

### **Bridge Street Code Review**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said May 6th is the date the Commission has been asked to have their comments to staff for the Bridge street Corridor Code. She said that the Commission would like to take a few minutes to review their comments so that they may stick to the schedule and provide their comments to staff as a group prior to the next joint meeting.

Richard Taylor said he agrees with the General Purpose 153.057, and asked that additional language be included regarding the Corridor as the center of community, and as a place that serves all residents, existing and future.

Mr. Taylor asked how the Historic Core boundaries align with the existing Historic District. Mr. Langworthy said the Historic Core is within the Historic District but there are other areas, such as Historic Residential and parts of the Historic Transition that are also included.

Mr. Taylor said the Code mentions that there is Architectural Review Board (ARB) oversight on building and site development, and provides architectural guidelines. He asked how this related to the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. Mr. Langworthy said the ARB has asked staff to review the Guidelines as one of their annual items of interest and ensure there are no conflicts between the Guidelines and the proposed Bridge Street regulations.

Mr. Taylor asked if it will be completed before the Code is adopted. Mr. Langworthy said yes.

Mr. Taylor said he was concerned about two different groups providing oversight in the same area. He asked if the ARB is going to take the Bridge Street Code into account when making decisions. Mr. Langworthy said yes, the Board must. He said the Architectural Review Team (ART) will make recommendations to the ARB, but the ARB will have the final decision.

Mr. Taylor asked if the ARB had the option of not applying the Bridge Street Code to a proposal.

Mr. Langworthy said the only deviations from the Bridge Street Code were through the administrative departure process. He said if an applicant asked for a departure, the Board could approve it, but otherwise ARB would have to follow the Bridge street Code.

Mr. Taylor said he is concerned because the existing Historic District design intent is very simple and lightly detailed, but that does not seem to be addressed by the Bridge Street Code. Mr. Langworthy said the proposed Code outlines the permitted building types and a description of the design details for building types.

Mr. Taylor said he would prefer that the ARB have the final decision on what is appropriate in the Historic District, because the Code introduces new building types into the District and the City is will need to evolve to accommodate them.

Mr. Taylor asked on page 4, 153.059(A)(9), whether use determination should be a Planning and Zoning Commission decision, instead of the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). Jennifer Readler said the use determination would be made by the Director, with a procedure for appeals to the BZA for standard administrative decisions. Mr. Taylor confirmed that an appeal to the Director's decision would go to the BZA.

Mr. Taylor asked if the language at the end of page 7, 153.059(3)(C)(1) Eating and Drinking was the same language the Commission required regarding the patio furniture storage approved for the Dublin Village Tavern.

Rachel Ray said the intent is the same, to ensure it is not visible from the right-of-way, but the language is different. She said she would look at the language to see if the requirements could be made consistent.

Mr. Hardt said he wondered what would prevent someone from subdividing land and submitting multiple applications under 153.059 (C)(1)(a)(1), which limits the number of single-family detached homes within a certain area. He said he also did not understand the purpose of 153.059(C)(1)(a)(2), which places distance requirements between single-family detached developments in the Bridge Street Corridor.

Mr. Taylor asked how the last sentence in 153.059(C)(1)(c), which limits the amount of customer visits to live/work units per day, would be enforced. Ms. Ray said the difference between home occupations and live/work is an area where additional clarifications are needed, and the next draft of the Code will include modifications to those regulations.

Mr. Hardt asked if 153.059(C)(2)(e), Hospital, was referring to hospitals or medical facilities. Mr. Langworthy said it referred to a large clinic or specialty hospital, as opposed to a general hospital. He said that, for example, the Nationwide Children's Orthopedic Hospital would be a specialty hospital; the size limitation on hospitals in the Bridge Street Corridor would limit hospitals to those categories.

Mr. Fishman asked where the number 35 came from units for 153.059(C)(1)(a)(1), as we would allow an attached condo development with more units. He asked about the consideration of patio homes with zero lot line development, as this detached unit type might be desired in the future. Mr. Langworthy said he would look at clarifying the language.

Mr. Hardt asked if the intent was to build traditional single family homes in the Bridge Street Corridor. Mr. Langworthy said it is not preferred in this area, which depends on denser, walkable, mixed-use development.

Mr. Taylor said he was not sure what an accessory dwelling unit is, as listed under Section 153.059(C)(4)(k). Mr. Langworthy said it could be a mother-in-law suite.

Mr. Taylor asked how one dwelling unit with an accessory dwelling unit differed from a two-family unit. Ms. Ray said some of the reasons for the distinction include the building type requirements and the requirements for the building placement on the lot.

Mr. Hardt noted page 8 has a paragraph that touches on wind power structures, which the Commission had just discussed for the EAZ Districts. Ms. Ray stated Planning would look at taking a similar approach by making ground-mounted wind power equipment conditional uses as well.

Mr. Hardt said the provision requiring only two stacking spaces for drive-thru's seemed like it wouldn't be enough, as outlined in 153.059(C)(3)(c) on page 8. Ms. Ray said that drive-thru's require conditional use approval from the Commission, which would allow the Commission the opportunity to review the proposed circulation plan.

Mr. Hardt asked how the Commission could require more stacking spaces, if the Code stated a drive-thru only needed two stacking spaces. Ms. Ray said the conditional use standards state that the Commission has the ability to modify code requirements based on the use and the location, which means they could require more stacking spaces if they felt that the site plan and the use warranted more.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she could not picture a location within the Corridor where a drive through would be appropriate, since the Corridor is intended to be more pedestrian-oriented.

Ms. Kramb said she had trouble understanding how the lots, blocks and street sections would be regulated. She confirmed the Code would define a street pattern and that the Corridor would fill in the pattern as it develops over time.

Mr. Langworthy said the lots and blocks are one large piece of the Code, while the street network is another. He said the street network is still being finalized by Nelson/Nygaard, and once it is complete the results will be integrated into the Code. He said the intent is to be prescriptive in the Corridor. He said the network, lots and blocks are currently being reviewed against the plans for the OCLC and Dublin Village Center areas for compatibility.

Ms. Kramb said she has a general concern with requiring all the turning radii to be designed to a typical design vehicle rather than design speed. Mr. Langworthy said the street network is meant to be developed as an urban city block. He said that staff had been working with the Washington Township Fire Marshal on this point, and they have a minimum radius that is very small.

Ms. Kramb said that loading zones are not addressed in the lots, blocks, and street types. Mr. Langworthy said loading areas would typically be located in parking lots or rear lanes.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see an example of a community with a form-based code with on-the-ground examples of what had been built to the code. Mr. Langworthy said potential site visits are being investigated.

Mr. Taylor said that the draft Zoning Map shows a large green area on either side of Bridge Street in the Historic District area, which includes the existing cemetery, school and library. He said the street network in the Code shows the same area with a grid and the green space showing a number of street connections. Mr. Langworthy said the street network map is meant to demonstrate how primary streets are intended to generally be located in the corridor for the purposes of the street network.

Mr. Taylor stated that the City should identify the critical open spaces envisioned in the Bridge Street Corridor, particularly a large civic space in the Historic District, before development begins and the opportunity is lost.

Mr. Taylor said on page 28, 153.062(G), shutters should be required to be operational to ensure a high quality appearance.

Mr. Taylor said on page 29, 153.062(J), he would like to allow other options for artificial building separation. He preferred that some buildings should be allowed to look like one larger building, rather than a lot of smaller buildings put together. He said he was not sure what the Code meant by the statement, "building design should vary between vertical facade divisions."

Mr. Zimmerman said on page 28, 153.062(G), other window types, in addition to double-hung windows, are appropriate and should be used in the Corridor.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the Code does not account for urban street tree care standards, which is critical to the survival of landscaping in the Corridor. She referred to the list of approved street trees currently in the Zoning Code and said that the variety of options should be much smaller for this area; it should not be open to all of the street tree plantings used throughout the city. She said trees that will grow into large trees with grand statures should be planted in this portion of the city.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that the proposed Code includes interior parking lot islands similar to the existing Zoning Code requirements. She said that islands located every 75 feet are not necessary or even appropriate in this area. She said that she would like to see larger landscape areas that would support multiple trees and plantings.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Code needs modifications to the perimeter buffer requirements, because if parking areas are heavily buffered, then wayfinding signs will be needed. She said the landscaping requirements generally needed to be more thought out for appropriateness to an urban environment.

Mr. Hart said that parking areas should include landscape buffering from public streets and not necessarily between adjacent lots to the point that connectivity needs to occur from the public street and not between adjacent sites.

Ms. Amorose Groomes commented that overall, the landscape portion of the Code should be revised to be more specific to an urban environment, and that it include requirements that will result in successful and sustainable landscaping. She said she would like to see a more comprehensive approach to landscaping.

Mr. Hardt suggested that the modifications should necessarily reduce the amount of landscaping, but instead should make better use of the areas used for landscaping.

Mr. Hardt stated that he is not sure that the review process described in the proposed Code will achieve the desired results. He referred to page 101, 153.065(C)(5) Appeals Process and stated that he is dismayed with seeing the provision allowing appeals to be made to City Council which has not been approved elsewhere in the Zoning Code.

Mr. Langworthy stated that depending on the outcome of the proposed Code amendment for the Appeals process the same would be applied to the proposed Bridge Street Code. He noted that if the Code amendment is not approved, it would likely be eliminated from the next draft of the Bridge Street Code.

Mr. Hardt referred to page 102, 153.065(E), Requirements of Development Plan as opposed to the requirements for Site Plan Review. He said that it seemed that the site plan review process has lower review standards than there are for the development plan review.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that all of the Commissioners are generally concerned about the proposed administrative review process.

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred to the Summary Procedure Table on page 100. She asked why projects involving two or more buildings would be required to receive Development Plan approval in addition to Site Plan approval, whereas single buildings would only require Site Plan approval. She questioned why the approach was different based on the number of buildings .

Ms. Kramb said she understood the purpose of this type of approval process . She asked if Dublin would not be competitive if we used the current review process with the Bridge Street Code.

Mr. McDaniel said that an expedited review process would help make Dublin more competitive for development, which is one of the reasons the Code requirements are somewhat more prescriptive. He said there are businesses approaching the City about locating their projects in the Bridge Street Corridor. some with significant master plans covering larger areas that would be developed on a larger scale. He said smaller, individually-owned lots could be developed one building, one lot at a time. He reported that there is a general sense of urgency felt in the

community about completing the Bridge Corridor plan and vision, and people are excited about locating in this area.

Mr. Taylor asked if the larger master planning projects have also been showing street connections consistent with the Bridge Street Corridor plan. Mr. McDaniel said yes. Mr. Hardt referred to page 103, 153.065(F). He reiterated his concern that the criteria for the development plan approval is not stringent enough to achieve the type of quality development they would all like to see.

Mr. Langworthy clarified that the draft Code outlines two levels of review. He said all developments are required to go through the site plan review process, which focuses on the details of the plan.

Mr. Hardt said that he was concerned that the review criteria for site plan approval are even lower than the criteria for development plan approval.

Mr. Langworthy explained that the Code requirements have been drafted to prescribe the desired quality and design elements for elements including architecture, landscaping, signs, and lighting. He said that the process is not intended to be the point at which the desired level of quality is achieved. He said that that was the intended purpose of the Code requirements.

Mr. Hardt said he believed that the site plan and development plan requirements need to be switched in the Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that the Commissioners had no other comments regarding the Bridge Street Code at this time. She said that since there are no other issues, the meeting is adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.