



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 5, 2020 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

5. **Bridge Street District – Amended Final Development Plan 20-177ADMC-INF** **Administrative Request – Code Update-Informal Review**

Proposal: To add an Amended Final Development Plan to the review processes in the Bridge Street District (Zoning Code Section 153.066) to align with other processes.

Request: Informal review and feedback on a potential future Zoning Code Amendment.

Applicant: Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager, City of Dublin

Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager

Contact Information: 614.410.4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us; and

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-177

RESULT: The Commission provided positive feedback to staff regarding the inclusion of an Amended Final Development Plan process to the Bridge Street Code to ensure a more streamlined and efficient review process for less complex development projects. The Commission supported staff bringing forth a Code amendment to address this topic at a future meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Jennifer Rauch

C68B79E6958D44D

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP
Planning Director



[Motion passed 7-0]

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

5. Bridge Street District – Amended Final Development Plan, 20-177ADMC, Administrative Request – Code

Ms. Call stated that this is a proposal to add an Amended Final Development Plan to the review process in the Bridge Street District (Zoning Code Section 153.066) to align with other processes.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Husak stated that staff is seeking informal feedback on a potential future Zoning Code amendment regarding the inclusion of an Amended Final Development Plan option in the Bridge Street District review process. This was discussed previously at the October 1, 2020 Commission meeting. Included in the meeting materials are: the current criteria for the Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) in the PUD process; the criteria for the Final Development Plan (FDP) in the BSD Code; and the Minor Project review criteria in the BSD Code. The intent is that the AFDP process would exist between the Minor Project and the existing Final Development Plan. Staff is requesting the Commission's input on the two review criteria in the PUD vs. the BSD as well as the eligibility criteria for the Minor Project. In the PUD provisions, any application, regardless of how major or minor, that has previously been reviewed as a Final Development Plan is eligible for an Amended Final Development review. In the BSD provisions, this option only exists if the modification can fit within the Minor Project criteria. Under the current standards, a substantial site or building modification to an existing commercial site would require the same level of review as new construction, which is very cumbersome, time consuming and costly for the applicant and staff. That may deter owners from making improvements. In order to ensure the scope of the review process matches the scope of a proposed project, staff recommends the inclusion of an AFDP process in the BSD review process.

Public Comment

No public comment on the case was received.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call stated that she believes this process change is warranted.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is generally in favor of the recommendation, but further refinement of the process might be needed.

Ms. Call stated that if the Commission is supportive of staff proceeding with developing the proposed BSD Code language, there would be opportunity to refine the process when the proposed language is presented for the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Grimes stated that the proposal is common sense. It will make it easier for staff, developers and property owners to make needed improvements, decreasing the time and cost of doing so. They can invest their money in the property rather than in the process.

Ms. Fox stated that she is interested in seeing the property improvement process in the BSD made easier and less costly. However, the AFDP language mentions development of open spaces, lighting, driveways, signage and landscape plans; it does not mention the intent of the BSD for pedestrian connectivity and street vitality. Consequently, property owners' plans for renovation would not include that element. The intent of invigorating of streetscape needs to be emphasized repeatedly; otherwise, the Commission is not going to get what is desired in the BSD.

Commissioners were supportive of staff drafting a proposed amendment for the BSD Code review process for Commission consideration, with inclusion of the intent for invigorating the streetscape.

COMMUNICATIONS

- Proposed 2021-2022 PZC meeting dates will be revised and provided at the next meeting for consideration.
- The next regularly scheduled PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 10 at 6:30 p.m.
- A joint meeting of Council/PZC/ARB/BZA is scheduled for December 14 to provide an update re. policies, challenges and issues.
- A tentative second PZC meeting date in December 2020 to accommodate the number of cases (perhaps following the 12/14 joint meeting) will be recommended by staff.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council