



**DUBLIN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**AUGUST 20, 2009**

**CITY OF DUBLIN™**

**Land Use and  
Long Range Planning**  
5800 Shier-Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/ TDD: 614-410-4600  
Fax: 614-410-4747  
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us

**Agenda**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>1. Shamrock Auto Spa<br/>09-066CP<br/>(Discussion only)</b></p>         | <p><b>4012 West Dublin-Granville Road<br/>Concept Plan</b></p> |
| <p><b>2. Tartan Ridge – Section 3<br/>09-036FDP/FP<br/>(Tabled 6 – 0)</b></p> | <p><b>Final Development Plan/ Final Plat</b></p>               |
| <p><b>3. Zoning Code Update<br/>09-072ADM<br/>(Postponed)</b></p>             | <p><b>Administrative Request</b></p>                           |
| <p><b>4. The Meaning of Land Use Principles 3 &amp; 4</b></p>                 | <p><b>Team Presentation</b></p>                                |

Chair Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Todd Zimmerman, Warren Fishman, Richard Taylor, and Amy Kramb. Mr. Walter arrived prior to the beginning of Case 1. City representatives were: Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Tammy Noble-Flading, Dan Phillabaum, Gary Gunderman, Aaron Stanford, Steve Smith, Jr., Amanda Mahar, and Libby Farley.

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested amendments to the July 16, 2009 meeting minutes on the third paragraph of Page 12 to change the speaker from “Ms. Amorose Groomes” to “Ms. Karagory” and on the last paragraph of Page 14, to add the word ‘Council’ after ‘City’. [Action was not taken regarding approval of the minutes.]

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Fishman made a motion to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

### **Administrative Business**

Ms. Amorose Groomes announced there were no consent items and that the cases would be heard in the order of the published agenda.

**1. Shamrock Auto Spa  
09-066CP**

**4012 West Dublin-Granville Road  
Concept Plan**

Chair Amorose Groomes explained that this was a discussion about a concept only, and the applicant will be provided with feedback from the Commission and no action would be taken.

Claudia Husak presented this request for review and feedback on this Concept Plan for a proposed carwash. She said in July 2007, the Commission reviewed a similar proposal from the same applicant for the same site. She said some Commissioners were not supportive of the proposed use on the site as it did not meet the Future Land Use Map or the Area Plan, and some Commissioners thought that with some modifications, this use might work on the site. She said the applicant is back to hear additional comments from the new Commissioners not present in July 2007.

Ms. Husak said the site is approximately one acre, located on the northeast corner of West Dublin-Granville Road, east of David Road. She said to the west there is one lot between this site and the Shamrock Crossing development, approved in early 2007, which includes commercial uses oriented toward the road on the north and south sides of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this site and the property to the west are zoned R-4 which is a high density residential designation, and the land to the south, farther to the north, and west are all zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, and to the west is Lowe's and vacant land both zoned CC, Community Commercial District.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed site plan showing a 5,000-square-foot carwash oriented toward West Dublin-Granville Road, which includes four carwash bays and stacking. She explained that Code requires 12 spaces per lane for a carwash. She said the building is set back 40 feet from West Dublin-Granville Road. Ms. Husak said an escape lane is provided to the south of the building. She said there is an access point off Banker Drive and landscaping has been provided around all sides of the site.

Ms. Husak presented the SR161/Sawmill Road Area Plan that states that the planning goals for the area are to develop a coordinated mix of office, retail, and mixed residential uses while establishing a stronger sense of place and central focus. She said that the plan should facilitate pedestrian movement between uses and enhance the approach to Historic Dublin from the east. She said that was one of the focuses of the Shamrock Crossing development where there was a lot of discussion about where the buildings should sit and what type of uses would be permitted there.

Ms. Husak said Planning's concern is that the nature of a carwash is not in any way pedestrian oriented, and the way the building is oriented and the use of the building prevents any pedestrian activity and therefore, it is Planning's opinion that the Area Plan is not met for this particular use.

Ms. Husak said on the Future Land Use Map within the Community Plan, this site is designated as General Commercial, which is intended to account for many of the existing commercial uses within this area that currently predominately depend upon the automobile for access. She said the Community Plan considers this category somewhat outdated and not envisioned to be used for future development in this particular area.

Ms. Husak said the General Commercial category as a broad use category includes auto-oriented uses, however with the Area Plan, auto oriented use was not contemplated to be part of the General Commercial area or as part of the General Commercial use on this particular site.

Ms. Husak said the applicant included architecture for the carwash building. She said the building has been turned to have the doors face east and west rather than south, which was the 2007 proposal. She said the applicant is trying to put some elements together that would be reminiscent of the Shamrock Crossing architecture. However, she said it was still Planning's concern that having the garage doors facing both roadways as you approach is not the most desirable view on this roadway.

Ms. Husak presented some Preliminary Development Plan elevations submitted in 2007 of Shamrock Crossing that Mr. Taylor had requested be shown.

Ms. Husak said based on the findings discussed in this presentation, it was Planning's belief that even though the Future Land Use Map is technically met, the Area Plan is not met, and the Land Use Principles that are also part of the Community Plan are not met with this particular use on this particular site. She said Planning is basing the findings on the fact that the building is set back too far from the street to create the street edge that Planning is envisioning here and in the Area Plan. She said it hinders any pedestrian-oriented activities, it does not meet the recommendation and design intent of the Area Plan, and the architecture is not compatible with what is envisioned along West Dublin-Granville Road, particularly because of the presence of the garage doors. Ms. Husak said that Planning also believes that the proposal is inconsistent with what was approved for the design, intent, and uses of the Shamrock Crossing development.

Mike Close, Wiles, Boyle, Burkholder & Bringardner Co., LPA, representing the applicant, Shamrock Auto Spa, LLC said that when they were before the Commission informally in July 2007, the building was set in the center of the property, oriented with the bays open on the north and south ends of the property. He said they heard loud and clear the Commission comments about architecture. He said this plan moves the entire building closer to SR 161/Dublin-Granville Road, to the building line, with the exception of a 15-foot escape lane on the south side of the property.

Mr. Close said generally, the architecture and waterfalls on the front of the property do a significant amount of screening to this project so that the cars will not be seen, as staff believes they will be seen. He said it was interesting that Planning's comments on this report, compared to what was done in 2007, were almost line for line identical, so if nothing, they have been consistent on what they said. He said he thought the whole issue with this particular project was that he did not agree that this architecture is not high quality and not consistent with what was going on in Shamrock Crossing. He said from his perspective, the whole deal is what is the intent and use as

far as this pedestrian-oriented area is concerned. He said they all knew that in that area with nothing to the east for miles but commercial, and nothing to the west for miles but commercial, and no particularly large businesses like a Cardinal, Wendy's, or OCLC in the area, that this is not going to be an area where there will be hoards of people walking east and west on those sidewalks. Mr. Close said the issue then really is, does the fact that they are going to have essentially right turn in onto this property really hinder the pedestrian flow, and he did not think that it does. He said it would be seen also from the last plan, that instead of entering the project from David Road, that they moved the access so that they enter from Banker Drive.

Mr. Close said it seemed to him that the real issue here was that pedestrian issue. He said they are within the Community Plan. He said by definition, this project would go into the Community Plan as a General Commercial use. He said the question was really, what kind of impact they have on the pedestrians; what kind of impact does it have visually when you have this kind of landscaping and waterfalls in front of the project for those few pedestrians that will be there to walk through. Mr. Close said additionally, given the fact that this is a one-acre site that was not developed with Shamrock Crossing, he did not know how else it could be developed. Mr. Close said in that regard, he thought this kind of proposal was absolutely the kind of thing that does not detract from the appearance, detract from the connectivity, or interfere with the pedestrian traffic any more than any other project would because he thought anything you could get there, cars would have to turn back in to get to the project. Mr. Close said for all the reasons he mentioned, he respectively disagreed with the analysis of staff as far as those kind of impacts go.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for Commission discussion.

Todd Zimmerman said he was present the last time and he remembered that the building had been pulled forward. He asked how close the buildings from SR 161 were originally planned for Shamrock Crossing. Ms. Husak said the Shamrock Crossing text leaves the exact number open, so that was something that was to be determined at the final development plan stage. However, she recalled that in some instances, there were numbers like 15 feet, 30 feet, or 20 feet, something within that area discussed. She said they really wanted to have some relief to that, so there might be patio space that is a little bit further set back within kind of a recess.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what the distance was from Dublin-Granville Road to the building edge. Mr. Close said the only thing that they had allowed for the bypass lane was 15 feet. Ms. Husak said it was around 45 feet total. Mr. Close agreed, but said that two-thirds of that is landscaping. He said simply put, if they did away with the escape lane, they would still be roughly 30 feet back. Mr. Zimmerman asked if an escape lane was required. Mr. Close said he did not think they were required to, legally.

Mr. Zimmerman said his biggest concern was the Community Plan. He said he thought it would be based upon what they Commissioners thought about the Community Plan. He asked if they are going on how Planning looks at the Community Plan, that will be one way, or if they feel that this is part of the Community Plan. He said he was undecided a little either way to be very honest. He said it was going to be a classic infill, and there were two sites to the west. He asked if this was what the Community Plan wanted to fill it with, and what the whole thought was that they worked

so many hours on doing the recent Community Plan. Mr. Zimmerman said he wanted to hear the other Commissioners' thoughts.

Warren Fishman said it was the wrong use. He said the architecture was lovely and as carwashes go, it is a great-looking carwash. He said there are plenty of places in this area for development. He said there is a house across the street and other available lots. Mr. Fishman said in Dublin, properties are accumulated and put together as one parcel. He said however, in his opinion, once the carwash is on this site, it sets the stage, and it would not set the stage for high-end office or retail office or whatever. He said it is Dublin's corridor. Mr. Fishman said he agreed with Planning's recommendation. He said they fought to make that corridor look beautiful and it has a long way to go for development. He said they wanted to set the stage with some high-end use, not that carwashes are not needed and used. Mr. Fishman said regarding pedestrians, he agreed that right now, people will not be walking there, but if someone accumulates all that property and puts something there, then we will have pedestrian use, and that is kind of what was envisioned in the Community Plan. He said coming in off Dublin's side of Sawmill Road, coming into the corridor of Dublin we should have something that is high-end and attracts people, and so on, is needed, and a carwash will not do it. Mr. Fishman wanted it to be understood that the carwash was welcome in Dublin, that it was very well thought out, and he liked the way it was switched, but he thought it was the wrong place. He said the minutes provided had not changed his mind.

Kevin Walter said he had a problem with the use because of the location of where it was because it was kind of a gateway element for the City. He said a lot has been done in the last few years to bring the east side of the river into more of a neighborhood feel. He said when Mr. Close talked about them "not hindering pedestrian flow" he did not think that was the intent of pedestrian orientation. He said making a sidewalk and a nice path to go through is one thing. He said it was a nice sidewalk and the waterfall looked great. Mr. Walter said that things for pedestrians to do are needed. He said across the street, some sort of residential living is being contemplated, there is Wendy's Headquarters, Shamrock Crossing is being built, and things are being done to try to draw people to that side of the river. He said he had trouble with the pedestrian orientation, and that was one of his concerns.

Mr. Walter said the garage door sort of architecture was another concern. He said he liked that it was turned, but the garage doors will be seen from the road and that was problematic. He said it would be horrible in the winter when there is no activity on the site and you will just see the garage doors.

Mr. Walter said he did not believe this was classic infill. He said classic infill to him would indicate that there were no available parcels anywhere around there. He said if something is put on the parcel without accumulating land around it will make the parcel directly to the west undevelopable, not that it is the applicant's responsibility to accumulate land. Mr. Walter said it was the Commission's responsibility to try to look at things like that. He agreed the carwash was needed and if he were the owner of a carwash, he would want to be on SR 161 too. Mr. Walter said he would prefer to see the facility maybe back off Banker Drive if something were available there.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if Mr. Walter was talking about the garage doors or the openings. Mr. Walter noted that there were no garage doors shown on the plan.

Mr. Walter said regarding the escape lane, should at some point this concept moves forward, it would actually be beneficial to cover that escape lane and make it a non-functioning carport. He said that would pull it a little closer, so if there is some agreement that could be there, that might be an addition that might be helpful.

Mr. Close asked Mr. Walter if the parcel directly to the north, on the north side of Banker Drive would meet Mr. Walter's location problem. Mr. Walter said he thought that was a great suggestion. Mr. Close said if they moved back a lot, the position might be a little different. Mr. Walter said even if it were on Village Parkway it would have to be reconfigured. He said he was not trying to move them away from an area that does not have flow, because it is needed for the facility; he said he thought right in front of the City is probably problematic.

Mr. Close said he was not arguing with Mr. Walter. He said he was appreciating his comment for what it was.

Ms. Amorose Groomes clarified the location of the two detention basins. Ms. Husak said there is some development potential for the eastern half. She said there is an outlot available. Mr. Close pointed out that was still on Dublin-Granville Road, so that would be the same problem.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was trying to figure out how much land could be accumulated here to put something together. She asked if the sliver might have some possibility. Ms. Husak said there was just one site to the west of this and an application has been received for a learning center and maybe some other commercial use for the lot.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested the two parcels be tied together to get more land. Ms. Husak said even though there is the other lot; it is currently residential, and included in Shamrock Crossing. She said it is still for sale. Mr. Close said that would require a vacation of David Drive. Ms. Husak said she did not believe that Engineering would have any qualms about that. She said David Road had already been vacated to the north. Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that the parcel could be tied together as 1.5-acre, or this could go to Shamrock Crossing. Ms. Husak said there was a possibility.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the house west of the gray house was part of Shamrock Crossing. Ms. Husak said there were two houses west of David Road. She said the house immediately to the west of David Road was the one that an application has been submitted and now it is a half-acre site. She said another single-family house is part of Shamrock Crossing.

Mr. Fishman pointed out that if someone wanted to accumulate land for an office, they could also regrade that retention and put the retention on the other side of it, and then there would be two acres there, and then if David Road were vacated and Shamrock Crossing wanted to expand their use, they could have probably five acres there. Ms. Husak said that was speculation at this point. Mr. Zimmerman said at least in the front, there could be two acres and the width of David Road. Ms. Husak said there was definitely vacant land around the site.

Amy Kramb said she was okay with this. She said she thought it was far enough east, there were the retention ponds to the north and east of it, and you come up and see Lowe's, and this is much more attractive than the sign and entry into Lowe's. She said that with the mounding, landscaping, and waterfall, it would be the best-looking carwash in Dublin. Ms. Kramb said there would be pedestrians from Shamrock Crossing, but there is nowhere else to walk. She said she could not think what could be put on a one-acre spot that will draw that many more pedestrians. She reiterated that she was okay with it. Ms. Kramb said she thought it was an appropriate use for that small parcel. She said there were too many unknowns to assume requiring more land, retention basins, and that Lowe's would sell anything, and whatever.

Mr. Walter asked when the point would be reached where sprawl from Sawmill Road is enough. He asked how far into Dublin are we going to do this. He said they have to think further down the road about what happens across the street, what happens to Stoneridge Medical, and what happens to the big parcel of land that is to the east. Mr. Walter said Lowe's to him, felt like it should be the end of the real heavy commercial corridor, and he did not like it creeping in a little more, and a little more.

Ms. Kramb said that was the other side of the street, and she did not see people crossing SR 161 here. She said she was okay with it being just one acre. She said you would see the difference and know that you are in Dublin. She said it will look very different and be landscaped.

Richard Taylor said his biggest issue is with the description of the area as being pedestrian-oriented. He said this is why he asked Ms. Husak to show the elevations. He said there was a difference between "pedestrian-oriented development" and "pedestrian-oriented looking development," and in his opinion, this was a "pedestrian-oriented looking development." He said the buildings are on the street and there is a narrow sidewalk, but if you look at the site plan, 100 percent of the access is by car from the back. Mr. Taylor said no one will park in the back and walk around the front. He did not think cafes and umbrellas would be seen in front of the shops here. He said in fact, given the location, he speculated that there would not be much retail opening in these places. Mr. Taylor said there was no question it would look good on the street, but he did not see that as something that generated pedestrian activity.

Steve Langworthy said he absolutely agreed with Mr. Taylor. He said Planning talked with Shamrock Crossing before any final development plans are prepared, and it was requested that they create locations where pedestrians could move from the front to the rear because activating the street does not do any good unless you give people access to the street in some manner other than coming through a retail or restaurant space. Mr. Langworthy said Planning expects that when the final development plan is submitted, there will be something created that people go through that way.

Mr. Taylor said that was helpful, but as you look up and down the street there are so many already developed places that are not going to be pedestrian-oriented, but Historic Dublin is attempting to be and hopefully will be developed more that way in the future. He said starting down Riverside Drive, obviously there is development on the corner that things could change there. He said Wendy's headquarters will remain as a corporate office where there is a sidewalk and beautiful landscaping, but it is not a pedestrian-oriented development. Mr. Taylor said across the street, the

Shops at River Ridge development, which was done either before or during the publication of the Community Plan. He said it has that same pedestrian-oriented appearance to it, but it has the site plan and development as another strip center. He said it was internally oriented, the parking lot is in the front, and all the shops are at the back. Mr. Taylor said had that place been turned the other direction so that those shops were out on the street, and the parking was in the back the way that Shamrock Crossing is intended to be, there would be a large chunk of streetscape being developed at that end of the street. He said coming a little farther to the east, there is La Scala, Oakland Nurseries, Leo Alfred's, and the limited access drive that comes across there and all of those things in his opinion are barriers to pedestrian orientation. Mr. Taylor did not think there was any pedestrian orientation for this to continue.

Mr. Taylor said more specifically, the idea that pushing the building toward the street is going to enhance the pedestrian orientation only makes sense if this building has the kind of business that people are going to come and go from the street, and clearly, they are not. He said this building is designed so that you do not get out of the car, so there is no pedestrian use of that. He said he thought if the building were to appear here that the "pedestrian-orientation" would be better served by shoving it back to where it was before, not turning it, but pushing it back on the lot and taking the area in the front and developing that further as landscaping and maybe a little pocket park, or something that enlivens that if that is going to be a pedestrian area. Mr. Taylor said he thought that was one way to take a step towards the pedestrian orientation.

Mr. Taylor said comments about the architecture were warranted because it was mentioned in the Planning Report. He said that the building is compatible with the buildings on the street; however, he did not think that was a good thing. He said he thought this building was trying too hard to look like Historic Dublin and old buildings. He said that Dublin has a number of very attractive buildings that have no or very little historic imageries of them, and yet fit wonderfully in this community. Mr. Taylor said the three most obvious examples were the new hospital, the MAG building, and Cardinal Health which were buildings that fit very well in Dublin that stand well as known architecture and do not try to imitate anything else in Dublin. He said he would have made these comments on Shamrock Crossing if he had been on the Commission at the time it was presented. Mr. Taylor said that this is not Historic Dublin and he did not think they should try to make it that.

Mr. Taylor said the building should be good architecture and something that is of high quality. He said it just does not have to be a hip roof, a tower, arches, little gooseneck lamps, rounded dormers, and things that try to imitate that look. He mentioned the carwash that existed in Historic Dublin a few years ago. He suggested a building that was much less obvious that did not have a big, tall hip roof on it, hid itself behind the landscaping, had nice signage out front to indicate that the carwash was there, and let that building be a nice architectural object on its own without trying to imitate something else. He commented that this kind of project of this size and scale is the kind of thing that is presented to third-year design students to do something with, take an otherwise mundane project, and see what exciting things they can do with it. He said if the architects thought about it from a "how can this be a special building" as opposed to "how can it be a building that duplicates and replicates and fits in with everything else on the street," you might get something that is attractive in its own right.

Mr. Taylor said he thought the tower is a non-starter, and certainly, because of recent discussions the Commission has had, there is no way that the sign is going to go up 25 feet into the air as shown. Mr. Taylor summarized that he did not buy the pedestrian-orientation aspect of this and he thought that the community and the building itself are going to be better served by making it less visible, less obvious than what is drawn.

Mr. Walter asked about the Leo Alfred building's red tower that was massive in scale compared to what was around it. He said he hoped that when the rest of that develops that it will look better and like it belongs in that space. He asked if there was a way to tie this building to that building to better integrate those pieces.

Mr. Taylor said they were pretty far apart. He said one of the things that we have in Dublin, as discussed a few weeks ago about the Germain project, is that we tend to have low buildings that do not stand out and the signage does not predominate, but they still seem to do okay and still attract business. He said the earliest example he was aware of was the old BP station on Bridge Street that is now a Mr. Tire. He said when it was built, it was behind mounding, very low key, and you did not see the bays from the street. He said signage was low to the ground, out the front and it worked out very nicely. Mr. Taylor said at a gas station that was integrated in Lakewood, Ohio on a major street in a very residential area, the only sign it was a gas station was a ground sign and the building itself was in the background, and yet people still find it and use it successfully for years. He said that he thought there were ways to integrate this into the overall streetscapes that do not necessarily require it to replicate and imitate what is there. Mr. Taylor said this was a great example of where less would be more here in a big way.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not opposed to this and did not feel the use is counter to the Community Plan. She said while the Plan is a moving and breathing document, she did not have any fundamental problems with this being a carwash. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she shared Mr. Walter's concern with the property immediately to the west and certain that it is not Mr. Close's or his client's problem, but it should cause the Commission pause to figure out what it is that they can do with that particularly because their access is coming in from Banker Drive that they would really need David Road to stay in place for their access. She said once this would go through, abandoning David Road would be very problematic for this application. Ms. Amorose Groomes said her hope would be that the resident there might enter into some discussions with Shamrock Crossing if they ever had any interest in not residing in that home. She said she did not have tremendous problems with this being a carwash. She said she liked the way it was oriented. She said the Commission asked that it be changed, and they did.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not like the architecture. She said she saw a lot of roof, and every time she looked at the Leo Alfred building, all she sees is roof. She said she would like to see the building be of all natural materials. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she liked the arches and would like to see them on both sides. She said she would like to see a little more stone and less roof. She said the sign would never go that high in the air, so whatever building was designed, a place for the sign should be built that is in a reasonable elevation because the Commission does not like to put billboards in the air.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if anyone from the public would like to speak to this application. [There was no reply.]

Mr. Walter explained that his problem was with the use, which might be solved by the orientation of the building, but he did not know. He said so far they have provided a building that goes horizontal and a building that goes vertical, so they are either stuck with looking at the bays when driving by or struck with looking at the bays. He said he did not like coming up from the hill from the river and at the top seeing car wash bays for the next 50 years. He said maybe an orientation to the building that may cantilever it into the site might do something to eliminate that view shed and with proper screening and things like that, that may eliminate it. Mr. Walter said when Historic Dublin came in for the Bridge and High Streets development, the Commission looked at a series of view sheds and had some triangulation of what it would look like when sitting in the intersection. He said it would be interesting to see what it looks like coming from the east and west to get a better sense of what you may see.

Mr. Walter said he suspected that if the building was oriented the opposite way and the eastern edge of the property were screened, it would eliminate seeing the bays when coming up the river, and when coming from Sawmill Road side of it, screening might handle that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the landscape plant palette had a long way to go. She expected a carwash like this to have a higher end plant selection than Purple Leaf Sand Cherries and things that seen at a gas station in the City of Columbus. She said she would like to see a nice plant palette if it were to move forward. Ms. Amorose Groomes encouraged mounding on the east and west corners that could taper down where the waterfalls and things are out in the center and it would come gently down which would help visually. She said she liked the orientation because only the first two bays would be seen, whereas if the building were oriented in the other way, all four bays would be seen all the time, screaming at you in the face.

Mr. Zimmerman asked everyone to remember that this carwash will be open 24/7. He said regarding the carwash on Avery Road between Rings and Woerner Temple Roads, at the time, the Commission had no choice because it was in the text that the carwash was permitted. He said when seen at night, the inside of the building is white and it is a beacon that really shines. He said it was not the parking lot lighting. He said it was big and glowed. Mr. Zimmerman said there would be four bays here that are going to glow. He asked if that was what they wanted to look at 10 to 12 hours a day, depending upon what time of year it was. He said that was part of the orientation for pedestrian traffic. He asked if that was the vision wanted because of the orientation and traffic. Mr. Zimmerman said he thought the vision someday was for the restaurants and businesses they wanted to see. He asked that the Commissioners think about that.

Mr. Walter said that was a good point, and hoped that some of the concerns will be worked out if this comes back to the Commission. Mr. Zimmerman recalled that the Avery Road carwash landscape plan included a lot of extra tree caliper because they took many trees down and the Commission made them keep everything on site. He estimated it was 60 to 80 more caliper inches. He said it was vast with the trees and what all is there, but when you see it, it is nothing special.

Mr. Walter encouraged the applicant to think through the stacking, the vacuum island, and how a car could join back into the lane. He said everyone wants to pick the short lane, so thinking through the site plan is important.

Mr. Fishman clarified that he did not want to give the impression that he was against this because of the walking corridor. He said he was against it because he thought it was the wrong use for an entrance. He said, as Mr. Walter had commented, where is the commercial going to stop. He said they did not want this to look like Hamilton Road, they wanted it to look like the entrance of Dublin. Mr. Fishman said however beautiful this building is made, a carwash will still be seen when coming up and down the hill, and he thought that probably was not the best use for this property. He referred to the Community Plan where the spirit of this corridor is something that reflects Dublin, and said whether it is office architecture or something that looks like the hospital, or something, he did not think anyone envisioned a carwash, gas station, or something like that. Mr. Fishman said he thought something that looked like Shamrock Crossing or Stoneridge Medical Center was envisioned, and that was why he was against this. He said if there is a need for a carwash, there are other properties elsewhere in the area on Shamrock Boulevard and so on where it could be built.

Mr. Close thanked the Commissioners for their comments and attention.

**2. Tartan Ridge – Section 3  
09-036FDP/FP**

**Final Development Plan/ Final Plat**

Ms. Amorose Groomes explained that this application is for a Final Development Plan/ Final Plat for 26 lots in the Tartan Ridge neighborhood in the northern portion of Dublin. She swore in those who intended to speak in regards to this application, including Charles Driscoll who represented the applicant, Tartan Ridge, LLC, and City representatives.

Claudia Husak said this is a Final Development Plan and Final Plat for the third section of a residential development within Tartan Ridge, and the Final Plat requires a recommendation to City Council for final approval and the final approval of the Final Development Plan rests with the Commission. She said Tartan Ridge is located in the northernmost portion of the City and it is a Planned Unit Development that shares its southern boundary on McKittrick Road with Tartan West. She said to the east is Jerome Road and then Tartan Fields, which is outside of the City boundary, Brock Road is to the north and to the west is Hyland-Croy Road. Ms. Husak said Glacier Ridge Elementary school is located within a portion of this development. She presented a photograph, which indicated the subject site, which are the proposed lots immediately adjacent to the school. She said the slide indicated the approved 2007 Preliminary Development Plan. She said the whole development includes 246 single-family lots, about 68,000-square-feet of commercial development in the southwestern corner, 24 townhouse units, and approximately 70-acres of open space. She indicated where the 11 homes, which were included as part of the Parade of Homes in July was north of these, proposed lots.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed Final Plat for Section 3, which includes 26 single-family lots, numbered 145 through 170, and includes Reserve 'O' which is 20 feet in width and many existing mature trees. She said the lots are accessed by Glacier Ridge Boulevard to the north that provides

access from Hyland-Croy Road. She said in the center is Golden Rose Way and to the south is Emmet Row Lane, which will be platted with this section. Ms. Husak said to the east is Tartan Ridge Boulevard which comes into a roundabout where a majority of the lots have frontage. She said that as Tartan Ridge Boulevard turns south, it is called Burnett Lane, so the road really goes north from the roundabout. She pointed out the build zones that were included in this development, and said that rather than having front yard setbacks, these lots have a build zone that varies in width, and the requirement is that a portion of the front façade has to be within that zone in this development. Ms. Husak said the design intent behind it was to have more of a front door type community where there is activity to the street.

Ms. Husak indicated on the slide an area where a dry retention basin was proposed, but not included on the plat. She said that is where the majority of the stormwater is supposed to be handled. She said the basin is temporary, and in the future, there will be lots there.

Ms. Husak presented slides showing the two alternative layouts that were approved in the Preliminary Development Plan for Subarea D. She said the entire plat includes also lots within Subarea D, but the majority of the lots are from Subarea D-2, which includes an alternate layout. She said 24 lots are accessed through an alley are permitted or as the applicant is now proposing, 17 lots that are just street accessed and not accessed by an alley. Ms. Husak said the two options were included in the Preliminary Development Plan, and the applicant is proposing to move forward with the more conventional suburban front-loaded, single-family lots.

Ms. Husak explained that most if not all exhibits from the Preliminary Development Plan included the alley lots. She said that Tartan Ridge Boulevard comes to a roundabout generally in this area, and the design of that was not necessarily contemplating driveways. She said Engineering expressed concerns about the driveways as they were shown originally. She said that they have studied those in more detail, and has asked the applicant to keep away from the center of the roundabout for a certain distance to the north and south and not to put driveways within this particular area. She pointed out that that can only be accomplished if two lots share a driveway.

Ms. Husak said another concern is Lot 152 on the northeast corner which is the first lot seen coming in from Glacier Ridge Boulevard. She said that Planning has asked the applicant and it has been conditioned in the Planning Report to limit the garage orientation so that the garages are not facing outward towards the road as you are traveling into the subdivision. Ms. Husak said the exhibit presented shows the way that Planning would want that to be laid out so that the garages are oriented toward the east.

Ms. Husak said about half of those lots are restricted to not allow street-oriented garages or garage doors fronting out toward the road. She said that Planning is concerned that while the restriction is in place, it would still allow court-loaded garages, and there is a lot of pavement with them in the front of the home, in front of the build zone, within the build zone, and that is something asked that the applicant restrict. Ms. Husak said a particular concern of Planning is the lots that are fronting on what was required to be included as an open space connector. She said that particularly for this type of public space, having those court-loaded garages is just not a vision that was contemplated at the Preliminary Development Plan. She said the design of the Preliminary Development Plan was very much sold as a unique community or a community that

is not anywhere currently located within Dublin. She said that Planning believes that restricting those garages will get closer to that point.

Ms. Husak presented a graphic showing the different types of lots, which included 70- to 75-foot wide Cottage Lots. She mentioned that a discrepancy was found between the two northern lots and what the graphic shows and the text allows. She said the proposed conditions would help rectify those two lots. Ms. Husak said Park Lots and Village Lots are also included in this section. She reiterated that the Park Lots restrict the front-loaded garages, but the court-oriented garages would be allowed.

Ms. Husak said architecture in this development and how it is being reviewed or restricted is unique to some extent. She said there is a very detailed architectural diversity requirement. She said one of Planning's concerns is that this section may be developed by one builder and the architectural diversity is pretty difficult to achieve if it were to develop only by one builder. She said the text includes a provision that if the architectural diversity cannot be met, it would have to come back to the Commission to get a theme approved. She said Planning wanted this to be clear in the condition that it would have to take place under such circumstances.

Ms. Husak said all the criteria for the Final Development Plan and the Final Plat have been reviewed by Planning. Ms. Husak said Planning is recommending approval with the following nine conditions, as listed in the Planning Report:

- 1) That any minor technical adjustments to the plat should be made prior to City Council submittal;
- 2) That the plat indicate a Build Zone of 13 to 20 feet for Lots 152 and 153 and that street-oriented garages not be permitted;
- 3) That Lot 152 not be allowed to have to have garage doors facing west;
- 4) That Lots 154 through 170 not be permitted to locate garages forward of the front façade of the home;
- 5) That if the proposed architecture for the lots within this Section does not achieve the required level of architectural diversity, a theme for these lots be brought back to the Commission for review and approval;
- 6) That the design of the temporary detention be modified to preserve existing trees, subject to approval by Planning and Engineering;
- 7) That the detention basin not be permitted for longer than four years after the acceptance of the public improvement by Engineering;
- 8) That a temporary drainage easement encompassing the areas of the detention basin and the associated stormwater structures be provided prior to the recording of the plat, subject to approval by Engineering; and that a sign indicating the temporary nature of the basin be installed, subject to approval by Planning; and
- 9) That the plans and the deed restrictions indicate the Homeowners Association maintenance responsibilities of the hedge, subject to Planning approval.

Ben W. Hale, Jr., Smith and Hale, representing the applicant, Tartan Ridge LLC, explained that seven lots originally permitted were eliminated to achieve this plan, and they have worked diligently on the landscaping. He said they have included in the range of 600 trees or bushes,

more than required. He said in terms of the medians and landscape, they think they have gone way beyond the call of duty.

Mr. Hale said that in terms of the Final Plat, they agreed with Condition 1 and all the conditions with the Final Development Plan, except Condition 4. He said they had built courtyard homes in the development already, and they believed it was the type of home that was approved on the site, and they want to retain that as an option. He said they understood the diversity and architectural requirements and they would continue to comply with them. Mr. Hale said they believed that the courtyard garage housing type is appropriate.

Greg Chillog, Landscape Architect, The Edge Group, explained the approach to the landscaping at Tartan Ridge. He said one unique feature is the effort they made to make it stand out through streetscape, and part of that one element is the use of a continuous hedge throughout all the streets of Tartan Ridge. He said the idea behind that was to create a definition between the public and private space. He said that also helped to separate the private courtyard location from the public because the hedge helps buffer that along with the additional architectural features of the gates and gateposts at the sidewalks and driveways. Mr. Chillog said they worked with Planning intensely on the final design for what is seen in the strip of land in front of the lots and the right-of-way, and what that is ultimately is a continuation of a buffer treatment or a landscape concept which they committed to in Section 1 to provide some type of visual enhancement to the openspace connection from the park in the center of Tartan Ridge to the park to the north. He said they certainly made an effort to work with Planning to improve this public section of the development for the better.

Mr. Hale said they had very strict architectural standards and diversity requirements. He said when they agreed to those standards, there was a tremendous amount of thought given to them, and they think that courtyard homes are appropriate, they are improved in the text, and they want to retain them. He said a map was included in the text that mentions the lots where the roundabout is located and along the major streets and one of the things they committed to in this development was that in none of those areas where lots front public streets would they have front-loaded garages. He said that front-loaded garages are only allowed on culs-de-sac or on streets that are not major through streets. He said in all of those areas, courtyard homes are allowed, but front-loaded garages are not.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone who intended to speak in regards to this application. [There was no reply.]

Amy Kramb asked what traffic data was used to model the roundabout. Aaron Stanford said the traffic data used would be for the 2020 year with the entire development built out, including any outside traffic from a commercial area. Ms. Kramb said according to the plan, the driveway was right at the splitter island. Mr. Stanford explained that it was partly by Engineering's request. He said for roundabouts, what they looked for as far as access management is two main things. He said first, they do not want to see a driveway entering directly into that roundabout. He said the second thing they look for is to locate those access points outside of the crosswalks, so an additional conflict is not added with pedestrian and vehicular movements. Mr. Stanford said it pushed the driveway a little bit farther and he thought where it ended was as shown on the plan,

the driveway was moved just outside of the end of the splitter island.

Ms. Kramb said maybe, it was a foot or two from the split island. Mr. Stanford said for Engineering that was another positive because that enables that driver to be able to make an additional movement in and out of the driveway without being restricted by the splitter island to make those movements. He said they also look at site distance, which is measured a little different than at a standard 'T' intersection and then stopping site distance. He said they look for the actual queuing, so if a vehicle slowed down to move into that driveway or stop, there is an area to store one vehicle between there and that circulatory roadway.

Ms. Kramb confirmed that Engineering was okay with a one-car queue. Mr. Stanford pointed out that this street had a much lower volume than most of Dublin's roundabouts. He said this was 25 mph versus much higher speeds like on Hyland-Croy.

Ms. Kramb asked if Engineering was okay with the site distance with the hedge and trees. She pointed out that there was a tree right at the corner of a driveway, and traffic will not be seen coming out of the roundabout until the bumper is in the street. Mr. Stanford said typically, trees are not considered site distance obstructions because usually they are high enough that you can see from a vehicle. He said the hedges were low growing, and you should be able to see over the hedge or below the branches of the trees.

Kevin Walter asked if the full build-out of this development was used for the traffic model. Mr. Stanford said for the traffic study they looked at all the roadway network on opening day, plus ten years for all of Tartan Ridge.

Mr. Walter confirmed that no accommodations were made for Jerome Village which will have an immediate entrance onto this road across the street. He said everyone going to the retail center is going to drive down that road. Mr. Stanford explained that outside traffic is included. He said he thought for this one, which it was a few years ago, he did not think specifically they had included Jerome Village in their traffic study, but they would have outside traffic data included in the study. He said he could not speak to the Jerome Village traffic, but he thought that at the time that this traffic study came through, Jerome Village was not far enough along for it to be modeled in their traffic study.

Mr. Walter said he did not agree with that at all. He said they are trying to train drivers in Dublin how to work a roundabout, and at this one drivers will be making a left right before getting into it. He said he thought it was unconscionable for these driveways to be put around this roundabout, and he was disappointed that this alternative was chosen. Mr. Walter recalled that when this came through, the Commission had been to Franklin, Tennessee, they had looked at alleys, and this was a place to model that, and it was decided instead to go to a suburban layout because that was what everybody was buying. He said he thought it was a bad choice to make considering what they are trying to achieve here, and not to be completely contrary to it, he saw this looking like Memorial Drive with all these driveway cutouts on it. Mr. Walter said he thought it was going to be a high-traffic road and it will be the main thoroughfare down to the retail center for everybody that lives in and outside the development and farther east of it.

Richard Taylor congratulated everybody on what appeared to be a very successful and well-received Parade of Homes. He said that his feelings about this were the same as Mr. Walter's. He said he also was very disappointed that they went with what was an outside-of-the-box plan and instead they went to just doing more single-family lots with street loading driveways. He said it would have been nice to have at least one piece of this development be something different. He said they started with something special and chip away and chip away, and now they were back to curvy streets and culs-de-sac like we always have.

Mr. Taylor said he was also concerned about the driveways close to the roundabout, and particularly the one on the outbound side because there are going to be two houses using that. He said he could imagine somebody pulling into their driveway as their neighbor is pulling out at the same time. He said the farther they can get away from that, the better. He said nothing would be farther away than the lots being alley-accessed as opposed to loading from the street.

Mr. Taylor asked for clarification for Lots 154 through 170 regarding the front-loading garages, that front-loading garages and not courtyard loading garages were permitted. Ms. Husak explained that some of the lots are not allowed a garage door facing the street, unless it is an accessory detached garage loading to the rear of the home. She said the doors are not allowed to face the road. Mr. Taylor confirmed that courtyard loading garages was being proposed. He said that was really a non-issue on this to him.

Mr. Taylor said that if one builder picks this all up, which sounds like that is where it is headed, and is unable to achieve or having difficulty of achieving the text, it comes to the Commission. He said he was glad that it came back to the Commission, but he questioned why it would be difficult to do that if there is a text. He said the only thing he could think of was it would be difficult to do that with their standard product. Mr. Hale said that they did not believe that it is difficult in any way to meet the diversity requirements. He said that they believed that the Commission would never see it. He said this is not a unique location because there is another in the subdivision that is the same.

Mr. Walter said that same argument could be made to say that what was done on Tara Hill was a good idea.

Ms. Kramb said this plan fails under Criteria 2 for the vehicular circulation and safety because of those driveways by the roundabout. She said that they have a clean slate right now; it has not been built. She said it was different than if all the houses were there and they were putting in a road and it was decided that they had to have a roundabout and rather than tearing down the house and relocating someone, we will let their driveway stay this close. She said right now, there are no houses or driveways to contend with, and they should make this the best they can. Ms. Kramb said the engineers from her office, when building a roundabout would prefer to stay as far away from the roundabout as possible, 200 to 300 feet from the roundabout. She said it was different if something was already in place and then the road is built. She reiterated that there was nothing built yet and she did not think it should be built that close.

Mr. Zimmerman said he agreed with Ms. Kramb. He said when they originally saw this they were doing the alleyway system which worked well along there. He said they were knocking the

curb cuts out and were only looking at 75-foot wide lots. He said they would look at a lot of concrete and asphalt in front of the driveways. He said the original alleyway system gave it a completely different look which was that green, better look. Mr. Zimmerman referred to some of the City Council comments in the minutes. He said that they wanted to see a breakthrough for Dublin, something different and a true neighborhood community experience. He said it will have the architecture and it has the diversity, but it would not have the streetscape diversity. He said it would look like every other development, except it is going to be crammed on 75-foot lots, with driveway after driveway, and it will be really tight. Mr. Zimmerman was really disappointed because they were dealing with ultimate plan, however he said legally, he was sure it was the applicant's call. He said this development was sold as something 'Wow,' and to him that was the only little piece in there that offered anything different and special. Ms. Husak clarified that there are alleys to the south.

Mr. Zimmerman said it was like a neighborhood pattern, and now it is being eliminated. He said he thought that was something different. He said they were smaller lots, with cottage style houses and smaller homes. He said it gives you a different feel when the homes are pushed forward and now there is all the concrete in front. He said that took away the walkability of a pretty neighborhood. Mr. Zimmerman said now, all that would be seen is concrete. He said this is being done on a main drive and it will take some of the commercial in and everything else. Mr. Zimmerman said he assumed that legally, the Commission does not have any call on which plan they develop.

Steve Smith, Jr. said that legally, the applicants have the option of doing either of the two and it is their choice. He said legally, the Commission is confined to the Final Development Plan criteria. He said the text in terms of if the Commission finds something here that they do not approve of, that a criteria can be pointed to do so. He said that was what the Commission's review was limited to do.

Mr. Walter said it failed on Criteria 2, so if the applicant were willing to eliminate Lots 158, 159, and 160, then it would no longer fail on that, and if not, it fails. He said if it fails, the other option is to go with the alternative layout which does not fail and actually gives them more lots.

Mr. Zimmerman reiterated that he was very disappointed in this because he thought this development would be something different.

Mr. said he agreed with everything the Commissioners said. He said that eliminating the three lots or going to the other plan was probably their choice.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she also agreed with the other Commissioners. She said her inclination was to believe that these are to be homes where people have the ability to age in place and that this would be a downsize for many empty nesters and so forth. She said she could not see backing cars into a roundabout for anybody, regardless of age, but particularly for the target market here. Ms. Amorose Groomes said it was problematic and if something happened there, she would shoulder that because the Commission has the opportunity not to do that. She said the other Commissioners had presented their arguments eloquently, appropriately, and very clearly

indicated that it is review Criteria 2, that it would not be presenting a safe environment for folks to dwell.

Mr. Hale clarified that these were not 75-foot wide lots, they were 85-foot lots. He also made the point that in front of the lots where the roundabout is, there is about a 75-foot setback where the landscaping treatment is located. He said there are two roundabouts and they have the exact same situation in those other roundabouts with other lots. He said those lots had been approved prior to tonight, so this is not something that is unique to these lots.

Mr. Chillog pointed out they started planning how to do the intersections so that they would draw attention to the parks. He said a small traffic-calming island in the street turned into a roundabout. He said the traffic study was done without the roundabouts. He explained that the traffic circles were installed for beautification, not because of the anticipation of a high amount traffic.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that two motions are required.

Mr. Hale said that they would like to move the plat forward. He said that Mr. Driscoll would like an opportunity to work with Planning one more time to see what else they might do with the driveways to get them farther away. He said there might be another solution to move the drives some, and they would like to do that with staff on the Final Development Plan. He requested a tabling of the Final Development Plan, but asked for action on the Final Plat.

Mr. Walter said it seemed if the Commission approved the Final Plat, it would be near impossible to not approve the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that Mr. Hale wished to table the Final Development Plan and Final Plat. She confirmed that only one motion would be necessary to table the entire case.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Taylor made the motion to table this Final Development Plan/ Final Plat as requested by the applicant's representative, Mr. Hale. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Walter, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Tabled 6 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the Commission would look forward to having the applicant working with Planning to get this resolved and be back in short order.

Ms. Amorose Groomes called a short break before beginning the next case.

### **3. Zoning Code Update 09-072ADM**

#### **Administrative Request**

The Zoning Code Update was postponed prior to the meeting. There was no discussion or action taken.

#### 4. The Meaning of Land Use Principles 3 & 4

#### Team Presentation

Richard Taylor disclosed that although he was a member of this team, in reality he only was able to attend the first meeting. He said whatever is presented he had not seen and had nothing to do with. He said that he was sure it would be fantastic and wonderful, but he wanted his name taken off as he did not deserve any credit for the wonderful things that are about to be presented.

Tammy Noble-Flading said this team was tasked with the responsibility of digesting and explaining Land Use Principles 3 & 4, and to present them in a way that people can use them in the applications. She said until you look at them and use them, you do not understand how important they are. She said she was fortunate to have partaken in tonight's presentations. She said the team, along with Mr. Taylor consists of Steve Langworthy, Dan Phillabaum, and Amanda Mahar.

Ms. Noble-Flading said Land Use Principle 3, *Creating places with integrated uses that are distinct, sustainable, and contribute to the City's overall vitality*, are broken down into three digestible parts. Ms. Noble-Flading explained that *identifying distinct and integrated uses* was the idea of getting contained uses that complement one another in a close proximity to each other.

Ms. Noble-Flading said that *changing lifestyles, economic conditions, generational differences, and similar shifts in society may allow for creative development options that respect tradition, but recognize the new realities*. She said as communities change, whether they are changing through social conditions, economic changes, or simply demographic changes, those changes are expected in a community. She said for a community to be successful, they have to change with those conditions, however you can still recognize the traditional elements of the community and still take into consideration those changes that are taking place in the community.

Ms. Noble-Flading said to get to the heart of what she believed was the primary topic for this principle is *integrated uses*. She said again, she was equating that to the same terminology as mixed uses. She said they are first and foremost talking about creating places instead of developments, the sense of place that you get when you visit the Historic District or it is the sense of place when you go downtown Columbus. She said you know that you have arrived in a certain location with a specific point to it and it gives you a perspective, a feeling that you remember and identify with that particular location. Ms. Noble-Flading said that *form and character* talks to many of the points that Dan Phillabaum will talk about, but it is not just the use of a property, but it is how you design it as a site with activity and functionality. She said she liked the idea if you use a vehicle, that you park once and the uses draw you to the location where there are multiple things for you to do without physically getting back into a vehicle. She said you can walk about and interact with people and places without vehicular transportation.

Ms. Noble-Flading said regarding *architecture*, we do not want to create architecture that limits a particular use and/or cannot transition to a different use in the future. She said regarding a *distinctive area*, an example of the idea is that you cannot create a fake, distinctive area. She said she believed the Commissioners were talking about that in the Shamrock Auto Spa application. She said it was only going to be successful if you create it and it is a real representation of what you are doing. She said if you try to put a façade on a building, it is surely not going to be successful.

Ms. Noble-Flading pointed out that if a city is to be successful, it has to have overall vitality to it. She said regarding the idea of *vitality*, the group described or at least shared ideas of what it is. She said the city has to be economically vital, it has to have an activity, pedestrian car interaction and social activity to be successful, and with both of those two qualities we create a sustainable community. Ms. Noble-Flading said bringing those qualities together equates to what they are trying to achieve for the City of Dublin.

Ms. Noble-Flading explained that *contributing to sustainable uses* means uses were not something that they want to see come and go, but uses that can sustain a long period of time. She introduced Amanda Mahar who would provide examples of what they believe vitality in a city could look like or perhaps not look like.

Amanda Mahar said when looking at a city's overall vitality, they have a poor example of what they do not want to associate a city with, which was a general big box development that is seen a lot all over the country. She said it could be immediately seen that it was not designed to keep people in the area, and if it does, they probably not very happy when they are there. She said in order to create a functional development you need to incorporate and provide principles that work together to form a community. She said that positive principles that they looked at included mix of uses, which were already spoken of where there are shops, leisure, community involvement, commercial and residential, in a single building or in neighboring buildings. She said they would like to see high densities where there is a lot going on so that it is walkable.

Ms. Mahar said a strong sense of place is where you have an association with that area and you want to be there or you have memories and you are tied to that area. She said also well-fostered and community involvement, very strong, safe and attractive pedestrian, cycle links with a mix of facilities within easy walking reach of each other. She presented an example of a development, which was sea of asphalt, with very boring architecture, and a big box to keep as much space as you can, and there is no sense of place. She said it was more of a get in get out mentality where people really do not want to be there except for the essentials that they need, and there is no mix of uses, it is mostly all commercial.

Ms. Mahar presented an example of strong vitality in Jacksonville, Florida. She said there was a mix of uses with the commercial on the bottom and residential on the top. She pointed out a mix of pedestrian links, a sidewalk, bike trail, and parking lot. She said they also incorporated a green space that makes a safe environment so there can be a lot of people in the area, but you still have a feeling that you are safe and nothing bad is going to happen to you there. She said there is also a high density which we look for in these types of developments. Ms. Mahar said an area such as this could be summed up as walking, living, shopping, and being in the place. She said as the result, the design of a mixed-use development is convenient, has well located paths that create an area from homes to intended destinations which could be shopping areas, other homes, and open spaces. Ms. Mahar said that was what they felt is necessary in order to be a successful development for the city's vitality.

Ms. Mahar introduced Dan Phillabaum for his presentation on Land Use Principle 4. Mr. Phillabaum said Land Use Principle 4 in a way hones down a little further on Principle 3 and

specifically looks at *retail services in closer proximity to residential areas*. He said that could be viewed as an amenity and not a nuisance to residents. He said in order to achieve that, the design considerations obviously are of critical importance. Mr. Phillabaum said you can provide retail in close proximity to residential through the types of mixed use developments that Ms. Noble-Flading and Ms. Mahar spoke of and they also can be done on a lesser extent as infill projects and adjacent to existing neighborhoods. He said while both methods share some common design considerations obviously in the case of infill retail around the existing neighborhood, it is a much more heightened degree of sensitivity to those design considerations just to ensure that what is being proposed does not diminish the quality of life of the residents and what they are used to. Mr. Phillabaum said there were not many opportunities actually to achieve that.

Mr. Phillabaum said some of the benefits of retail services in residential areas built upon the earlier presentations. He said when land uses are put significantly apart it requires numerous and lengthy automobile trips just to achieve the daily trips, shopping, working, and obtaining services. He said conversely when orienting retail toward neighborhoods, it reduces the traffic volume on the thoroughfares, and you can contribute to a high quality of life for both residents and workers within the city.

Mr. Phillabaum said the basic characteristics are that they possess a variety of the functional attributes that positively contribute to day-to-day living and quality of life. He said they are typically small uses in or near residential districts that have a variety of neighborhood services and the use is very critical here. He said obviously they would not call a mixed use for a neighborhood retail, anything with a drive-thru or any auto-oriented types of uses. Mr. Phillabaum said a quarter-mile radius is used as just the typical standard that an average person would walk to a neighborhood retail center. He said bikepaths and other amenities that we have in Dublin would certainly enable that non-vehicle traffic to be a little bit farther out from these neighborhood centers.

Mr. Phillabaum said in order for these to be successful, they have to be appropriately integrated into a neighborhood and have a proper relationship with the thoroughfares as well. He said they can be looked at either integrating into a neighborhood or transitioning as you approach a neighborhood with different housing styles and different development patterns so they are not creating bad adjacency relationships. He said the design needs to minimize the impact of external traffic to the neighborhood.

Mr. Phillabaum presented examples which he chose as more horizontally integrated land uses and retails opposed to vertically being office or residential over retail. He said rather than repeating some of the characteristics seen on Land Use Principle 3, they would look at a few different examples which everyone is familiar with. He began with the Shoppes at Athenry and showed the quarter-mile radius, to provide a sense of scale and the number of rooftops that the small center can serve. He said it has some positives as well as some negatives. Mr. Phillabaum said issues that are run into with this particular example are the orientation of the architecture and how it interfaces with the neighborhood. He said the architecture being pushed back from the thoroughfare decreases its visibility and also puts all of the service areas in direct relationship with the single-family residences. He said in this case, the transition would have been one alternative that is introducing a different form of housing type, maybe stepping to townhomes to

maybe duplexes, basically transitioning from the retail environment. He said alternatively, it could have been wrapped with architecture with all of the vehicular movement located on the interior so it actually interfaces a little more with the neighborhood.

Mr. Fishman said the Shoppes of Athenry was probably one of the most successful centers of that size in Dublin. He said the only complaint he had ever heard about the center was that the residences that abut the center are too close. He said if it had been mounded and there had been a really good setback away from the houses and maybe a bikepath through there and 50 to 100-feet of trees or landscaping, it would be almost a perfect center. He said interestingly, the United Dairy Farmer manager told him that it was the highest volume store in Central Ohio. He pointed out that it was well landscaped away from the street and the sign met Code and so on. Mr. Fishman said he hated to hear that it could be buffered with a different type of housing unit. He said anyone that lives in that different type of housing does not want to be considered a buffer. Mr. Phillabaum clarified that there are a number of ways that transition can occur with perhaps mounds giving separation between the two. He said he would present a couple of other examples, which would maybe illustrate better the point he was trying to make.

Mr. Phillabaum presented the Tartan Ridge proposed small neighborhood center and the homes within the quarter-mile radius walking distance. He said it was much easier to do these types of neighborhoods when everybody knows going into it, what is coming next and that there will be retail. He said they are choosing to live there because they see a benefit in that. He said it was a case where they partially used some open space to give a little separation between the units, although they were still connected through bikepaths through that greenspace as well as the street system, and some townhouse units stepping to alley loaded smaller lot residential which remains to be seen. He said it illustrated both ways to interface neighborhood retail.

Mr. Phillabaum said some of the Commissioners had the opportunity to see West Haven, which he thought was also referred to tonight as one of the inspirations, if anything for Tartan Ridge. He said they were getting a little bit beyond the scale of a neighborhood center with this development. He said it was more of a town center level of commercial development, but again it was located on a principal thoroughfare to take advantage of through trips and serving people's daily needs as they go through, but in the larger scheme of the development, you can see the number of homes that this development could serve and beyond those just within the quarter-mile radius again they have a highly integrated grid street network that offers a lot of different paths and different ways to get around the neighborhood. He said here, they saw the townhouse units that backed to the retail and office space as well. He said this plan also included an elementary school that was linked along the spine. He said also focusing the other destinations within the quarter-mile walk so that everything can be accomplished in the same general vicinity.

Mr. Phillabaum concluded, by saying that they will see future opportunities for these and also to recognize the future importance. He said obviously within the developed portions of Dublin, there are relatively few opportunities to do the style of infill neighborhood serving retail in existing neighborhoods, and that was not unintentional. He said as Dublin approaches build-out, this different style of development pattern will assist in not only maintaining the high quality of life that Dublin is known for today, but also allow it to be competitive on into the future as some of the demographics and economics change and different types of housing demands can be met.

Mr. Phillabaum said they look forward to working with the Commission on making great places like this.

Mr. Walter suggested that the problem with the area across the river was that they had never defined what it was supposed to be. He said we have the Community Plan, but it is completely at odds with what exists. He said there are things there that are not going to change for a long time, so defining the sense of place of what should be there may help them in the future better figure out what should go in places. He said the Commission had pictures and things, but not necessarily a mission, theme, or some sort of identity for that area.

Mr. Walter pointed out that Mr. Phillabaum said use was critical. He said the best example of use being critical was Jeni's Ice Cream in Historic Dublin. He said until they went in, you did not know that people lived around there and all of the sudden there are baby carriages and teenagers and all kinds of folks. He said you do not want to be so definitive with the use category. He said the use has always depended upon what the developer can take into the space, but they should be thinking about those kinds of things when they think about use. He said that makes all the difference. He predicted that Bri-Hi will be more successful because people are showing up there just because of that one business.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the Commission stuck to good architecture, pushing it up to the road and trying to make it pedestrian-friendly, and then the market decided what should be there. She said she did not want to be in the business of narrowing down our uses because ultimately, the market will determine what is successful, and it has.

Mr. Fishman pointed out that there had to be a vision of what was supposed to be there. He said he talked to Pat Grabill and his first choice for that corner was an ice cream place. He said the important thing was the use and what it can be and if the developers can define it more, he thought it made it a lot easier.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the teams and said the presentation had been informative.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 8:42 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.