



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

Creating a Legacy

DUBLIN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 20, 2011

AGENDA

1. **Shamrock Crossing PUD, Subarea B – Heartland of Dublin**
11-057Z/PDP/FDP **4075 W. Dublin-Granville Road**
Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan
Final Development Plan
2. **2012 Annual Items of Interest** **Administrative Request**
09-080ADM
3. **Bridge Street Corridor – Code Modification** **Administrative Request**
11-020ADM
4. **Bridge Street Corridor – Vision Plan** **Informal Discussion**

Chair Chris 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, John Hardt, Richard Taylor, Joe Budde, and Amy Krumb. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Dana McDaniel, Stephen Smith Jr., Claudia Husak, Jennifer Rauch, Dan Phillabaum, Rachel Ray, Justin Goodwin, Jeannie Martin, Kristin Yorko, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Rachel Beck, Alexis Dunfee, and Libby Farley.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made a motion to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Zimmerman seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Administrative Business

Communications

[There were no communications to report.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She determined the order of the cases 1, 2, 4 and 3. [The minutes reflect the order of the agenda.]

1. Shamrock Crossing PUD, Subarea B – Heartland of Dublin
11-057Z/PDP/FDP **4075 W. Dublin-Granville Road**
Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan
Final Development Plan

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application involving revisions to the development text and the preliminary development plan for Subarea B of the Shamrock Crossing Planned Unit Development to permit the construction of a 65,000-square-foot rehabilitation and nursing facility on the southwest corner of West Dublin-Granville Road and Shamrock Boulevard. She said the proposal also includes a final development plan and there will need to be two motions, one for the rezoning with a preliminary development plan and one for the final development plan, with the rezoning going on to City Council for a final decision. She swore in those intending to testify regarding this application including Christopher Cline, representing the applicant, Kevin McCauley, Dan Dokken, David Lanning, David Saneholtz and City representatives.

Eugenia Martin presented this application. She said this case had been reviewed informally twice by the Commission; once in January of this year and then again in April. She said the Commission's comments regarded the building layout not engaging the street, the proposed suburban style architecture, and the in-wall air conditioning units on the building facades. She said the changes the applicant has made include adjustments in the layout of the building so it engages the street, modifications to the architecture to be reflective of the more prominent buildings found within Dublin, and the removal of the in-wall air conditioning units on the West Dublin-Granville Road façade and the Shamrock Boulevard façade.

Ms. Martin said the original development text had a limit on density, specific parking requirements, as well as specific architecture requirements. She said the rezoning will permit a change in permitted density, address the architecture requirements and the parking requirements. She said the applicant has gone the extra step of specifically incorporating elements of the Bridge Street Code into the modified development text. She said the other changes reflected in the text include tree preservation and landscaping requirements which address more of an urban environment.

Ms. Martin said this is a four-acre site with frontage on three streets; Shamrock Lane to the south, Shamrock Boulevard on the west side and West Dublin-Granville Road on the north side. She said the site slopes approximately eleven feet and in order to have the building along the street while accommodating the grade change, the applicant has proposed a two-tiered retaining wall in the northeast and an additional retaining wall in the northwest corner. She said the setback along West Dublin-Granville Road is 15 feet, 20 feet along Shamrock Boulevard, 15 feet along Stoneridge Lane and 15 feet along the east property line. She said the applicant is proposing an approximately 65,000-square-foot rehabilitation and skilled nursing facility, with 120 beds, two story building with 131 parking spaces as well as patios and a public plaza on the northwest corner of the site.

Ms. Martin said there is a proposed monument sign along West Dublin-Granville Road as well as one at the entrance along Shamrock Boulevard. She said there is a ground directional sign for deliveries located at the entrance on Stoneridge Lane. She said the building materials include brick, stone and siding. She said the building entrances include a flat roof canopy with three columns for. She said the loading dock is screened with a brick wall which complements the adjacent architecture on the building. She said there is a tower element incorporated into northwest corner of the building and extends approximately 8 feet above the roof.

Ms. Martin explained staff met with the applicants on site for a tree and existing plant material inventory. She said there are two trees (22-inch Kentucky Coffeetree and 22-inch American Elm Tree) which will be preserved and incorporated into the landscape plan. She said the applicant has agreed to fence off an 75x135 foot area for evaluation of the potential for additional trees to be saved and incorporated into the landscape plan.

Ms. Martin indicated the applicant has a post and hedge street wall treatment along Shamrock Boulevard and Stoneridge Lane which is in accordance with the proposed Bridge Street Code. She said the materials on the posts complement the building and are located 40 feet on center with shrubs and trees located between the posts. She said the proposed landscape plan meets Code for interior landscape requirements.

Ms. Martin said the proposed rezoning and preliminary development is recommended for approval to City Council with one condition, that the development text be modified to define a 'protected tree' as a tree that is independently viable in their current location and are in good or fair condition. She said the Final Development plan is recommended for approval with seven conditions with a modification to condition 3, in regards to the sign base height and a modification to condition 4, striking the requirement for incorporating interior landscape islands into the parking bays along the perimeter of the site. She said the applicant has agreed to the changes in the conditions as presented.

Chris Cline, representing the applicant, introduced Dave Lanning, Vice President of Development for HCR ManorCare, Dan Dokken, Vice President of LawKingdon Architecture, and Dave Saneholtz, Principal of Poggemeyer Design Group and Emil Diener, Landscape Architect for Poggemeyer Design Group. Mr. Cline said they designed the project in accordance with the proposed Bridge Street Code with the expectation the City was moving forward with the Code and the project would be approvable under the Bridge Street Code. Mr. Cline indicated they have obtained a Certificate of Need in regards to the 120 beds for this site from the State of Ohio Department of Health.

Mr. Cline said the northwest plaza near the front door will not be a public plaza and is envisioned to be used by the facility. He said there were in-wall air conditioning units on the West Dublin-Granville Road facade but have architectural screenings in front of them, making them not visible. He presented a conceptual movie which showed multiple views of the project.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked anyone who wished to speak to the application to come forward. [There were none]

Amy Kramb asked if the nursing facility to the south was part of Subarea B. Claudia Husak said Sunrise Senior Living is within its own Planned Unit Development. Ms. Kramb indicated she liked the overall design and asked what the northeast corner retaining wall will look like. Ms. Martin said it complements the building in color, but is constructed of an Allan Block wall. She said it will not be seen from the sidewalk.

Ms. Kramb said the development text is eliminating the density requirements. John Hardt commented the text includes a maximum lot coverage of 70 percent and limits the building height to 5 stories. He said the density will be limited by the development standards. Mr. Langworthy agreed lot coverage is how the Bridge Street Code works and regulates density by parking, setbacks and development standards.

Ms. Kramb questioned the landscaping installation timeline of four years as indicated on page 8. Ms. Martin said the requirement is stating the landscaping must meet the 50 percent coverage of the ground within four years. She said this is consistent with current code regarding landscaping requirements meeting opacity and height requirements within four years of installation. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the proposed plant material is being installed at 30 inches in height and should meet the requirements.

Ms. Kramb asked about tree replacement. Ms. Martin responded that in order to encourage development in an urban environment such as the Bridge Street Corridor, the Code requiring the replacement of trees was modified. She said protected trees in the area where buildings were required to be located did not need to be mitigated. She said protected trees which were incorporated into the landscaping could count

as a credit towards required landscape trees. She indicated to the chart within the development text which was similar to the requirements of tree preservation in the draft Bridge Street Code.

Mr. Hardt complimented the applicant's efforts and re-design of the building's architecture as well as the building's placement. He commented the tree protection definition in this text should refer to the Code and asked why it was defined in the text. Ms. Martin clarified the text elaborated on the condition of tree, stating it should be in good health and viable. She said the Code does not identify whether the tree is viable or healthy. Mr. Cline said the tree survey shows the trees on site are growing on top of each other and had never received proper care. He said the text improves upon the standard and it would not be fair to pay for trees which would not survive long term.

Mr. Hardt asked the text be cleaned up when referring to the setbacks. He said to use either the term building setback line or build to line. He said he would like to strike the maximum height requirement on the roof parapet because they would not build it any higher than needed for screening. Mr. Hardt asked if this facility will have medical gases and where the tanks would be located. Dan Dokken responded the facility would utilize small portable tanks.

Mr. Hardt commented he is not crazy about the in-wall air-conditioning units. He said he was concerned about using concrete for the bike path because the neighboring properties would not match that material as they develop. Ms. Amorose Groomes commented she thought it would be required within the Bridge Street Corridor to have concrete paths. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked that it be noted that concrete should be required within the corridor due to the urban setting as well as for the need to be plowed and maintained.

Mr. Hardt questioned the proposed detention basin on the adjacent Sunrise Senior Living site and asked if it has been built yet. Mr. Cline responded in previous zonings the Commission had approved the joint detention facility on the Sunrise site. He said the basin has been constructed, but needs to be surveyed to make sure it was completed as designed. He said there is a recorded agreement which splits up the responsibilities on a percentage basis between the cost of the construction and the maintenance between the two sites. He said there is a 24-inch sewer pipe which was installed as part of the Stoneridge Lane improvements. He said they will tie into the pipe and it will drain into the existing detention basin. Kristin Yorke indicated condition 7 requires the applicant to confirm the basin is built to the approved stormwater management controlled plan that was established for both Sunrise and Subarea B.

Richard Taylor complimented the applicant on the great job and the big changes to the project. He said he is excited to see it in Dublin. He indicated he would prefer not to have the preliminary and final development plan together, however he is satisfied with the explanation from Mr. Cline and in this case is agreeable, but would prefer to avoid the situation. Mr. Langworthy said he understood.

Mr. Taylor asked how close the project is to meeting the Bridge Street Code. Ms. Martin said it has been evaluated and under the Bridge Street Code, the use is permitted, but would require conditional use approval. She said the street wall is different from the Bridge Street Code in that the posts are located 40 feet on center and the Bridge Street Code spaces the posts at 25 feet on center. She said the materials are in line and the building type would be civic institutional. She said there was a chart which further defined the comparisons and asked if Mr. Taylor would like for her to review it. He said that was fine.

Mr. Taylor asked what the process would be for this building to be approved if the Bridge Street Code was adopted. Ms. Martin responded there would be some administrative departures the ART would have to review and in some cases where it did not meet the Code, staff would work with them to meet the requirements. Mr. Langworthy said they are working on the process based on the last meeting notes.

Mr. Taylor said he is in favor of the Bridge Street Code if this were the type of building they would get within the Code. He said the building has more modern overtones with some traditional elements, but

not a traditional building or Dublin building. He said this building on a fully developed street with buildings very close to each other on both sides of the street, could work with a lot of different kinds of buildings. He said he liked the materials of the building, the dark colors and was glad to see the physical therapy room moved to the front of the building on the northwest corner because that is the most active room in the building and needed to be at the most active part of the site. He said the northwest corner with the tower and the columns has a vaguely civic appeal to the building and it engages the street. He said he likes the repeated use of flat roof elements and suggested on the second story of the building where there is siding, to add a miniature version of flat roof elements on the front facade instead of the faux lintel over the top of the window.

Mr. Taylor suggested a deeper eave depth and knife edge or a custom gutter that fills the fascia and creates a nice termination to the edge, to liven the edge of the roof. He suggested striking on page 3 of the development text Section 5, Architecture, substitute the Bridge Street Corridor Plan, so it would read "the architecture within Subarea B will be street oriented and compatible with the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Plan".

Mr. Taylor asked to remove the reference of "local materials" because he would like to see new materials and thought "successful and high quality" would cover what was intended. He asked that on page 4, H, Roofs #1, under I, where it states 'the use of dormers, vertical vents and other architectural treatments are encouraged', to add "where appropriate" for the style. Mr. Taylor believes signs should stay within the 15 foot Code Requirements. He thanked the applicant for all their efforts in making this a great building.

Joseph Budde congratulated the applicants. He said the changes look fantastic and it is apparent they worked very hard on the plan.

Mr. Fishman said he does not understand how he will not see the in-wall air conditioning units on the front facade. Mr. Dokken responded the bronze-aluminum louvers are in front to the units, screening them from view.

Mr. Fishman said he liked the concrete bike paths and requested the joints be saw cut. He indicated six foot fences are not part of any code and asked the applicant why the height was necessary. Mr. Dokken said it was only in a small section on the rear of the building for the security of the residents.

Mr. Fishman assumed the roof material would be 50 year dimensional shingle. Mr. Dokken said the roof would be a 300 pound dimensional shingle. Mr. Fishman complimented the applicant and said the plan shows their efforts and respect for Dublin.

Todd Zimmerman thought the architectural changes were excellent. He asked if the Bridge Street Code will be as restrictive as the current sign code as it relates to the three color limit. Mr. Langworthy clarified the BSC will be similar to the EAZ plan where the logo counts as one color along with two other colors. Mr. Hardt had indicated the colors should be the logo plus one other color.

Mr. Zimmerman said the in-wall air conditioning units even with the louvers have too much of a motel/hotel look and would prefer they not be used in this corridor. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for other options. Mr. Dokken said they could go with a full piped system with a boiler and chiller with fan coil units however it is very expensive which is not supported by the revenue of this project. He said this type of facility typically has the in-wall air conditioning units for the controllability by the individual resident. Mr. Cline said they knew it would be an issue and the other option cannot be supported due to the changes made which has caused the project to be over budget.

Mr. Hardt said he thought they have camouflaged it on the street frontages and on this project it has been dealt with adequately. He said he thought the issue can be dealt with in the Bridge Street Code.

Mr. Taylor said he liked the solution of aluminum screens and in this case under these conditions he is alright with the units as long as they remain the matching colors as indicated in the renderings.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was a Street Tree Plan for West Dublin-Granville Road. Ms. Martin responded that the street trees were installed with the City improvements several years ago. She indicated the street tree along Shamrock Boulevard will be London Plan Trees along Shamrock Boulevard and Red Oak along Stoneridge Lane.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she has a problem with the material for the retaining wall at the northwest corner of the site. She said the existing stone walls on the other corners at the intersection are a stacked stone style with bookends. She said the wall proposed for this site appears to be different. Ms. Martin agreed and said the design of the wall was intended to be more reflective of an urban environment and also had a connection between the stone on the building. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that would not look right because it would not match the existing walls on the other corners. Ms. Martin said the direction she gave the applicant was for the long term vision of the corridor. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the wall design needs to be changed to a match the other walls.

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor made a motion, seconded by Todd Zimmerman, to approve this Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan application because the proposal complies with the rezoning/preliminary development plan criteria, the Community Plan and the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Plan, with five conditions:

- 1) The development text be modified to define 'protected tree' as trees that are independently viable in their current location and are in good or fair condition as indicated on the tree preservation plan;
- 2) The development text language regarding yards and setbacks be clarified;
- 3) The Architecture Section in the development text be modified to eliminate the requirement for local examples of installations and Section 5A reference compatibility with the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Plan;
- 4) The Roof Section be amended to add where appropriate for the style of the parapet roofs; and
- 5) That the text be modified to limit the height of the signs to 15 feet.

Christopher Cline agreed to the conditions.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor made a motion, seconded by Todd Zimmerman, to approve this Final Development Plan application because the proposal complies with the development text and preliminary development plan, the final development criteria, and the existing development in the area with nine conditions:

- 1) The final plat is amended to reflect the removal of platted setbacks;
- 2) The applicant work with Planning to determine additional trees that can be saved;
- 3) The height of the ground sign and the height of the directional ground sign are to be reduced to meet the approved heights in the development text and the sign base be no less than 12 inches in height;
- 4) The plans should be revised to clearly identify the square footage of required and provided interior landscape area;
- 5) The foundation plantings be adjusted to account for the location of the overhead canopies at the entrances and exits of the building;
- 6) The applicant should revise the gates for the fenced patios to not exceed four feet;

- 7) The approved stormwater facility and associated landscaping be completed on the adjacent Sunrise Senior Living site;
- 8) The retaining wall at the northwest corner of the site be built with stacked stone with a bookend treatment and built to retaining wall standards; and
- 9) The concrete bikepath joints be saw cut.

Christopher Cline agreed to the conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant and said this is a project that is illustrative of the process. She said they appreciate their cooperation and this will be a fantastic building. She said they look forward to having them in Dublin.

**2. 2012 Annual Items of Interest
09-080ADM**

Administrative Request

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced the administrative request regarding the Annual Items of Interest list for 2012 that will be forwarded to City Council and confirmed there was not a need for a presentation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone that would like to speak to this case. [There were none]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion to approve this Administrative Request for the 2012 Items of Interest be as follows:

Development Site Visits, with the objective to examine pre-construction and post-construction sites to compare "on the ground" to perceptions gained through the development review and approval process to strengthen each Commissioner's perspective of a project as drawn on paper and how it actually looks once constructed.

Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

**3. Bridge Street Corridor – Code Modification
11-020ADM**

Administrative Request

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced the administrative request for a review and recommendation to City Council of proposed amendments to the Zoning Code to establish a number of new Zoning Districts and regulations for the Bridge Street Corridor. She said they are scheduled to go over Lots and Blocks, Street Types and if time permits Building Types.

Mr. Langworthy recalled an earlier presentation by Planning that illustrated lot, block and street requirements and said this is the section of the Code that begins to lay the framework for what will develop within the blocks. He said they may only have time to get into an introduction of the building types.

Justin Goodwin reviewed the changes to Lots and Blocks and Street Types sections from the June 20th version of the Code. He said Planning added an additional exception to the block size and layout requirements by including limited access restrictions that will exist on certain major thoroughfares such as State Route 161 and Sawmill Road. He said Planning has also modified the principle frontage street references in Lots and Blocks by referencing back to the Street Type section. He said the previous draft of the Code designated principle frontage streets by street family, while the current draft illustrates them directly on the street network map.

Mr. Goodwin said the new draft provides more flexibility for the City Engineer to determine how block access may occur, specifically with regard to principle frontage streets. He explained that Planning recognizes there may be site constraints that warrant access from a principle frontage street although it would typically be preferable from a side street or an alley. He said Planning has also clarified the provisions dealing with front and corner side property lines on corner lots. He said there may be cases where a single lot line serves as the front property line for one building and the corner property line for another.

Mr. Goodwin asked if there were comments.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission would review the Code page by page and began on Page 14 Section 153.060 Lots and Blocks.

Code Section 153.060 – Lots and Blocks

153.060 –Lots and Blocks (C) General Lots and Blocks

Ms. Krumb suggested moving the phrase “wherever possible” under (C)(1)(c) to the front of the sentence. She also suggested a clarification to (d) regarding the requirement that streets terminate at an open space or building façade. She said that the referenced provision under Building Types requires a street to terminate at the front or corner of the building, but because (d) only says building façade, it was unclear if it implied all elevations were acceptable. Mr. Goodwin said that because the general provision references back to a more specific requirement, the more specific requirement would apply. Ms. Krumb suggested that (d) should specify “front or corner” building facades to clarify the intent without requiring a reader to flip back and forth between the sections.

Ms. Krumb said the phrase “development to remain” in the last sentence under provision (f) is an awkward statement, and suggested rewording to “remaining or existing development”.

Mr. Hardt questioned the requirement under provision (c) that streets should follow natural features rather than interrupting or dead-ending at the feature. He said he doesn’t object to it, but is confused by it because streets that follow natural features would run parallel to those features, but if a street were to dead-end into a feature it would be running perpendicular to it and would be a different street.

Mr. Goodwin said the intent was that streets should generally be aligned to follow features like stream corridors and not end at the stream with a cul-de-sac, but streets could terminate at a natural feature at a “T” intersection with another street.

Mr. Taylor asked what would happen if a building is built along a street and then an intersecting “T” street is then built later. He said the building might not meet the street termination requirements under that scenario.

Mr. Hardt said that although the block dimensions are maximums, he is concerned the sizes have no relationship to each other. He said if there are office blocks that are 500 feet in size and then there is a transition to a residential district at 425 feet in size they will not line up.

Mr. Goodwin said it depends on how the transitions happen between different districts or blocks. He said there is an extensive greenway network envisioned throughout the corridor that will provide a transition point, and there could be larger blocks on one side of the greenway with smaller blocks transitioning on another, which could establish a different pattern in the grid. He said Planning has calibrated the maximum block dimensions to their best understanding of how development might occur in the different districts, including potential development plans for some of the denser development that may occur at the “bookend” locations of the corridor, while recognizing there are difference in character that they are trying to achieve throughout the corridor.

Mr. Hardt said he has a similar concern regarding mid-block access described on page 15, which provides a number of different ways to divide up a block, but the last paragraph in the section says vehicular access to blocks should be aligned with other access points on opposite sides of the same block as well as aligned across the street from vehicular access points to another block. He said he is concerned that if one developer creates the “H” configuration and puts the street one third of the way across the site, the next developer has no choice where to put the street and there could be an entire infrastructure of blocks determined by the unit size of one apartment building. He said those cross block access points should be more stringently defined, maybe at the third points and half points, but thinks that as currently written,

the Code allows the first developer to set the pattern for huge swaths of land that the City ends up having to live with. Mr. Goodwin said that Planning would discuss this issue with Engineering.

Ms. Kramb asked on Page 15 if the term shopping corridor is defined. Mr. Goodwin said it is within the definitions.

Ms. Kramb said she is confused with paragraph (C)(2)(c), which states the block length for a shopping corridor shall be 300 feet unless otherwise required by the neighborhood districts section, or if it exceeds 400 feet a mid-block pedestrian way is required. Mr. Goodwin said the requirement can be clarified.

Mr. Taylor said he understands the intent of paragraph (C)(3)(c) dealing with energy efficiency but doesn't think it will have an appreciable impact in an urban district. He said if blocks are oriented east to west, the buildings on the south side get exposure to the sun throughout the day, but depending on building heights, they could be casting a shadow on the buildings on the north side. Mr. Langworthy explained this is an example of why the phrases "whenever possible" and "to the maximum extent practicable" have been added to the Code, to account for situations when the requirement may not be appropriate.

Mr. Taylor said he thought the orientation of the buildings could potentially provide exposure for both, but that isn't necessarily going to happen and he recommended the requirement be removed. Mr. Goodwin said Planning would consider this.

Ms. Kramb asked if the phrases "where designated" and "where provided" in paragraphs (C)(4)(b) and (c) are references to principal frontage streets. She also asked where this designation is actually made.

Mr. Goodwin confirmed the language refers to situations where principal frontage streets are designated and the text could be clarified. He said principal frontage streets are designated on the street network map in the Street Types Section.

Ms. Kramb asked about the limitation on access to principle frontage streets in subparagraph (C)(5)(c), and suggested that it will be more common to have access. Mr. Langworthy indicated the intent to keep principle frontage streets as pedestrian-oriented as possible and not interrupt them with driveways to the extent possible. He said the Code needs to stress that to keep those streets as clean as possible.

Ms. Kramb said she understands the Code's preference for access off of service alleys, but when she sees where the principal frontage streets are designated on the street network map in relationship to existing conditions, she does not think the access limitation is practical. Mr. Langworthy said that is why staff has built in flexibility for the City Engineer to waive the requirement if it is impractical. He said that is also one of the reasons to have maximum block sizes to ensure that streets are located frequently enough to provide reasonable access.

Mr. Taylor asked if mid-block pedestrianways described in Lots and Blocks could be the same thing as mid-building pedestrianways described in the Building Types section. Mr. Goodwin said they could be the same in some circumstances. Mr. Taylor asked which requirement prevails with regard to street trees, and suggested that landscaping only be required when the pedestrianway is exposed to the sky. He said the different requirements for pedestrianway widths and windows should also be coordinated. Mr. Goodwin said the mid-block pedestrianway requirements were generally geared toward an open pedestrianway design, but the separate design requirement for shopping corridors could also accommodate a covered walkway. He agreed the Code can be clarified to deal with situations where a mid-building pedestrianway is used to meet the mid-block requirement.

Ms. Kramb said she opposes mid-block street crossings due to safety issues. Mr. Goodwin agreed they are not appropriate in all locations and said they would be limited to locations such as dense shopping

corridors where cars are secondary to pedestrians. He said this condition exists at Easton Town Center and works quite well.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any other comments on Lots and Blocks and said they would proceed with reviewing the Street Types Section.

Code Section 153.061 – Street Types
153.061 – Street Types (B) Applicability

Ms. Kramb suggested the phrase “as required by the City” be stricken from paragraph (B) Applicability, because the statement just added confusion. Mr. Langworthy agreed.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see the street sections developed by Nelson\Nygaard and does not have any comments until he has a chance to review the preliminary designs.

153.061 – Street Types (B) Street Network

Mr. Goodwin presented the street network map (Figure 153.061-A). He said the street family concept has changed as introduced through the consulting work of Nelson\Nygaard and has been a useful framework for organizing street types. He said the consultant has provided nearly two dozen options for street designs and it was not feasible to put all of them into the Code. He said the street network map has also been revised to more accurately reflect the block size requirements and to ensure stronger street connections throughout the corridor.

Mr. Goodwin said the corridor connector streets include streets that already exist (State Route 161, Riverside Drive, Dublin Road, portions of Post Road, and Sawmill Road), providing critical connections across the entire corridor. He said an additional bridge option has been added to create an internal loop providing connectivity to both sides of the river with a district connector street system. He said the neighborhood streets are the ones the City has the least understanding of where they might happen, but is important to show some depiction of them to convey to potential developers the general pattern of development that the Code is trying to achieve.

Mr. Goodwin presented a series of slides illustrating typical street elements. He the street right-of-way is divided into a vehicular and pedestrian realm, which both need to be coordinated with the private development along the street. He said most streets are recommended to be two lane streets with eleven-foot lanes and eight-foot on-street parking lanes on both sides. He said bicycle facilities include the option of sharrows that would widen a typical lane out to 14 feet to provide enough space for a car and a bicycle to share the lane, and another option is a dedicated cycletrack that would be located behind the curb. He said the next element of the pedestrian realm is a minimum four-foot wide planting or furnishing zone that could be a hardscape treatment with tree wells, a tree lawn in some areas. He said alternative stormwater treatments and street furniture could also occur in this zone. He said that sidewalks will require a minimum of 5 foot clear walking distance.

Mr. Goodwin said Planning is working with Engineering to establish a set of guidelines that will help ensure streets are adequately designed for the development that is being proposed, with considerations for the overall character, land use, building types, building heights and setbacks to achieve an adequate dimensional relationship of heights of buildings and the widths of the street right-of-way. He said the Required Building Zone (RBZ) treatment is an important aspect of all the building types, because it is a transitional point between the public realm and the private realm. He said there are a variety of treatment options specified for each building type and in some cases for specified locations within the corridor. He said for example that in some cases the RBZ can be an extension of a streetscape and can function as semi-public space.

Mr. Taylor said he would hope they would get more than 5 foot sidewalks. Mr. Langworthy indicated five feet is the minimum clear walking area, but patios and other streetscape elements can outside of

that area on wider sidewalks. Mr. Goodwin explained that some street types include much wider sidewalks, depending on the adjacent land use. He said this is also why the streetscape treatment within the RBZ is important.

Mr. Goodwin presented examples of recommended street sections. He said corridor connector streets typically include a four lane boulevard street design with the widest right-of-way at 112 feet, and another option is a four lane street without a median that could potentially accommodate off-street parking during off-peak travel hours. He said that is a potential option that could work within the Historic District.

Ms. Kramb asked if the example section reflected the existing right-of-way for Bridge Street in the Historic District and said she did not see how the different sections could fit together.

Mr. Goodwin said the sections should be viewed as concepts that may need to be adjusted for specific circumstances. He said the intent is to provide enough flexibility so that the street types are workable in different contexts and the primary goal is to provide consistent facilities for the different modes of transportation within street corridors, but also allow for appropriate transitions within the street section to accommodate changes in development character. He said the Scioto River Bridge or a potential roundabout at Riverside Drive and State Route 161 are examples of transition points that would allow a street section to change along the corridor.

Mr. Taylor asked if this information could be provided in hard copy form so he could spend more time reviewing the different street section concepts. Mr. Goodwin said Planning and Engineering are in the process of adjusting some of the sections and developing the guidelines for how to apply them with development proposals and they would provide that information to the Commission when it is available.

Ms. Kramb asked why there is a reference to "existing or approved" alley locations in the explanation of the street network map in paragraph (C)(4)(e). Mr. Goodwin said there is one specific circumstance in Greystone Mews where alleys have been approved but are not yet existing.

Ms. Kramb asked why there were no delivery access or loading zone criteria although there are fire access requirements. Mr. Goodwin said those are typically regulated through engineering general requirements, but Planning will consult with Engineering to determine if there are appropriate requirements that could be added to the Code.

Code Section 153.062 – Building Types

Dan Phillabaum presented the general building type requirements and said Planning had incorporated many of the previous comments from the Commission as well as comments from the development community. He said more specific building material requirements are now included in the building type tables. He said for example that wood and fiber cement siding is now limited to residential-scaled buildings, rather than commercial building types. He said the Code also now includes more stringent measures regarding reflectivity of windows.

Mr. Langworthy stated the external reviews by the development community dealt primarily with elements impacting building quality. He said one example is the prohibition on flush-mounted windows, and although there were numerous comments that did not support this, Planning did not feel it was appropriate to change the requirement.

Mr. Hardt said he agrees with the intent of that requirement, but explained there is a point in the wall where the cold air from the outside and the warm air from the inside condenses and forms a dew point. He said that is where the thermal break in a window has to be and if placed incorrectly there is thermal bridging where windows sweat on the inside or water will condense inside the wall. He said there is a delicate balance on window placement within the wall cavity, this Code should not try to regulate it.

Mr. Phillabaum said the objective is to achieve some dimension or thickness to the walls of residential-scale buildings to visually convey a sense of quality construction and structural integrity. Mr. Taylor said he liked this explanation and suggested that intent language be added to the Code.

Mr. Langworthy asked that as they go through the Code to let staff know if there is an explanation or further information needed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

4. Bridge Street Corridor – Vision Plan

Informal Discussion

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced the informal discussion without a case number, it is a quick recap of the Goal Setting Retreat and Discussion that City Council had on Monday regarding the Bridge Street Corridor.

Mr. Langworthy said Ms. Amorose Groomes and Mr. Fishman was present for the presentation, but if they were not able to attend it there was video produced and will be up on the website. They went through a series of Goals as set each year, they reviewed the previous goals and indicated that one of the current goals is to complete the Bridge Street Corridor planning efforts. There was a good discussion and largely the same information that was presented to Planning Commission just in a different format of Transportation, Open Space and Land Use topics. The predominant issues was with open and public space and it was described to them the various kinds of spaces to be created. The major elements was the relocation of Riverside Drive to capture a portion of the park along the river and the actual intersection improvement for Riverside Drive and SR 161 with a roundabout solution that will not affect the Bridge Point Shopping Center that much.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it was one of the most productive conversation that has happened in the three and a half years they have looking at engaging the river front.

Ms. Kramb asked if they were keeping the south bound lane under the bridge with the roundabout. Mr. Langworthy agreed they were. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that it is the intention to keep it and Engineering had indicated they could save it.

Mr. Taylor thought they need to make it not just a traffic and engineering solution because of the prominent position that occupies there to the whole city and this corridor that be a place making exercise. Mr. Langworthy said they talked about an element within the roundabout itself and there will likely room in the corners to something dramatic as well.

Ms. Amorose Groomes encouraged the commissioners to view the video when it is available online, that there was a lot of great discussion of the implementation and challenges for them to think creatively and find solutions and there was a conversation with Mr. Hardt that he had potential solutions that has been forwarded to Mr. Langworthy to working some of the bugs out and will hear about in the future.

Mr. Langworthy agreed to send out an email with a link to the video when it becomes available.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Other Business

Ms. Amorose Groomes announced the next meeting is November 3 and the objective is Pages 24 – 75. Mr. Langworthy asked that they be ready and in their extra time to read ahead and indicated they are staying on schedule.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for additional comments. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.