



## MEETING NOTES

# Historic Dublin Task Force

Tuesday, September 1, 2020 | 4:30 - 6:30 pm

**Historic Dublin Task Force Members Present:** Kim Way (Chair), Kathy Lannan (Vice Chair), Garrick Daft, Carol Matune, Alan Szuter, and Lynn Long.

**HDTF Members Absent:** Mary Szuter, Clay Rose, Sally Van Horn, Ed Ostrowski, Burt Dowden, Craig Price, Jay Nordenbrock, Paula Yonnotti-Ansel, Becky Brightman, Enas Lanham, Olivia Wirth, and Rohan Madan.

**City Council and Dublin Staff:** Council Members Jane Fox; Jennifer Rauch, Planning Director; Tammy Noble, Senior Planner; Sara O'Malley, Economic Development Administrator; Devayani Puranik, Senior Planner; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Cyndy Barney, IT Project Lead; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Ms. Noble welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance and participation. She said Jeannie Willis, Tina Wawzkiewicz; and Shawn Krawetzki provided presentations at the meeting on August 18, 2020. The next steps for the Task Force is to formulate recommendations that will be presented to City Council.

Devayani Puranik was invited to this meeting to provide information on a parking study she is working on with Engineering with the primary focus on the Historic District. She also stated that JM Rayburn was invited to speak this evening about the Mobility Project/Wayfinding.

Ms. Noble said the Task Force needs to compare the results of the mapping exercise conducted on August 4 to the City's 2007 Area Plan and highlight new areas of focus that will lead to potential recommendations. Mr. Way suggested the task force considers different strategies and gaps; and narrows down recommendations to deliver clear recommendations to City Council.

Ms. Puranik said parking is a valuable asset both for the City, residents, and business owners and explained why parking should be managed in downtown Dublin. Parking management is essential for sustainable and long-term maintenance of parking in the District as parking is a very expensive asset. Surface parking costs \$5,000 to \$10,000/space to construct (including the value of the land they occupy) and structured parking costs between \$25,000 and \$50,000 per space. Premium parking spaces are identified as those directly in front of a business and are highly desirable. It is important for the economic vitality of the District that premium spaces are turned over quickly to accommodate more customers. Our residents and business owners in the Historic District are used to free parking with less than a five-minute walk and therefore, demands are high. We need to encourage behavioral changes that guide consumers to the use of parking garages that are currently at no charge to the public when they are intending on staying for long periods of time.



This will keep on-street parking open for short term parking needs for convenience of customers visiting retail destinations.

Ms. Puranik presented a map of structured parking and on/off street parking both in the Historic District and the Bridge Street District. Parking in the Historic District has 52 on-street parking spaces; 267 spaces in off-street public surface lots, 201 spaces in after-hour parking lots and 924 spaces in structured parking (Bridge Park West and the Library Garage). The map also included private parking areas versus lease parking and time limited parking versus unlimited parking areas. Ms. Puranik stated that in the Bridge Park District, there are 97 on-street parking spaces on Riverside Drive, 235 spaces for on-street parking for all other streets; 2,231 spaces in structured parking (Blocks A through C) and 641 spaces in structured parking in Block D.

As a result of the Parking Study, Ms. Puranik said the following needs to be implemented as part of management:

- a. Shift Demand to distribute parking more evenly across all parking options;
- b. Reduce Demand to minimize future expansions of parking infrastructure and to balance modes of access like bike share and alternative transportation in favor of vibrant, walkable urban environments;
- c. Expand Capacities by adding shared parking rather than private/reserved parking facilities and add after-hour parking;
- d. Manage Event Parking Demand to ease constraints on “everyday” parking resources during intense-demand conditions;
- e. Deploy Technology for state-of-the-practice efficiencies and experience for the customers; and
- f. Coordinate Parking Management to optimize system-wide management and synergies.

Ms. Puranik said parking availability is the most important Key Performance Indicator for the District’s parking management program, as it most directly defines the customer parking experience. Availability will be more difficult to maintain among the district’s most convenient and popular parking options, particularly during times of peak demand. The most effective means of ensuring consistent availability (spaces are mostly, but not completely full) among these spaces during peak-demand periods, is charging for these spaces. Parking supply and demand conditions should be evaluated and used to set/adjust parking rates in pursuit of optimal availability conditions during periods of peak demand.

Ms. Puranik stated that a standard performance target for on-street availability is 15% of all parking spaces or about 1-2 spaces on each block. The study showed that there was 85% to 100% availability from 10 am -11 pm in the Historic District and 85% to 100% availability from 10 am - 11 pm in Bridge Park. The recommendation of the Downtown Dublin Parking Management Study is that when 85% of the on-street parking spaces are occupied, that is when charging for parking

makes sense and will help change behavior by encouraging turnover or moving parkers to the parking lots and garages.

Ms. Puranik stated The Mobility Study focused on ways the City of Dublin can leverage the emerging paradigm shift in urban mobility – in which a sudden expansion of shared-vehicle travel options is transforming long-established connections between vehicle ownership and independent mobility. This would fully realize its potential to remain a top-tier residential, business, and tourist destination in the Columbus region. Parking generally and parking management in Dublin’s walkable-urban centers, in particular, are central to these efforts and a key focus among stakeholders engaged through the Mobility Study outreach efforts. Mobility and Curbside Management will provide an opportunity to test technologies useful to managing parking as part of Smart City initiatives to collect data for future integration with alternative transportation and curbside management and implementing Senior and Workforce Circulators, Complete Streets Resolution, and Bikeshare. This would be in conjunction with a parking management pilot of broadband infrastructure that will uniquely position the City of Dublin to be at the forefront of integrating and beta testing new infrastructure technologies (Smart Cities) and initiatives. Smart Parking can be one of these, not just for the sake of managing parking, but also the opportunity to test technologies useful to that end. Smart Parking technology can provide guidance, communication, and a monitoring system for certain surface lots and on-street parking spaces in Historic Dublin.

Ms. Puranik ended her presentation by asking if there were any questions regarding this high-level overview. She confirmed for Ms. Noble that there were approximately 1,500 parking spaces in the Historic District.

Mr. Szuter said he gathered from the presentation that there is not a shortage of spaces in the Historic District but instead, a lack of awareness of parking space locations and availability should be the focus. He suggested people do not want to walk 10 minutes to reach their destination and could technology be used such as a parking availability APP. Ms. Puranik answered there are two companies that offer that service that could be considered. One requires sensors to be added and the other requires cameras. Test companies are designing a pilot and hopes technologies can be incorporated. It would work for every area except garages. The City is learning from systems in Westerville and Columbus and need to determine how invasive a system would be and what it would cost.

Mr. Way asked if there is an APP available for everything that could include parking as well as Historic District information while visiting/touring. He asked if an APP will provide locations for parking while one is still at home or other options like offering a route to be taken by bicycle or public transit and the length of time the alternative modes of transportations would take. Perhaps

this could be something we develop ourselves. Mr. Szuter stated his family in Chicago, IL have an APP available that allows them to reserve a parking spot.

Ms. Fox asked what would happen in a scenario where a space is reserved but does not get revealed because of a no-show or that the space was not paid for. Ms. Puranik said there are different policies implemented depending on the city. A camera system that uses license plate recognition, if there is a no-show, was suggested.

Ms. Long agreed parking is sufficient but demographics of patronage matters, especially for the handicapped. The library garage is too far for elders. Ms. Puranik confirmed there are just handicapped spaces in the public parking lots. Ms. Long was asked about the parking for where she teaches classes. They use commerce parking; they do not need parking for 50 patrons like a restaurant.

Ms. O'Malley reported the City has 30 spaces in the Dublin Community Church lot.

There is a recommendation to City Council to change out signage so public parking is more visible. Ms. Long agreed signs are important as they have national teachers that fly in and some from neighboring states like Kentucky that may drive in. Ms. Fox said she is concerned about the elderly being able to access parking if they cannot use Apps. Ms. Puranik said some systems allow for people to call in for help. She added the goal is not to alienate anyone.

Ms. Fox asked if visiting the Historic District is going to become less easy if patrons have to use an APP or make a phone call to locate parking. Additionally, she asked if "parking management" will be detrimental to the Historic District.

Mr. Szuter suggested creating a map with green dots that represent open parking spaces. Then someone driving in from say Indiana for example, should be able to drive in and grab it. Ms. Noble suggested working with volunteers headed by Christine Nardecchia as they could help bridge the gap by being mediators.

There needs to be a distinction in parking, such as a garage or a surface parking lot.

Ms. Lannan inquired about sensors and if all street parking included Riverview and Franklin Streets. Ms. Puranik said sensors work well for on-street parking and to obtain the most accurate data there has to be a sensor in every space. If the City decides to use a system that uses sensors, it will be done in phases to get an understanding if that was the right direction for the City to take. She also confirmed those streets are part of the 1,500 total number of spaces.

Ms. Lannan asked if the City currently counts the number of cars in the parking garages. Ms. Puranik answered there is no parking management proposed for parking garages yet so technology is even more important. On-street parking space occupancy of 80% was based on observation. Mr. Way said he recommends parking management but to let the City decide which type of technology to use.

With no more questions, Ms. Puranik's presentation for this part of the meeting was complete.

Ms. Puranik introduced JM Rayburn, Planner I in the Long Range Planning Division. She said he has been stewarding the Mobility Project, a pilot program for multiple demographics including our senior population and our employees through the work shuttle program. This includes overseeing these programs through Covid-19.

Ms. Rauch provided an update to the Dublin Mobility Study, which is to compliment what Ms. Puranik just shared. The Dublin Mobility Study is the City's strategic plan for innovative transportation network improvements to support the community's evolving mobility needs and provided a graphic showing the four phases of the project that began in 2017 with a lot of public outreach. Phase 4, which began in 2020 assesses pilot programs and transitions to permanent mobility programs and identifies funding options.

Mr. Rayburn stated there are five key objectives for the Mobility Study: where to support economic development; promote equitable access to mobility; expand multimodal options; improve public health; and preserve our environment by focusing future growth.

Mr. Rayburn further stated there are also five Strategic Mobility Priority Areas in Historic Dublin as follows:

1. Shuttles & Circulators (Micro-transit)
2. Bike Share (Shared Micro-mobility)
3. Wayfinding on Shared Use Paths
4. Concepts for Mobility Hubs
5. Complete & Smart Streets

Mr. Rayburn said Phase 2 of the Mobility Study was completed in 2018, and focused on priority setting and action plan development in alignment with City Council's "Connected Community" theme. There are many ways to connect systems as there are a lot of assets to leverage. Routes can be programmed with the shared use path system. These concepts are exciting and technology will be part of the endeavor. The City will lean on regional partners for best practices. Columbus has some policies staff is reviewing.

Mobility in Historic Dublin will appear as follows: The Dublin Connector (micro transit); Wayfinding; Bike Share (shared micro-mobility); Complete and Smart Streets; and Mobility Hubs. Bike share will be incorporated in future endeavors and will include other communities in the northwest corridor. Mobility Hubs provide a space to co-locate at least two modes of transportation and serve as transfer points: Downtown Hubs include Bridge Park and Historic Dublin; the Campus/Community Center Hubs include medical centers, office parks, recreation centers, etc; Park and Ride Hubs serve large transit stops with park & ride; and Neighborhood Center Hubs serve residential areas at a common access point. These hubs must be accessible and provide the ability to navigate throughout the City.

Early concept plans have been started for the Bridge Street District and Historic Dublin. Mr. Rayburn presented a graphic showing what a Downtown Mobility Hub could look like. Between the City street and buildings there could be a bus/shuttle stop, and then 200 square feet of bike parking, a mobility kiosk and a bike facility all under a transit shelter. There would be a hailed-ride service connection point and two curb spaces for car sharing.

Mr. Rayburn said his presentation was based on the larger objectives of the program and do not rely on more than one mode of transportation. He completed his presentation by offering to answer any questions. As there were no questions, he offered to meet with the Task Force again for discussions with smaller groups/topics.

Ms. Noble began to focus on the August 4, 2020, mapping exercise. All the comments were taken from the first three meetings and were assimilated into topics or themes. She presented the map, which is also available online at <https://dublinohiousa.gov/planning/historic-dublin-task-force/>. The legend includes specific examples provided by members of the Task Force with associated commentary. Under the map, there is a "click here" option so additional comments can still be provided/published. Noted locations on the map represent objectives to highlight examples of their comments. All examples were posted as a result of the mapping exercise. Ms. Noble presented the summary of comments. She stated the purpose tonight is to take some of the comments from the mapping exercise to draw similarities. When the Task Force engaged in this exercise, there will likely be connections with the 2007 Area Plan.

Mr. Way said the process has prompted extra independent thinking despite what the 2007 Area Plan might have said. He recommended that the members think broadly now about the Historic District.

Building on the last meeting, Mr. Way indicated he has seen the City following, implementing, and accomplishing streetscape desirables or improvements from the 2007 Area Plan and would like to see that continue. The Task Force can still be impactful as the area is growing and changing. He has heard the concern that people have expressed about losing the essence of the Historic District

and wants this group to have the opportunity to review new development and respect what it is. The group needs to preserve the area as best possible and not allow development pressures to negatively impact the area.

Ms. Long agreed preservation should be a strong philosophy that the group supports.

Ms. Fox asked if the Task Force has discussed development outside the scope of just architecture/buildings. The answer was yes, including the assets and whole character of the Historic District.

Ms. Noble presented the map from the exercise and explained the markings on the map point to places the Task Force prefers or would like to use as an example for changes in the District. The comments were represented as they were presented by each member with no edits or interpretation. She went through the groupings and subgroups devised like parking, traffic, and streetscape that all work hand in hand. It was interesting that the group was very united on the topic of parking not being an issue in the District. The Task Force does not support more parking lots/area and would like to focus more on traffic concerns and pedestrian safety. The streetscape should feel like the Historic District to help distinguish the area from other parts of the city.

Ms. Lannan said the Task Force could put forward a streetscape. She indicated Mr. Krawetzki's presentation to the Task Force also went to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) last week and they requested more renderings. She reiterated that renditions of changes is helpful. It would be a good policy for the City to make visual changes to the Historic District but the ARB's input is important and should also be presented to City Council.

Ms. Noble continued with more summary of comments such as character. This should and will be important to other groups for what is appropriate for the Historic District. She inquired about the level of preservation the Task Force is considering to achieve. Mr. Way reiterated there is a concern of losing character and stronger language is needed. The current regulations may not go far enough to keep with the character and preservation desired and suggested making the process more rigorous. Development in the Historic District should undergo an extra level of scrutiny, especially for S. High Street. Ms. Lannan referenced the homes on North Riverview Street. This area is the very core of the Historic District and should be preserved. When homes fall into disrepair the owner or new developer will go to the ARB and request demolition. The ARB should take a stronger stand and enforcing a property maintenance policy. Ms. Noble stated there is a demolition process that goes through the ARB but that has been a strong discussion point across all the Boards, Commission, and Council. The question is, where to draw the line. She also stated that staff is currently reviewing property maintenance regulations so properties are less likely to come into disrepair.

Ms. Noble focused on wayfinding. The City would like some consistency on signage city-wide but the Task Force wants the Historic District to be unique. She asked about vitality and how to encourage more people to visit the district, stay, and bring vitality to the area.

Ms. Noble continued with the summary comments with parks and open space. She noted the Task Force provided specific ideas including Indian Run, which has been highlighted as an important area to preserve. Ms. Lannan suggested using Indian Run as a high buffer area. The number one important thing to her is to protect that corridor and have it shared with the community. Mr. Way indicated that the intention and use of parks is going in the right direction and reiterated that the residents in the Historic District do not want to encourage high-end condominiums along the Scioto River where there should be more connectivity of green space. The Task Force has suggested more access to several parks as well as to the Scioto River and introducing additional pocket parks, if they are being intentional and specific. This aligns strongly with the 2007 Area Plan.

Ms. Noble asked if there should be a singular, primary area for activities. She asked if there should be a focal point for gatherings in the Historic District and how the Task Force felt about the West Plaza as a gathering space as well as others locations. Mr. Way said the park emerging (Riverside Crossing Park) is becoming a nice gathering space and he added the beauty of the Historic District is its intimacy. Mr. Daft said there used to be a Veteran's Parade and cookout next to the Old Cemetery but that area is now taken up by the parking garage. Mr. Way added the area including the L-shaped building could be rethought and the area south of Bridge Street is in need of revitalization.

Ms. Nole shared staff's preliminary comparison to the 2007 Area Plan to the alignment of the Task Force's recommendations. In the 2007 Area Plan, one of the objectives focused on creating a central focal point for the District and creating unique gateway features. Comments from the Task Force that align with this objective include making entry into the Historic District notable and encouraging street signs, lights and banners that are unique to the District.

The second objective of the 2007 Area Plan that aligns with comments from the Task Force was enhancing the quality streetscape environment of the District. Members of the Task Force have similar comments including encouraging brick sidewalks and benches (ie attention to streetscape), trees that contribute to the look of the Historic District, and discouraging LED lights that are not acceptable, especially on South High Street.

Ms. Noble stated the third objective of the 2007 Area Plan with similar ideas are the need for safe vehicular and pedestrian choices. The Task Force reinforced the ideas which include the desire to have improvements made to Franklin Street and maximize space for walking and pedestrian movement.

The fourth objective discussed was encouraging shared parking and clear wayfinding. The Task Force was very united in the sentiment that they do not support more parking areas and would like to encourage shared parking when feasible. The members also highlighted the need for clear wayfinding especially between parking areas and retail businesses.

Ms. Noble focused on encouraging mixed-uses and highlighting the civic nature of the District and establishing clearly defined parks and open spaces. She referenced several comments presented by the Task Force that align with these previous objectives of the 2007 Area Plan.

Ms. Noble concluded the analysis and then focused on comments raised by the Task Force that were unique and therefore potential new recommendations to City Council. These comments included: the creation of a group/entity to oversee management of the District; creating process improvements for business owners; to review the impacts of demolition to the District and how it relates to preservation; ensuring proper balance of historic preservation; to explore options for alternative mobility (shuttles, bike share program, etc); and reviewing sustainability practices and how they impact the historic nature of the District.

With the presentation completed, Ms. Noble entertained further questions and final comments.

Mr. Way said he was interested in mixed-use buildings with people living over businesses. He commented that the Riverside Drive/SR 161 roundabout is not included within their purview and should not be included in their analysis.

Ms. Lannan noted the difficult crosswalk in front of Starbucks that according to the presentation by Engineering is being resolved. She does not enjoy pushing devices to cross the street or have flashing lights to cross. Traffic is slower moving south of Bridge Street so she does not see a need for crosswalks with current technology. The District is evolving to be a fairly easy place to move around. The traffic light at Rock Cress Parkway has been successful at slowing down traffic.

Ms. Long inquired about the designation of historic buildings and if the goal is to increase designations. She suggested possibly adding one or two per year. That is an important element for Historic Districts. Mr. Way suggested the City should throw every tool to that end they could. Ms. Noble said the Task Force needs to make it a priority and since it involves private residences, they would be able to help with the process. Ms. Long suggested if historic designations were an initiative of the Historic District, with collaboration, the process could be completed to relieve the property owner and use the designations as a marketing tool.

Ms. Noble asked if there was anything else that is important that should be made a priority. She asked how the City of Dublin can assist the businesses to stay in the Historic District and how

important preservation should be. There appears to be a strong interest in the balance of preservation and sustainability. Should there be a different oversight of the District.

Ms. Noble stated there would be one or two more meetings to formulate recommendations to present to City Council. She thanked everyone for their participation, noting there is still a lot of work ahead of them. She said her PowerPoint presentation will be available to the Task Force on the website. She offered to send the draft recommendations to each member so they have something to react to but asked how the framework looks going forward. Mr. Way and Ms. Lannan should at least be meeting and reviewing the information.

Ms. Noble adjourned the meeting and stated the next scheduled virtual meeting is September 15, 2020, at 4:30 pm.