

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held \_\_\_\_\_

June 11, 2018

## CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Peterson called the Monday, June 11, 2018 Regular Meeting of Dublin City Council to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chambers at Dublin City Hall.

## ROLL CALL

Present were Mayor Peterson, Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, Ms. Alutto, Ms. De Rosa, Ms. Fox, Mr. Reiner and Mr. Keenan.

Staff members present were Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Readler, Ms. Mumma, Ms. Crandall, Mr. Earman and Ms. Gee.

## ADJOURNMENT TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mayor Peterson moved to adjourn to executive session to consider the purchase of property for public purposes.

Ms. Alutto seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Fox; Mr. Keenan, yes.

The meeting was reconvened at 7:10 p.m.

Other staff members present included: Ms. O'Callaghan, Chief von Eckartsberg, Mr. McCollough, Mr. Boggs, Ms. Goss, Mr. Rogers, Ms. Burness, Ms. Richison, Mr. Papsidero, Mr. Hammersmith, Ms. Husak, Ms. Rauch, Mr. Gaines, Ms. Wawszkiewicz, Mr. Plouck and Mr. Myers.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Alutto led the Pledge of Allegiance.

## SPECIAL RECOGNITION/PRESENTATIONS

- **Dublin Citizen Police Academy Alumni Association – Presentation of Scholarships**

Debbie Giddings, 5764 Tara Hill Drive, representing the Dublin Citizen Police Academy Alumni Association stated that this year, there were five applicants for the two \$1,000 scholarships that were offered. After consideration, the Alumni Association decided to offer five scholarships for lesser amounts. The applications were reviewed by the board members and some outside resources on the basis of content, clarity, grammar and community volunteerism. The following scholarships were awarded: Avery Stoll - \$250; Ethan Odenthal - \$250; Jacob Hirschy - \$500; Garrett Hosterman - \$1,000; and Evan Keiffer - \$1,000.

Mayor Peterson congratulated the scholarship winners who were present.

- **Grizzell Middle School Girls Lacrosse Team – 2018 Shamrock Invitational Champions**

Ms. Alutto presented a proclamation to the Grizzell Middle School Girls Lacrosse Team in recognition of their win of the 2018 Shamrock Invitational. A photo was taken of the team members and coaches.

## CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no comments from citizens.

## CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Peterson moved approval of the one item on the consent agenda.

- **Approval of May 21, 2018 Regular Council Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Reiner seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

June 11, 2018

Page 2

Held \_\_\_\_\_

## **INTRODUCTION/FIRST READING – ORDINANCES**

### **Ordinance 39-18**

**Rezoning Approximately 47.37 Acres on the East Side of Hyland-Croy Road, Approximately 1,200 Feet South of the Intersection with Tullymore Drive from PUD, Planned Unit Development District (Autumn Rose Woods) to PUD, Planned Unit Development District (Autumn Rose Woods) for an Amendment to the Approved Development Text to Permit the Split-Rail Fence to Remain Along the Perimeter of Reserve C, to be Owned by the City of Dublin. (Case 18-023Z/PDP/FDP)**

Ms. Alutto introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Husak provided the following information:

#### Background:

- This Ordinance was considered by City Council in March of 2017. On August 10, 2017, the Planning and Zoning Commission approved the final development plan and recommended approval to City Council of the final plat for the Autumn Rose Woods subdivision. The application included all final development details.
- In March 2017, the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and recommended approval to City Council for the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat. Council subsequently reviewed the Annexation and the Rezoning/Preliminary Development and Preliminary Plat, and Infrastructure Agreement concurrently as provided for in the Pre-Annexation Agreement entered into by the City of Dublin and Pulte Homes of Ohio with Ordinance 28-16. Council approved Ordinances 25-17, 26-17, and 27-17 at the May 22, 2017 meeting. With the approved Annexation and Rezoning, the site was brought within the municipal boundaries, and zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District – Autumn Rose Woods.
- At the time of the rezoning, Council approved a waiver to the Tree Replacement requirements defined in the City's Zoning Code due to the substantial preservation of nearly 16 contiguous acres of woods. The approved development text provided that with the City's agreement to assume the responsibility for that open space maintenance, the fence surrounding the open area would be removed.
- However, the residents of the adjacent neighborhood were concerned about the impact of the removal of that fence to the privacy and security of their backyards. Ms. De Rosa met with residents of the adjacent Bishop Run neighborhood and shared their concerns at the March 19, 2018 City Council meeting. At that meeting, Council voted to direct staff to process an application to allow the existing fence within the Autumn Woods Rose development to remain where it was previously intended to be. As the removal of the fence was approved in the development text, a new rezoning application was required to make the change to the development text; that application has been initiated by the City of Dublin, per City Council's direction.
- The proposed development text includes language stating that the existing perimeter paddock fencing located along the boundaries of Reserve C, west of Mill Springs Drive and to the southern property boundary of Lot 102 in the Park Place subdivision may remain and will be owned by the City of Dublin upon dedication of the reserve by the developer. The text also addresses the condition of the fencing upon dedication by the developer to the City to eliminate obligations by the City to improve the fence condition. The exhibit included indicates the location of fencing that will remain in Reserve C.
- On May 17, 2018, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to recommend Council approval of the proposed Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan with no conditions. Simultaneously, the Commission also approved a Final Development Plan. The final plat, recommended for approval by the Commission on August 10, 2017 will be forwarded to Council once the developer has provided the necessary infrastructure.

There were no questions from Council.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the June 25, 2018 Council meeting.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

June 11, 2018

Page 3

Held

## **Ordinance 40-18**

### **Authorizing the City Manager to Execute and Accept Necessary Conveyance Documents to Acquire a 0.027-Acre Fee Simple Warranty Deed for Right-of-Way, Without Limitation of Existing Access Rights; a 0.581-Acre, Permanent Utility and Grading Easement; and a 0.055-Acre Temporary Easement from the Board of Education of the Dublin City School District, for the Property Located Along Hyland-Croy Road for the Public Purpose of Constructing a New Roadway, Which Shall be Open to the Public Without Charge.**

Mayor Peterson introduced the ordinance.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the City intends to construct the Hyland-Croy Road / Riviera Connector (the "Project"), which is a new public roadway connecting the Riviera neighborhood with Hyland-Croy Road. In the 2018-2022 Capital Improvements Program (CIP), site acquisition was programmed in 2017 and utility relocation, construction and landscape is programmed in 2018. The Project requires the acquisition of property interests from eight property owners. Ordinance 40-18 pertains to property owned by the Dublin City School District, which is located north of Brand Road and east of Hyland-Croy Road at 8300 Hyland-Croy Road. The City has participated in good faith discussions with the Board of Education of the Dublin City School District. The parties have come to mutually agreeable terms for the acquisition of the property interests from the Board of Education for \$21,000, which is the appraised value.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired if staff reviewed this area for the existence of landmark trees.

Mr. McDaniel indicated that he believes that occurred with the alignment of the right-of-way, but he is not certain of the findings.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes requested that the information be provided for the second reading.

There will be a second reading/public hearing on June 25, 2018.

## **Ordinance 41-18**

### **Adopting Amendments to Chapter 99 of the City of Dublin Codified Ordinances Addressing Small Cell Facilities and Wireless Support Structures within the Right-of-Way, Including Design Guidelines for Specifications and Aesthetic Requirements that All Small Cell Facilities and Wireless Support Structures Must Meet Prior to Installation in the City of Dublin Right-of-Way. (Case 18-011ADMC).**

Ms. Alutto introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Readler stated the following:

- In December 2016, the Ohio legislature enacted a law that would allow companies to build technology infrastructure in public rights-of-way with minimal opportunity for local governments to consent to or regulate the build-out.
- In response, approximately 90 cities sued the state in five separate lawsuits. Fifty cities sued in Franklin County and the City of Dublin was among the 14 Central Ohio plaintiffs.
- The law was overturned in June 2017, before officially going into effect. The municipalities, with significant leadership from the City of Dublin, reached a compromise with members of the telecommunications industry regarding how to regulate certain wireless equipment within the rights-of-way of Ohio's communities.
- Municipal leaders and telecommunications industry representatives collaborated on new legislation, Ohio House Bill 478 ("H.B. 478"), which amended Ohio Revised Code Section 4939. The bill was signed by Governor John Kasich on May 2, 2018 and will go into effect on August 1, 2018.
- Ordinance 41-18 must be adopted and be in effect as of this August 1, 2018 deadline in order to impose the proposed Dublin requirements on new applications.
- The new language ultimately provides more predictability and speed to the industry, while also protecting the character of Ohio's cities. As a result of the compromises with the industry, small cell facilities and wireless support structures are permitted uses within the right-of-way and are not subject to zoning approval.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

June 11, 2018

Page 4

Held

- It is important to note that H.B. 478 only addresses small cell facilities and wireless support structures within the right-of-way. This does not affect the City's ability to regulate the large macro towers. A cross-department team has been preparing the code amendment and design guidelines, working with Ice Miller. The participants are Planning, Engineering and the Law Director. Assisting the team is Landplan Studios.

Mr. Papsidero provided an overview of the proposed legislation. Some of the goals they attempted to accomplish in what was a tight timeframe were:

- to meet the requirements of H.B. 478;
- provide an administrative process that works with the City's current right-of-way process; and
- ensure that any future installations that may occur in the City are consistent with Dublin's planning, engineering and aesthetic priorities through clear and consistent design guidelines.

In terms of the Ohio Revised Code, H.B 478 did amend a previous Senate bill, which was adopted in 2017 that requires municipalities to permit small cell towers within the right-of-way, typically located on existing public and private infrastructure, as well as the installation of new poles within the right-of-way. It also:

- gives the City the ability to regulate the placement and appearance of these towers and associated equipment;
- prescribes timeframes in which the City must review and approve submitted requests that are consistent with our Code and guidelines;
- prohibits all municipalities from preventing the installation of small cell towers in the right-of-way within individual political boundaries; and
- requires that our local processes and requirements not be subject to or part of the zoning ordinance. This is why it exists in a different part of the Code.

In terms of the City's approach, what is proposed is amending Chapter 99, Wireless Communications, by adding new sections to address the administrative process that will occur. This will be administered by Public Works through Chapter 98, which is the Right-of-Way Management section of the City Code, under general right-of-way permits and special right-of-way permits specific to small cell facilities. Separate Design Guidelines have been drafted, which will provide an administrative tool to guide the design and placement of towers and the associated equipment, administered by Public Works and supported by Planning.

#### Small Cell Tower and Related Equipment Description

Different from the typical wireless communications, the large, tall macro tower. Per this legislation, they are:

- Limited to 40 feet in height
- The associated equipment/electronics will either be attached to the pole or sit in a separate utility cabinet adjacent or near the pole. [He showed example of an existing small cell tower and associated utility cabinet located in Hilliard; all placed within a median with landscaping.] There are a couple hundred of these types of installations throughout the state.

#### Co-Location

A small cell tower:

- Can be attached to a City street light pole or traffic signal pole, as well as private utility poles. In Dublin, those would be the AEP wood electric poles, most of which are located in the Historic District. In most cases, they would be located on an existing pole or a free-standing pole. The guidelines will address the requirements.

#### Administrative Process

It will be administered by Public Works. There are four permit request types:

- Co-location on an existing structure, City or private utility pole.
- Free-standing pole, which would be owned by the carrier and placed in the right-of-way.
- Removal of one of the previous types of installations
- Eligible facilities requests, per the Ohio Revised Code -- typically modification of existing wireless installations



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

June 11, 2018

Page 5

Held

- Timeframe - The ORC is very specific regarding the City's ability to process the requests. The established timeframe is 60-120 days, specific to each permit type. The State Law also allows a carrier to submit a package of multiple locations, which can be processed as a single application. Per State law, because this process is outside of the zoning code, there is no public review; it is ineligible to include that.

### Design Guidelines

These will be administered by Public Works, with support of Planning.

- The guidelines address general guidelines, context specific, related to different parts of the City. Standard drawings/specifics are at the rear of the document.
- Except where the context-specific guidelines indicate differently, co-location will be encouraged to minimize the amount of visual clutter within the right-of-way.
- With co-location, the height of the existing structure cannot be increased by more than five feet, per State law.
- Existing private utility poles are eligible, depending upon the carrier's ability to work with the owner to make that specific pole work.
- An attachment to any City pole must not compromise the structural integrity of that pole; it requires City Engineering approval. This requirement did not exist in the previous legislation adopted by the State in 2017. The revised law gives the municipality more authority in this area. [Image of potential small cell towers and associated utility boxes was displayed.]
- New wireless support structures. ORC is very specific in terms of 40 feet, which can be reduced to 35 feet in residential districts.
- Spacing requirements – City has some latitude and can suggest moving the small cell tower a certain number of feet to address visibility, street trees, etc.
- Setback requirements are included.
- Pole and foundation specifications. [Example shown of a new, free-standing support structure, located on Riverside Drive and Bridge Park.]
- Antennas – Some requirements (size, shield/shroud) are per the ORC. There are diameter specifications. Must be mounted at top of pole, cylindrical in shape, color matching the pole. The attempt is made to reduce visual clutter. [Examples shown of a co-location meeting guidelines versus one not meeting guidelines.]
- Associated equipment and utility cabinet. ORC limits the cabinet to 28 cubic feet, which is large. Although many carriers have smaller equipment, it must be permitted, if requested, per State law. All the secondary equipment must be concealed within a cabinet enclosure. The City is recommending Landscaping screening if the cabinet is ground-mounted.

### Context-specific guidelines:

- Specificity has been added for the Historic Dublin, Bridge Street and West Innovation districts, all other commercial areas, and residential districts. The City cannot prohibit these poles, per State law, but the guidelines provide the City's preferences. The sites designated in yellow are recommended as preferred, also side streets, lanes and alleys, so that the towers are not located on Bridge and High or at the intersection thereof. Part of the intent is to have them mounted on the existing wooden utility poles. Long term, that may change if those utilities are buried. In the interim, this will help protect the aesthetic characters within those two Historic Dublin corridors.
- Co-location on existing AEP poles. New poles are strongly discouraged. Co-location on the existing pedestrian-scale street lights is not permitted, because their design and fabrication cannot support those poles. Throughout the U.S., this is a common way in which small cell towers are installed, because many cities throughout the U.S. have a predominance of wooden electrical poles.

### Historic Dublin District:

- If there is a new pole, it must align with an existing pole on the same right-of-way, to minimize visual clutter.
- Must have a black powder-coated finish.
- Must be approved by the City Engineer.
- The City is not supporting the placement of ground-mounted equipment cabinets within the tree lawn, or the pedestrian-furnishing zone on High and Bridge streets, as that would create visual clutter.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

June 11, 2018

Page 6

Held

- Placement of additional landscaping will be required when there are ground-mounted cabinets within the District.

Bridge Street District:

- The guidelines suggest that the preferred corridors for placement are corridor-connector and District-connector streets, which are identified on the street network map. Placement on local streets within all of Bridge Street is discouraged.
- On new streets, new wireless support structures may be placed.
- Co-location on existing street lights is not supported. From an Engineering and fabrication support, they cannot support antennae.

West Innovation District:

- The guidelines focus on arterial and collector streets.
- New poles are preferred because it is a developing area.
- Ground-mounted equipment is discouraged in certain areas, such as the future Main Street or Town Center on the Ohio University campus.
- The color preference in this District is bronze, which matches other poles in the City.
- Landscaping when there is ground-mounted equipment.

Other Commercial Districts:

- Preferred placement is on arterial and collector streets.
- Co-location, since there is already infrastructure in place to minimize visual color.
- Bronze color
- Landscaping for ground-mounted equipment, or placement in existing planting beds.

Residential Districts:

- Preferred placement on arterial and collector streets, except in areas where residences front onto those streets; local streets are strongly discouraged.
- Co-location on existing poles; new, free-standing poles are strongly discouraged.
- It is beneficial that in the majority of neighborhoods, there is no underground electrical running through the street. These small cell towers need power and fiber. One carrier has suggested that their approach might be to be located on the perimeter of a neighborhood, on an adjacent arterial, not in the neighborhoods, but they would be able to project into the neighborhood.
- Color – bronze; landscaping when there is ground-mounted equipment.

Council Questions/Discussion

Mr. Reiner stated:

1. In reference to the required landscaping of ground-mounted equipment boxes, he suggests that evergreen plant material be required. With deciduous plants, during summer and winter, the boxes would be visible through the branches.

Mr. Papsidero indicated that could be specified.

2. Inquired if there are any municipalities that have looked at this as a profit center. Mr. Papsidero responded that they have not. The ORC is very specific in regard to the fee that the municipality may charge, which is \$250 per installation. That is the only fee that can be charged on an annual basis.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the fee is actually the negotiated price, based on the national average.

Mr. Reiner noted that the previous towers have been great revenue sources for many property owners.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes:

1. Asked if there is there a quantity limitation on the number of towers that may be placed in a community?

Mr. Papsidero responded that the ORC does not permit a municipality to place a cap on the number.

2. Inquired if a utility pole could have more than one small cell tower attached, for example -- one at the top and one or more on the sides, one each for different providers.

Mr. Papsidero responded that the proposed guidelines state that the antennae can only be at the top of the pole, as a way in which to prevent that cluster from occurring. The City has been told by one carrier that there are conflicts between the antennae when that is done, so it is desirable to separate them. However, on a street, there could be four



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

June 11, 2018

Page 7

Held \_\_\_\_\_

towers within the same block; that cannot be prohibited, although there are some distancing requirements that provide the City some latitude.

3. Are there any removal requirements for towers no longer in use?

Mr. Papsidero responded that there are. The guidelines require that if the tower is no longer in use, it has to be removed within a certain time period. It would be difficult to monitor, but the assumption is that the carriers will choose to remove their equipment/pole.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that their use of electrical service could be the most expensive component, and if discontinued, that might be noticeable. Is it possible to collect that information, perhaps require a phone number for their electric service provider? These small cell facilities may prove to be a shorter-term solution than what is currently anticipated. If so, the City will need to have the ability have them removed, if they are no longer in use.

Mr. McDaniel introduced Greg Dunn, the City's special legal counsel who handles telecommunications and cable television issues for the City. He requested Mr. Dunn's response to Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes' inquiry.

Mr. Dunn stated that the City is permitted to require that the towers be removed, if no longer in use. The difficulty, as has been pointed out, is in being aware when they are no longer in use.

Vice Mayor Groomes requested that staff study the issue and identify a way in which to know when the tower is no longer being used. The information could be requested on the application, so it is not difficult to determine at a later date.

4. Inquired if the guidelines specify maintenance expectations for the utility boxes.

The City is littered with utility boxes in disrepair. The guidelines could include annual City inspections of the utility boxes.

5. Inquired about the radiation restrictions.

Mr. Dunn responded that the FCC has radiation restrictions, and they have preempted the field for anyone else to regulate radiation.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired about the specifications. Is there a restriction for how many towers can be located within a proximity to meet the radiation threshold?

Mr. Dunn indicated that he does not have that information.

Vice Mayor Amorose stated that the more towers there are, the more radiation there will be. She requested that there be verification of the FCC rule and inclusion of a requirement in our process that the applicant submit their radiation levels. In this way, the City can determine what the total amount would be in a given space, so there are no "hot" zones.

Mr. McDaniel stated that legal staff would look into whether this can be done. There is another level of regulation at the federal level, which preempts this.

Mr. Keenan stated that the FCC regulates them individually, but what about collectively – if there are four or more in close proximity.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she is concerned about the sum of the total – she would like staff to research that.

6. Noted that the City is discussing the burial of utilities in the Historic District. What happens if a service provider places their device on a utility pole, and the City takes down that utility pole.

Mr. Papsidero responded that it would then be necessary for the company to re-apply to install their utility on a free-standing pole.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired if the City would be financially responsible for the relocation of their tower.

Mr. Papsidero responded that the City could be responsible for part of the cost.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he believes if there is a City project, such as a road widening that results in removal of their utility, the relocation is the company's responsibility.

Mr. Dunn stated that scenario is addressed within the law. If the City requires that the tower be moved for a public safety issue, the responsibility is the company's. If the City requires them to move it for our convenience, it is the City's financial responsibility. That is consistent with the right-of-way regulations for other utilities.

Vice Mayor Amorose stated that because the City prefers to bury utilities whenever possible, perhaps there is an opportunity to avoid that expense by putting that in our regulations upfront, essentially, a clarification that the company will be "leasing" the pole as long as the pole exists. If the pole is eliminated, their "lease" expires.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held \_\_\_\_\_

June 11, 2018

Page 8

7. Stated in regard to the guidelines' current language regarding either a bronze or black powder coating, perhaps better language would be to say that the color would be determined at the time of application, depending on the location. At a later time, the City may have a different preference, depending upon what occurs in the West Innovation District. It might be preferable not to specify the color in the current language, but to state that the color finish would be specified at the time of application.

Mr. Dunn responded that the guidelines can be modified administratively by the City at any time. The City has provided itself a lot of flexibility in the guidelines.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the West Innovation District could certainly evolve as it develops. The intent is to be District-specific in this requirement, so if the City changes the color based on the architecture or other reasons, it would change for the entire district.

Mr. Keenan inquired if the City is not permitted to control the number of poles, towers and uses.

Mr. Dunn responded that it may not control the total number.

Mr. Keenan inquired if there is a mechanism pertaining to need.

Mr. Dunn responded there is not.

Mr. Keenan stated the company could install 50 towers, even if there is no need, and the City would have no ability to control. Is that correct?

Mr. Dunn responded affirmatively. There was an unsuccessful attempt to have proof of need via an engineering study included in the Bill. However, these companies are facing a significant capital investment nationwide, so it is not likely that they will install more facilities than needed at this time.

Ms. De Rosa inquired how many are anticipated in Dublin.

Mr. Papsidero stated that in a meeting with one of the major carriers, they suggested that south of SR161 on either side of I270, there is a possibility of 8-10 towers. Based on the initial conversations, it isn't anticipated that the City will be overwhelmed with them.

Mr. Dunn added that, although installation of small cell towers will probably not have a fast start, the future of this technology is not known. If the industry determines a way to get enough bandwidth into homes, it may result in many being installed, replacing the wire-linked carriers.

Mayor Peterson stated that, aesthetics aside, the community may have better cell service as a result.

Mr. McDaniel requested that Mr. Dunn address the issue of speculative builders. With macro towers, there are individuals working on a speculative basis, similar to real estate brokers. There was an attempt to address this key issue, i.e. allowing parties who are not acting on behalf of any specific companies to install the small cell towers.

Mr. Dunn stated that they made a major effort to have the legislation permit only companies with FCC licenses to provide cellular service to be able to place these towers in the right-of-way. The concern was such companies could come in and build the towers, speculating that they would lease them later. That was a major fight, which brought many people in the tower industry to the State House. Their effort was successful, and only companies who have the capability of providing the cell service can build the tower.

Ms. Fox inquired about the review process:

1. ART will be the reviewing body for most applications, except in the Historic District, correct?

Mr. Papsidero responded that the reviewing process would be handled at the staff level by the Public Works Department. Planning will provide assistance on new installation, but there is no ART, ARB or PZC review. The Ohio Revised Code requires administrative review only.

Mrs. Fox inquired if there is no other review for a Conditional Use.

Mr. Papsidero responded that there is no Conditional Use; it is an administrative permit.

2. In the Historic District, the Pinney and Spring Streets area between Riverview and Blacksmith Lane is all residential. Could they be removed from the list of potential sites?



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held \_\_\_\_\_

June 11, 2018

Page 9

Mr. Papsidero responded that the strategy was that in the Historic District, they must be placed on the existing utility poles. The intent was not to limit the options too much. We preferred not to insist on placement on Bridge and High Streets. There was one carrier who indicated an interest in mounting a tower on one of the City's traffic signals. Engineering has concerns about that particular co-location, so it was preferable to give them the utility poles as an option. The City could look into that further, but the City is trying to provide some flexibility and encourage them to be placed on existing poles to minimize the visual impact. One carrier expressed concern that the slope of the terrain on the east side of South High would limit the cell signal. The carriers will look for high points in placing their facilities, which will be better for them than installation in lower places within the Historic District. However, because the City cannot deny the requests, it seemed better to encourage the placement within certain circumstances.

Ms. Fox stated that she has no objection to their placement along the alleys; however, Blacksmith and the area towards the river is all residential. That is outside the alley service area. She would like consideration to be provided for those one block areas.

Mr. Papsidero stated that they would look into this.

3. There seems to be no opportunity for these poles to be placed on top of trees, event artificial ones; there seems to be no opportunity to camouflage them. Is placement on poles the only option?

Mr. Papsidero responded that they must be placed in the right-of-way, so it would have to be a street tree or on something that looks like a fake tree, which is probably not what the City wants in the right-of-way.

Mr. McDaniel stated that when the City deployed its 24-square mile WiFi system, they learned that there are interesting tradeoffs related to topography. When SB 331 was introduced and passed, the providers were permitted to place these towers anywhere, anytime and in any format they desired – that was the starting point. A coalition of 90+ cities and the Ohio Municipal League pushed back, and significant improvements were made.

Ms. Fox stated that given this technology is needed, the proposed guidelines are well done in the attempt to make the towers as unobtrusive as possible. She has read about these installations in other historic districts, and some horrific installations have occurred within some of the most beautiful scenic areas in the country. Kudos on the work that has been done with these guidelines.

Mr. Dunn commended the City of Dublin, which provided the leadership. Dublin organized the plaintiffs, and Mr. McDaniel led that effort.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about guidelines. Do guidelines provide enforceability?

Mr. Dunn responded that the term "guidelines" was chosen by staff. Guidelines are enforceable.

There will be a second reading/public hearing on June 25, 2018.

## **Ordinance 42-18**

### **Adopting Amendments to Section 153.162 of the City of Dublin Codified Ordinances (Zoning Code) to Require Registration of Sign Contractors and Bonding for Sign Installations. (Case 18-018ADMC)**

Ms. Alutto introduced the ordinance.

Mr. Papsidero stated the over the past several years, particularly in 2017, the City has increasingly noted that retail and office tenants in shopping centers and mixed use developments install signs without permits or not in accordance with approved details of the permit (this problem has also occurred on individual retail sites). The Planning Division has worked with tenants and property owners to resolve individual issues, but in some cases violators have been non-cooperative. In February 2018, the Planning Division notified the relevant property owners of the City's regulations and enforcement procedures and that the City was stepping up enforcement actions to ensure full compliance with the City's sign regulations. At the same time, the City looked at other local municipalities to learn what their administrative requirements were. We discovered that in many cases, sign contractors are required to register with the City, required to have an annual bond in place in case there are issues with an installation, and require insurance. The only requirement Dublin had in place was that the sign contractor register with the Building Standards department. This proposal puts the onus on the sign



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

June 11, 2018

Page 10

Held \_\_\_\_\_

contractors to meet Code and to convey the need for compliance to their clients.

### Summary of Modifications

The proposed amendment would expand and clarify requirements as related to sign contractors, and sign installations of building mounted and ground signs.

- The proposed provisions include new requirements for annual registration of sign contractors with the Planning Department, not Building Standards.
- The contractor must have commercial liability insurance in the amount of \$300,000 for damages to a single person, and \$500,000 for one occurrence.
- They also must post an annual bond with the City.
- It also provides the City to ability to revoke the registration or deny its renewal if there are ongoing zoning violations or if installations have been made without a sign permit.
- The application has an acknowledgement that states the owner, tenant or contractor is aware of the Code requirement.

This proposal was circulated among all parties who have submitted sign permit applications with the City over the past three years. Staff met with the Central Ohio Sign Association Leadership and has their support. On May 3, 2018, the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and recommended approval of the proposed Zoning Code amendments to City Council.

### Council Questions/Discussion:

Mr. Keenan stated that:

1. The City already has a requirement that sign contractors provide proof of insurance and post a bond. Why would these contractors be treated any differently? This seems to fall within the same framework. All the municipalities require that.

Mr. Papsidero stated that this function is being moved to the Planning Division, so that it can be enforced through the zoning code. That will provide more authority to address the issue upfront.

Mr. Keenan inquired if the existing sign contractor bond requirement could be used, and just expand the use.

Mr. Papsidero responded that might be possible. Staff will look into it.

2. The \$300,000 and \$500,000 limits are odd, each person and each action. Typically, there is a single limit for something less than that. Plus there seems to be no property damages limit, just bodily injury.

Mr. Boggs stated that the coverage limit was taken from the City of Columbus analogous sign ordinance under which they license their sign contractors, with the thought that if someone is complying with the City of Columbus limit, as most contractors in this area would be trying to do, that would be a level appropriate for the City of Dublin as well. If Council would like staff to find comparable suburban limits, or re-address before the next reading, staff will do so.

Mr. Keenan stated that the wording seems to address only bodily damage, not property damage. "\$300,000 for damages for single person and \$500,000 for one occurrence," seems to be for a person.

Mr. Boggs responded that a general commercial liability policy is mentioned in the Code language, but staff will review the coverage limits and ensure that property damage is included, as well.

Mr. Keenan stated that it might simply be a nuance in language and could be clarified without causing any additional expense to the contractor.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired the cost of the bond and the bond amount.

Mr. Papsidero responded that a \$10,000 bond amount is very common, and the City's cost is \$250.00/year.

Mr. Boggs stated that the way the Code language is written is that the cost would be set by the Planning Director, and those numbers are based upon discussion with the Central Ohio Sign Contractors Association.

Mr. Papsidero stated that staff contacted several other suburbs. The amount was typically \$10,000, sometimes \$25,000. We wanted to more research before determining what the most appropriate amount would be for Dublin.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

June 11, 2018

Page 11

Held \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. Keenan inquired about the typical home improvement contractor's bond amount -- \$5,000 or \$10,000? He believes it is \$5,000 or \$10,000 and costs about \$200 to \$250/year.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes asked if there is the ability to wrap the bond in with the fee. Sometimes that can be a far more affordable way for contractors to obtain a bond, especially for the smaller sign shop business.

Mr. Papsidero stated that staff could review that. Their goal was to do a single bond once a year, not a bond per permit.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that if the business buys a single bond per year, and the individual pays for their portion, i.e. 100 permits on a \$100,000 bond -- each contractor would then pay \$100.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the intent is that the contractor files the bond each year when they register. Then City can pull the bond if there are issues with the contractor.

Mr. Keenan stated that when the contractor is doing a lot of work, it is cost-effective; if they are doing one job/year, it is not.

Mr. Papsidero responded that the majority are doing a lot of work in Dublin.

Mr. Boggs stated that in the initial draft circulated to the sign contractors, staff had proposed a bond associated with each permit application. Their response was that an annual bond was more consistent with other cities. This proposal reflects their suggestion.

Ms. Fox stated that:

1. When PZC discussed this, the Commission was concerned with making this more expensive for the small business owner to have a sign installed. She prefers whatever is the best way in which to keep the cost as minimal as possible.
2. The cost of a Zoning Code violation is \$100/day. However, it is difficult to enforce because it is cost prohibitive to take someone to court. Not knowing how this bond works, if there is a problem with a contractor, will this also be expensive to enforce?

Mr. Keenan stated that there is recourse against the bond company -- that is the purpose of issuing the bond. He is not certain if that includes fines and penalties.

Mr. Boggs stated that the issue with enforcing the zoning code through the Mayor's Court citation process is not so much the dollar cost as it is the cost of time and procedural protections that enter into the process. It is necessary to prove each element of the offenses. Being able to draw on a bond to address those violations and recouping abatement costs is a more streamlined process. However, it does not exclude the ability to go to Mayor's Court or the Environmental Court, if the circumstances are appropriate.

There will be a second reading/public hearing on June 25, 2018.

## **Ordinance 43-18**

### **Adopting the Proposed Tax Budget for Fiscal Year 2019.**

Ms. Alutto introduced the ordinance.

Mr. Gaines stated that the City is required to file its proposed tax budget with Delaware and Franklin counties each year. This is for the 2019 tax budget. The Finance Committee does a very preliminary analysis to arrive at these numbers. Approaching the end of the year, there will be a more detailed Operating Budget analysis.

Ms. De Rosa inquired if, procedurally, this has to be amended if there are changes during the year, or is this filing a one-time requirement.

Mr. Gaines responded that the requirement is for filing only once, even if there are changes later in the year.

There will be a second reading/public hearing on June 25, 2018.

[Mr. Keenan left Council Chambers at this point.]

## **INTRODUCTION/PUBLIC HEARING - RESOLUTIONS**

### **Resolution 28-18**

#### **Resolution to Express Support of Complete Streets Principles.**



June 11, 2018

Page 12

Held

Ms. Alutto introduced the resolution.

Ms. O’Callaghan stated that the City of Dublin has been recognized as a Bronze Level Bicycle Friendly City by the League of American Bicyclists since 2013.

Staff is preparing to submit a Bicycle Friendly City application in early August with the goal of achieving a Silver Level status. City Council and staff have longed embraced Complete Streets principles, and the City has been recognized as the leader in this area, pursuing the goal to accommodate all modes of transportation to meet the needs of its citizens. Passing a formal Complete Streets resolution provides an opportunity for Dublin to achieve a higher score in the upcoming Bicycle Friendly City application process. A formal resolution adopted by Council will also help the City increase its ratings with MORPC’s Regional Sustainability 2050 Initiative, as well as other grant opportunities.

Mr. Reiner noted he strongly supports this adoption.

Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes.

[Mr. Keenan returned to Council Chambers.]

**OTHER**

• **Master Sign Plan – Columbus Metropolitan Library Dublin Branch and Downtown Dublin Parking Garage Signs (Case 17-125MSP)**

Ms. Rauch stated this is a Master Sign Plan for the new library and the parking garage. This is a comprehensive sign plan that includes signs for the library, the parking garage, and some construction fencing. The Master Sign Plan requires review by ART. ART has reviewed and provided a recommendation to Council. Following Council’s review and approval, the applicants will proceed through the building permit process.

Master Sign Plan Proposal:

Library Signs

The Library is proposing to install a ground sign along High Street in the landscaped area shown on the slide, as well as two window signs at the two main entrances of the library. The slide rendering depicts the proposed sign location. The sign is small in scale, with a maximum height of 6.5 feet, 16 square feet overall. Because of the grade change within the area, it is important that the scale of the sign is appropriate for the area.

The window signs located at entrances are a little less than two square feet, white background with gray text. The sign includes the Library’s hours and address.

Parking Garage Signs

A variety of signs are proposed to address the wayfinding needs for pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles, and assurance provided that there is sufficient signage and wayfinding for all these groups to navigate the site, both inside and outside of the garage.

- The garage is visible on three rights-of-way. The three street-facing sides all include a projecting sign and a canopy sign, as well as graphics at the three stairwells and some internal graphics at the North Street entrance. A depiction of the proposed North Street entrance was shown of a canopy sign with orange lettering that illuminates white at night; upper left of that is a larger parking garage sign of 150 square feet, based on the scale of this building. The park and the circle “P” letters are illuminated at night as well.
- When entering the garage from the North Street entrance, there is a large wall interior to the garage that has some opportunity for graphics. ART recommended that this be included as part of the Master Sign Plan to permit some graphics for the library interior to the garage that can be seen from the right-of-way.
- For the Franklin Street side, there is a similar proposal for a canopy sign. In this location, there is a circle P next to the public parking entrance with a smaller scale projecting sign, largely due to the changing grade and decreased elevation overall.
- The bicycle parking and bike hub are located on the Rock Cress side of the Garage, so there is a canopy sign and bicycle graphic indicating bike parking on that side. Instead of a parking garage sign, a bicycle sign is located on the stairwells, all of which are internally illuminated as well.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

June 11, 2018

Page 13

Held \_\_\_\_\_

- Graphics in the stairwell. The colors of these numbers correspond with the internal wayfinding of the garage. ART had some concerns about the overall scale and visual aesthetic and recommended that those be reduced. The updated rendering was not available for the packet, but she can share a visual of what that would look like in a smaller scale. These graphics are located at each of the stairwells, inside and outside, for identification of where one is in the garage.

### Construction Fencing

The proposed construction fencing includes construction graphics, and these signs are 96 square feet for each of the proposed signs, showing the completed library. Depending upon the graphic, temporary location information is provided as well as partnership information and contractors. A sign is proposed at the North Street side and another one at the High Street elevation.

ART has recommended approval with the following:

1. Reduced height in the stairway numbers to six feet in height;
2. Adding an internal wall graphic at the North Street entrance as an additional sign type.

She offered to respond to questions, noting that the Library representatives are present as well for questions.

### Council Discussion:

Mr. Reiner inquired about the 160-square feet of blade sign.

Ms. Rauch responded that would be only on North Street.

Mr. Reiner stated that it takes up a significant portion of the Library's entire façade. Was there any discussion about reducing that to make it less dominant for the entire building?

Ms. Rauch responded that although ART did not make that recommendation, if that is Council's direction, reducing the height can be discussed.

Mr. Reiner stated this is a commercial size sign; 160 feet of sign is obtrusive. It would make it look like a commercial parking garage in downtown Columbus.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she believes everything about this looks obtrusive. The City has spent millions to face this structure in beautiful terra cotta, yet that will be covered up with billboards to identify what it is. Clearly, the structure is a parking garage. It is not wrapped in anything. Some of our buildings that are wrapped in other uses are more difficult to identify as a parking garage. She is not supportive of the numbers being visible from the sidewalk whatsoever. No one walking by the parking garage needs to know that level 3 is green. The intent is for a pedestrian-scale building with that "flavor and feel." It is not appropriate to cover up with facility with signage, given the investment on the facing of it.

Mayor Peterson stated that he agrees. The slide rendering with the colored numbers was not in Council packets. To him, that looks cheap; there has to be a more subtle way in which to remind drivers of the floor where they parked.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that every other parking garage does it in a way in which it can't be seen from around the corner.

Mayor Peterson stated that it is necessary to view this only for someone when exiting his/her car.

Ms. Alutto stated that she does not understand the benefit of seeing the numbers from the outside for someone who parked inside. She does not support the multi colors. It does not seem to fit. What is the purpose of so many "P (parking) signs? The only sign she likes is the creative blade bicycle sign. None of the other signs are creative.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the Parking sign has both the word and then the letter P under the word. Only one of those is necessary.

Mr. McDaniel requested Council's direction. The numbers on the outside can certainly be eliminated and focused only on the inside. The parking sign could contain the letter "P" only.

Mr. Reiner stated that he believes a blade sign is necessary for drivers looking for parking, but the sign should be more subtle and smaller in scale.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form B101

June 11, 2018

Page 14

Held

Ms. Amorose Groomes added that a blade sign with just the "P" would be the international symbol for parking.

Ms. Fox stated that this garage is located within the Historic District. The regulations in the District are eight square feet on a blade sign, with a maximum height of 15 feet. The "P" is sufficient. She has no objection to the "public parking" on the wall sign, which is at a pedestrian level. It is important to remember that this building is in the Historic District and it must be in context with that. The signage should not mirror what exists in downtown Columbus, or even what exists on either side of the river. There is a need to be sensitive to the area.

Mayor Peterson stated that throughout the sign package, the name is referenced as "Columbus Metropolitan Library - Dublin branch." However, on the interior sign, it references only "Columbus Metropolitan Library." Could "Dublin branch" be added as well? He believes that reference should be consistent.

Ms. De Rosa:

Inquired if there is a way in which to respect the Library's brand yet make the stone base of that sign match the building.

Ms. Rauch responded that the stone on the base matches the stone on the building.

Ms. De Rosa inquired if there is a way in which to add more "personality" to that base.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes asked if she is suggesting, perhaps, having it extend further up the sign.

Ms. De Rosa stated that Council has discussed the use of the stone to make a transition between historic and modern. She understands the need not to compromise the brand itself. However, she is not a designer and therefore is unsure about how that might look. She requested that staff explore that possibility.

Mr. Reiner expressed kudos for the construction fencing signs. It is worthwhile to inform everyone of the project underway.

Ms. Fox stated that she understands that the Columbus Metropolitan Library (CML) has a standard logo. However, if this sign were to be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission, they would be looking at it based on the Bridge Street District sign guidelines. The guidelines indicate looking for something creative and unique, but something that would match the character and context of the Historic District. Therefore, she asks that in looking at the ground mounting piece, they also look at ways to make it more distinctive and iconic to match the setting versus simply having a sign that matches the other CML signs.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes suggested that could be achieved either with materials or the way in which the letters are mounted on the sign.

Ms. Fox stated that there are many examples of ways in which to do this in the Bridge Street District Guidelines.

Ms. Rauch stated that what was originally proposed was a sign that looked almost identical to the existing signs, very small in scale, not representative of the corporate branding of the Library. ART's suggestion was to provide something more vertical and more representative of the library's brand. The present rendering is a revision of the original submission.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired about the materials used for this sign.

Mr. Rauch responded that they are metal cabinets.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired whether they are pin-mounted letters, laser cut into the metal, or vinyl covered. She suggests that they consider ways in which to add more texture or relief to the sign lettering. This sign will interact with the public; it is not a drive-by sign.

Mayor Peterson asked if staff is seeking approval tonight that incorporates Council's direction, or do they prefer to amend the proposal to incorporate the direction provided and bring it back for review/approval.

Mr. McDaniel stated that staff has attempted to capture Council's direction. It may be necessary to obtain concurrence from the Library on the sign base and the sign lettering.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held \_\_\_\_\_

June 11, 2018

Page 15

Alison Circle, Columbus Metropolitan Library stated that EMH&T can look at that, but she would need staff's clarification of the direction provided by Council tonight. Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that there should be sufficient time to work on this prior to the time the Library is ready to open. Mr. McDaniel stated that there is adequate time, but it would be desirable to clarify and accurately capture Council's direction tonight.

Ms. Fox stated that Council desires a sign that has some imagination and draws the eye. The sign itself should also have a distinctive, iconic quality. The examples in the BSD guidelines show distinctive ways in which to use dimension and materials. Ms. Circle inquired if the Library can also retain the standard brand in the design. Ms. Fox responded affirmatively. Mayor Peterson stated that he is certain it is possible to "marry" CML's standard identification with some uniqueness for the Dublin branch.

Ms. Rauch summarized Council's direction:

- Library Ground sign – Increase the height of the stone base and incorporate additional relief and creativity in the sign;
- Modify the North Street projecting sign to match the design and the scale of the projecting sign on Franklin Street.
- Add the "Dublin branch" text to the Library internal sign graphics.
- Significantly reduce the stairwell numbers to address pedestrian wayfinding.

She noted that her concern with eliminating it altogether is an individual in the stairwell needs to be aware of the level they are on, but the identification does not need to be as large.

Mayor Peterson requested Council's preference regarding approval tonight.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she would prefer that the revisions be incorporated and the sign package brought back for later review/approval.

Per Mayor Peterson's inquiry, Ms. Rauch clarified that the parking sign on North Street would be the same as that proposed on Franklin Street.

Ms. Fox inquired the size of that sign.

Ms. Rauch responded that it is 31.5 square feet.

Ms. Fox inquired what size is permitted in the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch stated that she does not have that information with her but would provide it when the plan is brought back to Council. This sign is larger than what is permitted by Code, but this is also a larger building than the traditional historic building. The views to this would be more in scale with the elevation.

Ms. Fox stated that it is important to understand the proportions, what is allowed, and what we are giving more of via waivers.

Mr. McDaniel stated that staff would bring back some options for that.

Ms. De Rosa stated that the book return is located inside the garage. How would a person be aware of that fact?

Ms. Rauch responded that it would be necessary to enter the garage to see that sign. There is no external signage for that to discourage people entering from the out exit. As structured, the driver would enter from North or Franklin Streets, pass by the book drop, and exit on Rock Cress. The wayfinding is internal to the garage.

Ms. Fox stated that she would like to see less of a commercial look to the signage and something more, subtle, context appropriate.

Mr. McDaniel indicated that staff has the clarification needed for Council's direction.

Mayor Peterson moved to table the Master Sign Plan.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

## STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. McDaniel highlighted information included in the packet:



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held \_\_\_\_\_

June 11, 2018

Page 16

- Development Plan/Site Plan for Riverside Crossing Park, East Plaza, Phase 1. On June 25, staff will provide an update regarding Council's requests for modifications and obtain any further guidance from Council.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes noted in regard to Item 2(c) in the memo (the request to provide real cut stone on the 14-foot east facing plaza wall) that she requests information on what will be on the 10-foot wall as well.

Mr. McDaniel responded that can be provided.

Ms. De Rosa stated that Council had extensive discussion about the need to have flower beds, etc., in the plans, but she did not see that request outlined in the memo as clearly as she recalled from the meeting.

Ms. Fox noted that the public engagement is proposed as July 11, correct?

Mr. McDaniel responded that staff is proposing the tentative date of Wednesday, July 11 as a public engagement meeting, if that is acceptable.

Ms. Fox noted that is fine. (Council concurred on the date.)

Mr. McDaniel summarized that on June 25, staff will bring the update back to Council, validate that the issues have been addressed, and then have the public input meeting on Wednesday, July 11 from 6-7:30 at the DCRC. Staff will communicate the meeting date to the public through the various tools. At the August 13 Council meeting, staff will bring this plan back for Council review.

Ms. Fox added that Council had previously discussed their desire to use the interactive message board for the park plans, seeking input from the public who visit the Rec Center.

Mr. McDaniel responded this was done previously, but can be done again.

Ms. Fox noted that it would be helpful to do something similar in the Bridge Park area in one of the green spaces. These residents will be major users of the park and their input would be desirable. Another possibility is the City website by inviting people to respond to specific questions regarding the plans.

- Council Work Sessions

There will be a work session on Monday, July 18. The intent had been to discuss parking study results at that meeting; however, that item will be deferred until after Council's summer break. He recommends that, per Council's goal setting retreat direction, Council instead use this June 18 meeting to review its Land Acquisition policy. In addition, on Wednesday, July 20, a work session is scheduled in follow-up to the May work session regarding the Historic District and Bridge Street District. Staff will be seeking guidance on those items. The June 20 work session packet will be forwarded later this week.

## COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

### Planning and Zoning Commission

Ms. Fox, Council representative to the Planning and Zoning Commission reported that at its last meeting, the Commission:

1. Discussed and approved Block D of the Bridge Street District comprised of five buildings and four blocks. Council previously reviewed that Site Plan. As she indicated to the Commission, when the City has reviewed site plans in the area, they have not looked at block configuration in terms of ways to improve loading/unloading services. Because street alleys are not provided, most of the service is forced to occur on the neighborhood and circulator streets. This issue became apparent when she was looking at ways to make these buildings more pedestrian-friendly with less loading/unloading service traffic. The City is limiting itself in these site plans. She suggests that Council review the Bridge Street guidelines in regard to this issue.
2. Discussed the Dublin Corporate Area Plan. The residents present at the meeting were comfortable with the City moving forward with this plan. The Commission expressed that landscape buffering of the Frantz Road residential neighborhoods was of high importance.
3. Discussed the use of the open space within the Kroger area plan and the need to make that more than just a greenway, but a very attractive public realm space.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

June 11, 2018

Page 17

Held \_\_\_\_\_

## **Administrative Committee**

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, Committee Chair stated that the employee review materials were forwarded to Council members in advance of the meeting occurring on Wednesday, June 27.

## **Finance Committee**

Mr. Keenan, Committee Chair noted that the next committee meeting will be held prior to Council's regular meeting on Monday, June 25 at 5:30 p.m. The committee will be review a Cost of Services study. All Council members are invited.

## **Dublin Community Foundation**

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, Council representative, stated that at the last meeting, the Library reported on their fundraising goals. The Community Foundation is planning to assist in the fundraising.

## **Dublin Friendship Association**

Ms. Alutto, Council representative stated that the Association met on May 22. Mr. Earman reported on the Riverside Crossing Park, and there was a good discussion about potential programming of the park, including the possibility for an arena. She and Ms. Richison will continue to work with the Greater Columbus Sister Cities International. The group recently attended a day at the Memorial Tournament. They are very interested in partnering with the City of Dublin on potential interactions with the India Sister City. Some exchange students from Japan will be visiting the City the week of August 19-25. There is an opportunity to provide housing for the exchange students; if interested, she suggested anyone contact John Rockelman or the Coffman or Scioto High Schools administrative offices.

## **Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC)**

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, Council representative, reported that the MORPC Executive Committee met last week. They will be discussing upcoming land strategies and the potential impact of the Hyperloop on that. There will be a MORPC Board meeting on Thursday, June 14.

## **US 33 Innovation Corridor Group**

Ms. De Rosa, Council representative reported that the group will meet on Friday, June 15.

## **Dublin Arts Council (DAC)**

Mr. Reiner, Council representative, reported that the Sundays at Scioto summer schedule began with its first event yesterday, June 10. There was a good crowd, and no rain!

## **Dublin Board of Education**

Ms. Alutto, Council liaison noted that the June meeting was cancelled and has not yet been rescheduled.

## **Washington Township**

Mayor Peterson reported that he enjoyed the opportunity to spend time with Township Administrator, Eric Richter at the villa during the Memorial Tournament. He has many ideas that he would like to discuss, and he and Mr. McDaniel will be meeting with him soon.

## **COUNCIL ROUNDTABLE**

Ms. Fox reported that:

1. She attended the first Aging in Place community input session. Over 50 people attended, and amazing input was received. She anticipates hearing some interesting and unique thoughts from our residents.

Ms. De Rosa inquired if a report on the meeting would be provided.

Ms. Alutto responded that the report will be brought to the Public Services Committee who next meets on September 5. After review, the Committee will forward recommendations to Council.

2. The Memorial Tournament was great! She really liked the banner on the AC Marriott, and it was appropriate for the Tournament event promotion.



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held \_\_\_\_\_

June 11, 2018

Page 18

3. She attended and enjoyed the Leaderboard Breakfast, and enjoyed hearing the presentation from Mr. Zimmerman.
4. Enjoyed the Hospitality Tent at the Tournament. It was nice to have dedicated time for the Consul General and for Marysville City Council. Next year, it would be helpful to know more about who and when various invitees would be attending.
5. Noted that Monterey Park was the perfect venue for the Memorial Day lunch. She enjoyed Mr. Reiner's comments at the ceremonies.

Ms. De Rosa:

1. Congratulated staff, the City and the Memorial Tournament staff on a well-run event!
2. Thanked staff for installing the panhandling signs. Her only concern may be with the visibility.
3. She, Mr. Reiner and Mayor Peterson attended the Library beam installation event. The building process is moving well, with anticipation of having the structure enclosed by fall.

Mr. Reiner:

1. Thanked everyone who attended the Memorial Day event, notwithstanding the hot, muggy weather.
2. Thanked Mr. Sullivan for the excellently run Memorial Tournament this year. He did not hear any complaints from his ward during all of that activity. Kudos to the Tournament staff for organizing and creating a great event for the City!

Mr. Keenan:

1. Echoed the comments on the Tournament. He enjoyed the Villa venue and the opportunity to meet the Consul General of Ireland. He was able to introduce him to other City guests as well.
2. Staff will be preparing for the next City event on July 4 – he wished them luck!

Ms. Alutto:

1. Thanked staff for the panhandling signage. She believes the sandwich board sign is an appropriate size. However, the individual who often stands at one particular corner removed the sign and tossed it behind the Burger King sign. She has shared with the City Manager's office photos of similar signage that OSU has, which is anchored with sandbags and impossible to move. She agrees that the sign on the other corner is too small and too high. Residents have expressed their appreciation of the City's attempts to mitigate the issue.
2. Attended the Memorial Day services. An Upper Arlington resident who attended shared with her his opinion that the City of Dublin does an excellent job recognizing its veterans. He is a veteran who often attends the City's veteran events.
3. Attended Fore!Fest and enjoyed the event very much.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes:

1. Attended the new Muirfield Ridge groundbreaking event on May 22. It is a nice way for senior housing to be available in relative proximity to the City, providing a product that is not readily available. It is a great use of that property and will not be burdensome to the schools.
2. Participated in the graduation of the Eli Pinney Space Academy. She congratulated the graduates, who are actually launching a jellyfish project into outer space. That is a significant accomplishment for elementary students!
3. Complimented Mr. Reiner on his speech at the Memorial Day ceremonies.
4. Enjoyed the opportunity to spend time at the Tournament with the Consul Generals of Ireland and Japan.
5. Echoed the previous comments about the panhandling signs. She is grateful to staff for mobilizing that effort.

Mayor Peterson

1. Congratulated Mr. Sullivan and City staff on the excellent Memorial Tournament! He appreciates Chief von Eckartsberg and the Police Department who provide



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of \_\_\_\_\_

Dublin City Council

Meeting \_\_\_\_\_

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held \_\_\_\_\_

June 11, 2018

Page 19

protection for all of the large number of pedestrians attending this event. They do an amazing job!

2. Enjoyed the Consul General O'Brien's comments on visiting the "other" Dublin!
3. Recommended that everyone review Ms. Gibson's memo about centralized tax collection, which was provided in the Information Only packet. He believes that Council should have a work session to discuss these issues. The City and Council, too, may have to fight this effort in every arena, as it appears to be a trend for the future. This is an issue that could fundamentally change this community, impacting our resources. Absent those resources, the community will be significantly impacted. Ms. Gibson's memo is very informative in regard to expectations for our future.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor – Presiding Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of Council