this came out of the work session with boards and commissions. Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively and stated that much of this was sparked from the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) having concerns about seeing variances on individual lots being maxed out. There was a lot of discussion about how to make ensure the character and quality are what Dublin wants. Staff is considering how to influence this in a meaningful way. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that when we try to manage by code, we end up

incentivizing things we did not mean to incentivize. When looking at these objectives (unique neighborhoods, preservation of natural character, strategically sited open spaces, etc.), that is the job of staff and boards and commissions. She thinks Code speaks that this is the desire of all the things we want. It may be more difficult to push back because Dublin got a bad reputation for being difficult to work with. She thinks we should wear those as badges of honor and not insults. She does not know how we would write a code that is significantly different than the code we have that would yield significantly different results. Open space has to be in right spot if 75% of homes are adjacent to it. Ms. Rauch stated that it comes down to how to be clearer to applicants. The Zoning Code in some instances, does not have a lot to push people to bring the character quality part. Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested identifying the City's exposure of straight zoning districts and possibly pursuing rezonings in those areas. That would be consistent with the Community Plan. Submittal of open space is a conversation. Not every site is conducive to conservation design. Dublin has prioritized natural and cultural features in two ways: tree removal fees and landmark tree program. She referenced stormwater basins being amenities and stated that Dublin typically does not go for dry basins because they are never dry. Ms. Rauch stated that staff does not disagree. Her impression was that expectations were not being met. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that this seems like an exercise in education. In her career, writing code is one of the most difficult things to do. There probably are some tweaks that could be made but this feels like an education problem.

Mr. Reiner stated that when we originally came up with the conservation zone, the idea was that it would be mandated. Developers were invited into a room and introduced to the idea. They did not want to do it and did not understand it. They understood traditional developments. Is it staff's job to educate developers regarding the desired formats?

Mr. Keeler stated that he does not understand why we could not create conservation zones. It seems reasonable to him. It seemed like no one was enamored with the Hyland Croy development. We have a code, developments fit in the code, but we did not like the result so it seems like something has to change. From a developer's standpoint, other communities have told them that they can not do certain things because it is not in the Code. Things we want or do not want should be codified. Wet basins are not an amenity but they serve utilitarian purpose. When we created the matching grant, the idea was to make it work, not make it pretty. He agrees with Ms. Amorose Groomes in that he does not mind pushing back. He does disagree with the one comment regarding forcing a developer to allocate other usable property versus floodplain. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it is about location.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked staff for their input. Ms. Rauch responded that is where what we are trying to accomplish with this process. When an applicant comes forward with a planned unit development, that is a more negotiable process. Developers are

much more savvy about mandates. Staff is trying to keep this out of a major code amendment with guidelines that would support the code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for real life examples of areas where staff is having difficulty enforcing high standards. Ms. Rauch shared that hypothetically, they have a proposal that has come forward where tree preservation is required but there is also a density maximum. They are under the density requirement but that does not get to the character of the project. So staff is asking how do we help articulate what a good neighborhood looks like and how to lay out clearly to developers the minimum standards for a quality of development.

Mr. Reiner asked about conservation design with a reluctant developer and a possible negative recommendation. Ms. Rauch stated that she is not opposed to making recommendations for disapproval. Conservation design is not a codified requirement and staff cannot require that. Mr. Reiner asked how Council can give staff that power. Ms. Rauch stated that is where she thought staff was going with these guidelines and making that clear. If the Committee does not think guidelines are enough, they can discuss more. Staff does want it to be so prescriptive that it limits creativity. They are trying to provide some benchmarking around what they see as pain points. Mr. Reiner stated that he thinks it would be fair to tell a developer up front that their project does not fit Dublin. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that there may be only 4 or 5 properties that would be appropriate for conservation design. Ms. Rauch stated that the percentage of area applicable for conservation design is about 7%. It is a finite amount. It does matter and we want to make sure we are being mindful. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that what likely will be seen more are developments the size of Hyland Glen. She suggested possibly adding one thing to Code requiring developments be true to Code and to meet design guidelines and then we work on those guidelines.

Mr. Keeler stated that even if the appropriate land for conservation design is only 7%, we should do it anyway. He agreed that maybe it should have been done 20 years ago but we are here today. Developers can build nicer houses commanding higher prices and have fewer kids in Dublin City Schools.

Ms. Rauch stated some of these things are more appropriately timed with the Community Plan update. Staff will keep moving forward with how they are currently handling development proposals and do a mapping exercise.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that work design guidelines is easier than Code. That also can start addressing highway frontage. A design guideline companion book could be created.

Ms. Rauch stated that this design guideline book is looking at single-family design. The intent is to create what those are with some imagery. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that in her tenure, she has learned how difficult it is to codify a feel. In her mind, the design guidelines handbook would not be more than 4 pages long. It would be vague on purpose so we could work with developers. Every piece of property is different.

Mr. Reiner summarized that staff will locate parcels that are left for conservation design, offer developers the parts of conservation design. The Committee offered consensus that retention/detention areas are not to be considered part of open space. Ms. Rauch stated that staff will map opportunities for conservation design.

Ms. Rauch continued by sharing the guidelines for the public realm – micro level. This level looks at roadway character, front yard design, pedestrian interaction, etc. These are topics that have been discussed and agreed upon but staff is looking to provide more clear guidance.

Mr. Reiner asked about the cadence on street trees. In other municipalities, it seems like theirs is tighter. Dublin might want to tighten up the cadence on street trees. Some neighborhoods do trees on either side of the sidewalk which is really nice. It creates a whole other sense of community. We have too much distance between shade trees. Ms. Rauch stated the currently the cadence is 1 tree every 40 feet for large trees. Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that it depends on the species of tree.

Mr. Reiner referenced garages and stated that they need to be screened. We can allow some amount of green space between garages. There are little things that other neighborhoods have incorporated into text. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that currently, there can only be so many street-facing garages.

Ms. Amorose Groomes referenced language in the guidelines regarding rear-access by alleys. She has never seen an alley that was really well done that she would want to replicate. She would prefer to see a detached garage in the rear of the lot than an alley.

Mr. Keeler stated that for redevelopment, he is open to more density and would be open to alleys. Reflecting on the idea that he wants 20 houses instead 40. It is not Dublin's role to solve every type of housing issue. Empty nesters does not want a huge yard to mow. One of the stakeholders referenced the Edwards neighborhood launch and he could support that. He thinks that there is an application for some Dublin residents.

Mr. Reiner referenced page 27, the Tartan hedges are a nice aesthetic. It is important to put in shade trees. They will continue to carry the neighborhood. He asked how we could do that if we get to a certain density level. Ms. Rauch stated that staff can look into that.

Mr. Reiner referenced the recent development where HVAC units were discussed. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that when density gets high, AC units must go to the rear of the structure. Ms. Rauch noted that was included.

Ms. Rauch stated that staff will go back and look at this from a larger perspective, do some mapping for conservation design, and bring forward revisions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the most important information for her is a list problems staff is having. She requested staff identify Dublin's greatest exposures.

Mr. Reiner asked how fast can the Committee could see something back on the more specific items (mandating screening, closer street tree cadence, uniform hedgerows).

Ms. Rauch stated that requirements would have to be a code update. Staff can have a quicker turnaround on the list of problems. That helps make sure our vision is being

met. Mr. Reiner asked how fast can the amendments can come back to Council. Ms. Rauch stated that staff would need to identify some of the larger pieces and have some more comprehensive discussion. Mr. Reiner stated that those could be codified really quick. He would love to see that come forward in the next 30, 60, 90 days. Ms. Rauch stated that she does not want to make these changes in a vacuum. Mr. Reiner stated that street tree planting and garage doors are fixed items.

Mr. Keeler stated we are talking single-family tonight. We need to talk about multi-family as soon as possible. Ms. Rauch stated that is largely handled within area plans. Staff is working on that. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked about exposure points along the interstate. Ms. Rauch stated that staff is close to having what is needed. Discussions need to be held with how we execute (Code, area plan, etc.).

Mr. Keeler stated that a Commission member stated that we need to decide what we want on multi-family. So much was brought to us from developers and we reacted. The fear is that is going to happen in Metro Center. Mr. Keeler stated that the City traditionally does not buy land for residential development. If we could do that, the idea would be that we would be driving the bus and developers could throw their hat in the ring if they wanted to participate. We could design the neighborhoods we want, where we want them. It would be a streamlined planning process. A developer would just tell us whether they can make it work. Mr. Keeler stated that he does not know the logistics of making that work. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it would definitely be a policy update but it is not a bad idea. When the City ends up being the land holder, we end up contributing the value of the land to make the public private partnership work. In her opinion, it works better with a privately held company.

Mr. Reiner shared slideshow of zoning improvements he would suggest. The design he suggested is not a grid neighborhood but radial design. Mr. Keeler stated that stakeholders do not want cul-de-sacs. Mr. Reiner stated that the radial housing is more interesting than what we are currently getting. He stated that all of the street tree/buffers will die at the same time. Mr. Ranc stated that we have all trees in the right of way inventoried. Mr. Reiner stated that we have to be tough on builders.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 6:52 p.m.



Chair, Community Development Committee



Deputy Clerk of Council