

office building located on the northwest corner of West Dublin-Granville Road at its intersection with Shamrock Boulevard. She swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case including the applicant's representative, Paul Orban, BHDP Architecture, and City representatives.

Paul Orban, BHDP Architecture, representing Wendy's International, 274 Marconi Boulevard, Columbus was present.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted a Planning presentation from Jennifer Rauch was not necessary since there were no conditions recommended. She asked if anyone wished to speak with respect to this application. [There was no one.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion to approve this Corridor Development District application because the proposed modifications are consistent with surrounding development and the Corridor Development District requirements of the Zoning Code, with no conditions.

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

Administrative Business

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes noted that there were students in the audience and she offered to sign their papers.

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

Administrative Request

Chair Amorose Groomes introduced the following administrative request for 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 were scheduled to review Building Types, Neighborhood Standards, and if time permits, Open Space Types. She noted there were nearly 50 pages of Code to review.

Steve Langworthy pointed out Jeff Tyler, Dublin's Chief Building Official, and Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner were present to answer any questions about the proposed code modifications or the new edition of the Building Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was to be any discussion regarding the Draft BSC Review & Approval Process Chart that was included in the meeting packets.

Mr. Langworthy suggested he would briefly explain it at the end of the Code review.

Ms. Amorose Groomes began the Code review with Building Types on page 24. Ms. Amorose Groomes explained she would call out each section of the proposed Code for any comments or questions.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (B) General Building Type Requirements.

Amy Kramb made a general comment that throughout this section, '*Existing Buildings*' is typically capitalized, but there are several times it is lower case.

Dan Phillabaum agreed to make the corrections.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (B) General Building Type Requirements (2) Existing Structures (d).

John Hardt noted this requirement dealt primarily with parking and said it might be appropriate to include it in the parking section of the Code. Mr. Hardt said if he were a user of the Code looking for parking requirements, he would not look for it in this section.

Mr. Langworthy said it could be repeated elsewhere, but explained that as it dealt specifically with existing structures, and in order to keep all that information in one place, it was placed here. Mr. Langworthy said his preference would be to include the requirement in both locations.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (B) General Building Type Requirements (2) Existing Structures (e) Reconstruction or Movement (2).

Todd Zimmerman referred to the first sentence; *Any permitted reconstruction shall be started within 12 months of the time of damage and be continued until completed.* He suggested a time limit for completion was needed.

Steve Langworthy explained there were actually two time limits. He said one will be seen later in the approval section for abandoned structures. He said as long as there is an active building permit, that has to be allowed to be continued. He said the time limit is governed by the building permit itself.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was a definition included for reconstruction, and asked when construction is considered to have begun as it relates to the time limit.

Mr. Langworthy explained the time limit starts at the time a building permit is issued.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (B) General Building Type Requirements (2) Existing Structures (e) Reconstruction or Movement (3).

Warren Fishman noted the amount of building expansion or reconstruction permitted was 50 percent. He recalled it had been 25 percent in the past. He pointed out 25 percent on a large building could be a significant portion of the building, and asked if it was unreasonable to require a building to be brought into conformance at 25 percent.

Mr. Langworthy said this was a new provision. He explained under the current Code 25 percent was the trigger requiring compliance with the landscape provisions of the Code. He said 50 percent was a common number used in non-conforming situations, so it was carried through.

Mr. Fishman asked if everyone agreed they could tear off 50 percent of the building and still not bring it up to code. Ms. Amorose Groomes indicated if that was standard procedure, she was okay with it.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (B) General Building Type Requirements (2) Existing Structures (g) Exceptions

Richard Taylor referred to his comments last week about maintaining the powers of the Architectural Review Board (ARB), and said to make sure that the Code addresses those previous concerns.

Mr. Langworthy said that will be seen in the new Procedure section. He said it has been revised to give the ARB the same authority they currently have.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (C) General Building Type Layout and Relationships (2) Shopping Corridors

John Hardt referred to *Shopping Corridors shall include building types that permit retail uses on ground floors...*, and said that 'permit' feels like an administrative word. He asked if it should be 'facilitates retail uses.' He confirmed they were looking for buildings that accommodate retail on the first floor.

Mr. Phillabaum agreed the language can be clarified.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements

Mr. Hardt made a general statement about this section and those that follow. He said he had comments tonight on the paragraphs here, but said he was uncomfortable with a large portion of the language included. He said to the extent that they want to say a certain style or form of building is appropriate in different parts of the Bridge Street Corridor, he thought that made sense, and to the extent that we want to say a certain style of building should have either a pitched roof, a flat roof, or it can have any one of a number of kinds of roofs, that made sense to him. He said as soon as they got into prescriptive requirements saying the roof pitch and the overhang shall be a specific requirement, it felt to him like we were trying to legislate architecture. Mr. Hardt said he had previously gone on the record saying he did not think it was even possible or feasible to do that. He said he thought, although the intentions were good, the result is going to be something other than what we are really looking for. Mr. Hardt said he was prepared to comment on this tonight to help make the text as good as it can be, but he would prefer a lot of the proposed language not even be included.

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested some justification as to why they would attempt to legislate the architecture as Mr. Hardt indicated.

Mr. Phillabaum explained many of the architectural standards in the Bridge Street Code are included to achieve numerous building characteristics that are requested of applicants on a regular basis, but not addressed in the current Code. He said they tried to make it as predictable as possible for someone designing a building. He said, for example, an applicant might design a building with a principal roof pitch less than 6:12, to discover during the ART review that for most structures that pitch will not be acceptable and they will then need to go back to the drawing board. He said they think it is important to have numerical standards for many of these architectural elements. He said if the Commission preferred a different numeric standard would be more appropriate or lend more flexibility, they would certainly be open to discussing that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked why developers needed roof pitch to be dictated.

Mr. Fishman said the problem was the Commission does not have the control. He said for years, the Commission told applicants for instance, a 3:12 does not look good in a particular area, but now they will not be able to do that.

Mr. Hardt suggested setting aside roof pitches as an example because a roof pitch is something that affects the fundamental shape and form of a building and that may be something, that in spite of his criticism, he might even be comfortable having in the Code. He said as they review the coming pages, it is much more than that. He said they were saying flat roofs, for example, must have an eave and that eave must be eight inches thick. Mr. Hardt referred the recently approved Piada flat roof and said he did not know if it met that number, but he could argue that it ought not. He said there are all sorts of fantastic architecture that do not have exactly an eight-inch thick roof.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if Mr. Hardt could suggest any solutions, from an architectural perspective.

Mr. Taylor said his feelings were identical to Mr. Hardt's. He said he kept returning to the goal and intent. He said he was in favor of the part of this Code that specifies the size of blocks, setbacks, and all of those things that specify where a building should be and establish the overall mass of the building with the goal of creating the street fabric. He said that sets the character of the space. He said the details of the facades and architecture are the things that really enliven that space. Mr. Taylor said all the diagrams provide a great example, but he thought more needed to be left to the individual designer to interpret. Mr. Taylor said based on the examples used in previous Bridge Street presentations and in the Code, the goal seems to

be to create something similar to mid-19th century commercial block architecture. He suggested if the Code were more general.

Mr. Taylor said one of his fears was that we end up with buildings like the picture on page 29 which was much too prescriptive. He said he was afraid that if the Code is so prescriptive the design choices would be limited and the result is not going to good. He said he would rather someone try something entirely new that they thought met the intent of the character.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the basic question was whether they should take all of the numbers out and change the language to more intent statements.

Mr. Taylor said his preference would be to have the references to the details be based on examples, and not include prescriptive numbers.

Mr. Langworthy asked if it should be a certain number or provide an acceptable list.

Mr. Hardt referred to, *Windows and masonry buildings shall have architecturally appropriate lintels and sills.* He said what it did not say was that lintels shall be 'X' inches high and overhang the end of the window by 'X' inches. He said that it did not stipulate the solution, but said if you have a masonry wall, lintels and sills are architecturally appropriate for the style of the building. He said that was all the Code said and did not prescribe a solution.

Mr. Taylor said that language left the ART with room to play with it and not be stuck with something that met the Code, but did not look good.

Mr. Phillabaum said they all shared the same objective. He said they did not want to tie any architects hands from being creative. He said when numbers are seen in most cases, it is to protect against a worst-case scenario or design of the lowest common denominator.

Mr. Hardt said the Code read like a 30-year old Code from a community that had been burned here and there on buildings, and someone went through it and wrote requirements to make sure that something never happens again. He said what they would end up with was a new ugly. Mr. Hardt said he would rather stick to the intent than the prescriptive requirements. Mr. Hardt said generally speaking, he was mostly against anything that was numeric. He said roof pitches might be different because they do affect the form and mass of the building and that is at the heart of a form-based Code.

Mr. Taylor said he thought the removal of the specificity opens the possibility that now and again, they may get a building that is not as good as it could be, but it also allows the possibility that we will get buildings that are better than what they would be if they followed it specifically.

Mr. Langworthy asked the Commissioners to state which numbers were acceptable and which needed to be changed to intent statements as they continued to go through the Code paragraph by paragraph, so that Planning could address that.

Mr. Hardt said the Code does not say that you have to have a pitched roof. He said the Code states if you have a pitched roof, the pitch should be in this range, and he was okay with that. He said however, you also have the option to do a building that does not have a pitched roof for certain building types.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (1) Parapet Roof Type (a) Parapet Height (1).

Mr. Hardt pointed out the roof deck behind a parapet is often sloped, so they needed to clarify how the parapet height is measured, whether it is from the highest point to the roof.

Mr. Langworthy said okay.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (1) Parapet Roof Type (a) Parapet Height (2).

Ms. Kramb recalled Mr. Taylor discussing the heights of parapets at the last meeting. She said she wanted to make sure this corresponded with the changes made last time.

Mr. Taylor said it was not clear what the parapet height requirements were intended to achieve, and seemed contradictory. He said it was stating roof parapets must screen the mechanical equipment, but they must be no lower than two feet and no higher than six feet, and often times they cannot control the height of the mechanicals.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it might be more effective to state the requirement as a measurement above the mechanicals; a minimum of two feet and not more than one foot above the mechanicals.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (1) Parapet Roof Type (a) Parapet Height (3).

Mr. Hardt suggested a period be added after *facades* in the sentence and to strike the rest of it because he thought it would be open to interpretation as far as what is visible from a public right-of-way, especially when there are tight blocks.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (1) Parapet Roof Type (b) Horizontal Shadow Lines

Mr. Taylor confirmed that where the projection needed to create the shadow line was not mentioned. He asked the following sentence be changed as follows, *An expression line shall should, may, or might define the parapet from the upper stories of the building...*, because he could think of a number of examples of buildings where at least parts of the building do not have a line that separates the parapet from the upper story of the building.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (a) Pitch Measure (1).

Mr. Taylor suggested adding, *Principal roof shall have a pitch appropriate for the style of the building, but should generally not be less than 6:12 or more than 12:12.*

Mr. Hardt agreed the additional language was needed.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (a) Pitch Measure (2).

Mr. Hardt said he was not sure of the intent of this paragraph.

Mr. Phillabaum explained this provision was primarily to address roof wells where a pitched roof with no ridge is used to create the well and screen mechanicals. He said there may be instances where a pitch greater than 12:12 might be necessary, and they wanted to allow that flexibility.

Mr. Taylor said he was concerned this provision may create the problem that we have with the BriHi buildings, where portions of the roof stick out and look unfinished. He said he worried a roof pitch of 18:12 is pretty close to vertical. He said he was not sure how that was going to work.

Mr. Hardt said he would be more comfortable saying that pitched roofs shall be in the range of 6:12 to 12:12. He said if specific unique situations necessitate a steeper pitch they be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, depending upon what they are trying to screen and how much latitude the building has. He said he agreed 18:12 was close to vertical.

Mr. Phillabaum explained that was the intent of the paragraph, but it could be reworded to be clearer.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (a) Pitch Measure (3).

Mr. Hardt said he would look for similar modifications with the 3:12 pitch for dormers and balconies. He said he would prefer language that just requires the pitch to be appropriate to the building style.

Mr. Taylor confirmed that 'porches' meant porch roofs.

Mr. Taylor said there are other important details on dormers which were very important and can be done either really well or done badly. He suggested language be included to address the appropriateness of the dormer for the style.

Mr. Phillabaum said they could add language to deal with other important design details for dormers.

Mr. Taylor suggested then, *Appropriately detailed and scaled and roofed dormers for the architectural style.* He pointed out there were many references available for what is considered appropriate for dormer design.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (b) Roof Structure (2).

Mr. Hardt said locally, in describing retail architecture, they have often referred to false shingled roofs with a well behind them as a mansard roof. He asked if that was what was meant in this section.

Mr. Phillabaum clarified this section was dealing with true, dual pitched mansard and gambrel roofs. He said the Code only permits these roof types for detached single-family buildings, unless it is architecturally appropriate on another building type.

Mr. Hardt wanted to make sure they were not prohibiting what the industry has always called mansard roofs on commercial buildings which are really are not a true mansard.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (b) Roof Structure (3).

Mr. Taylor said this requirement had the same issues with prescriptive wording as number 4 below and Mr. Hardt agreed the 75 percent was suspect.

Mr. Phillabaum said this could be revised to be consistent with what is architecturally appropriate to the building type.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (a) Roof Structure (4).

Mr. Hardt said he thought one dormer for every 15 feet was too prescriptive.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (b) Roof Structure (5).

Mr. Hardt pointed out the materials listed were nice, but there are some that are notably absent, including asphalt shingles. He asked if that was deliberate.

Mr. Phillabaum clarified there was a formatting error in this section. He said (b) 3, 4, and 5, should be indented, as all of those requirements deal specifically with gambrel and mansard roofs.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see good simulated materials permitted for roofs.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (c) Parallel Ridge Line and (d) Dormers.

Mr. Hardt said these two conflict with each other. He said (c) *When the principal ridge line runs parallel to any street, gabled end shall occur at least every 100 feet*, which would tell him the longest ridge line possible was 100 feet, and then (d), *If you have a ridge line greater than 100 feet*, you must do these things.

Mr. Phillabaum explained they are not actually mutually exclusive. He said there were scenarios where both requirements would be applicable. He said it sounded like in general, the direction from the Commission was to revise the language toward architectural appropriateness, so they could say *dormer and cross gable spacing architecturally appropriate to the building type*.

Mr. Hardt said the provision, *When the principal roof pitch is greater than 10:12...*, requires you add dormers and he thought that would discourage people from putting steep pitched roofs on the building which is probably not what they want. He was in favor of *architectural appropriateness* over that prescriptive requirement.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (e) Gable Ends.

Mr. Hardt said this section should include a number of architectural features.

Mr. Hardt said he had no idea what *...measured by the average window size as used in the upper stories of the building* meant.

Mr. Phillabaum explained the paragraph was to be reworded to read *a vent or window is required on street facing gabled ends. The size of the vent or window must be at least one-half the area of the average window size*. He clarified it was not the area of the gable, it was half the area of the average window on the upper floor.

Mr. Taylor said he preferred it say *An architecturally appropriate ornamentation should occur in gable ends*, and leave it at that. He said that could be a window, vent, or in a brick building, it could be a carved medallion of some kind or an accent stone.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (f) Roof Height.

Mr. Hardt said he was not sure what they were trying to accomplish with this paragraph. Mr. Phillabaum said they were trying to avoid buildings in the Historic District that feature a roof mass that overpowers the rest of the building. He said limiting the height of these roofs to not more than the height of the upper story would assist in preventing that situation.

Mr. Taylor asked if there was a reason to think that was a problem more in the Historic Core than other areas. Mr. Phillabaum said this part of the requirement is to preserve the traditionally intimate scale of buildings in the Historic District, which is why it was applied specifically to the Historic Core.

Mr. Hardt said the second sentence referred to all other districts, and that was the portion of the paragraph he understood the least.

Mr. Phillabaum said similarly to the first sentence, it limits in any other district, the roof cannot be more than one-and-a-half times the height of the upper story. He said it is to avoid a building mass dominated by the roof. He said if the upper floor can be 12 feet as measured by the Code, you could have an 18-foot maximum height of the roof.

Mr. Langworthy asked if it was preferred that it say something like, *The roof mass should be appropriate both to the location, if it is in the Historic Core, for example, and the building.*

Mr. Taylor said he would like to add *or as prescribed by the Architectural Review Board* to the end of the first portion of the requirement. He said there are buildings in the Historic District of front gable facing cottage type buildings, where a taller roof is entirely appropriate.

Mr. Phillabaum said ARB could make that determination. Mr. Taylor said if the ARB has the authority to apply this or not requirement, then he is very happy.

Mr. Langworthy said the Bridge Street Code gives the ARB the same review authority as the current Code.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (2) Pitched Roof (g).

Mr. Hardt asked if an occupied space within a roof counted as a floor. Mr. Phillabaum said it did. He said it would be classified as a half-story. Mr. Hardt asked that be clarified.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (3) Flat Roof.

Mr. Hardt said he disagreed with the provisions requiring eaves on flat roofs as well as the dimensional requirements listed in this section for the reasons he had previously stated. Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed it be revised to read more as an intent statement to achieve *architectural appropriateness*.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (4) Flat Roof (e)(2).

Mr. Hardt said the four feet limitation for vertical walls seemed arbitrary and he did not know what they would be trying to prevent. Mr. Phillabaum agreed it could be removed.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (4) Flat Roof (f).

Ms. Krumb said this section should be stricken because she did not know how there could be occupied space behind a flat roof type. Mr. Phillabaum agreed.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (4) Towers (c) Tower Width.

Mr. Hardt said he thought 20 feet was building specific and arbitrary. He said it was all a matter of the width of the tower is proportional to its height, not to the rest of the building necessarily.

Mr. Taylor said a solution could be to take the language from (a) and add it to this section to give the ART, or required reviewing body, the power to approve it.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (D) Roof Type Requirements (4) Towers (d) Horizontal Expression Lines.

Mr. Hardt said he thought that, *...unless the tower element is a major architectural element extending from the ground story*, was the definition of a tower. He said the requirement that an expression line must pass through the tower was fairly random. He said there are wonderful examples of towers that have expression lines and those that do not. He suggested striking all of (d) because it was situation specific whether horizontal expression lines were an appropriate design feature or not.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that (d) should be stricken.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (E) Materials (1) Façade Materials (b).

Ms. Krumb pointed this was a fragmented sentence. She suggested changing the period after *doors* to a comma to make it one sentence.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (E) Materials (1) Façade Materials (c).

Mr. Taylor said he had the same comment as he did regarding the roof materials. He asked if cultured stone was prohibited, and suggested there are excellent examples of cultured stone and other stone-like materials, that were not real stone. Mr. Phillabaum said they could add cultured stone.

Mr. Hardt pointed out the thickness of one-half inch is noted for the fiber cement siding, but one of the market leaders in that category does not meet that requirement.

Mr. Phillabaum said there are manufacturers such as James Hardi that have product lines that meet the requirement. He explained the objective of the greater thickness was to create very strong shadow lines across the façade. He asked a minimum thickness be suggested for inclusion, to avoid the specification of paper-thin siding that results in a very flat façade with no shadow whatsoever.

Mr. Taylor said he agreed with intent, but he did not know if one-half inch was the right number or not.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (E) Materials (1) Façade Materials (e).

Mr. Hardt recalled that last time, they talked about striking the word *local*. He suggested instead, they might instead say...*high quality installations in similar climates* instead. He said what was relevant was if a product would hold up if applied in climates similar to ours. He asked if he was the only one concerned about it. He said he did not think it had to be local.

Mr. Zimmerman agreed.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (E) Materials (2) Façade Material Transitions (a).

Mr. Hardt pointed out this did not distinguish between vertical and horizontal transitions. Mr. Phillabaum said a graphic would be added to depict the meaning.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (E) Materials (3) Roof Materials (a).

Ms. Krumb noted there was no material listed for flat roofs. She said shingles would not work on a flat roof.

Mr. Hardt suggested adding a paragraph, *Flat roofs can use any appropriate material.*

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (E) Materials (3) Roof Materials (b).

Mr. Hardt said he had the same climate versus local comment for this section.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (E) Materials (3) Roof Materials (c).

Ms. Krumb asked how possible it was to finish roof penetrations to match the color of the roof. Mr. Phillabaum said typically they are painted to match the color of the roof.

Mr. Hardt referred to *Where these elements on any other street facing façade are unavoidable, particular care must be taken to render these elements less visible.* He said he understood it, but it was open to a lot of interpretation depending who is applying this requirement.

Mr. Phillabaum explained the first part, prohibited roof penetrations from being visible along principal frontage streets, and the second part of the provision requires they be painted to match when visible from any other type of street.

Mr. Hardt said the two scenarios were covered when it said they could not be on a principal frontage street and if it was anywhere else, they have to be colored to match the roof. He said it seemed there could be a period there and omit the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. Taylor said there is a possibility that a two-story building is built next to an existing four-story building with windows that would look down on the lower building. He said in that condition, the roof color and the

color of the roof penetrations need to be coordinated and may be more important than not seeing those elements from the street. He said many cities have a provision dealing with these situations.

Mr. Taylor confirmed that 'green' roofs were allowed on flat roofs.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (E) Materials (4) Color.

Mr. Hardt recalled Ms. Krumb had pointed out last time that historic palettes had not been defined. Ms. Amorose Grooms recalled last time, the definition was going to be by the paint manufacturer, Sherwin Williams. Ms. Krumb said their *National Trust* color palette could be used.

Mr. Phillabaum said nearly every manufacturer has a line of historic color palettes, and that are appropriate to a number of different eras and would allow a sufficient amount of choice.

Ms. Krumb said she had issues with *Other colors may be utilized for details and accents, ...* which would allow for any color to be used and would not necessarily be from these historic color palettes.

Mr. Langworthy suggested leaving it at historic palette that they could be contrasting. He said they would still stay within the historic palette, but it would be a different color. Ms. Krumb said that was fine.

Mr. Phillabaum clarified the 10 percent permitted for details and accents was intended as 10 percent of each façade, and not as 10 percent of the cumulative area of the building façades.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (F) Entrances & Pedestrianways (3) Entrance Design (a).

Mr. Hardt said this read like Architecture 101 on how to design an entrance, and was unnecessary unless there was a particular problem to be solved.

Mr. Phillabaum explained the purpose is to avoid potential problems. He said in most cases, an architect or designer is going to understand how to effectively call attention to the principal entrance. Mr. Langworthy suggested language be included.

Mr. Taylor said they should clearly call out the entrance, engage the street, and be pedestrian in scale.

Mr. Langworthy suggested examples be given.

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Hardt agreed with Mr. Langworthy's suggestions.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (F) Entrances & Pedestrianways (3) Entrance Design (c).

Mr. Fishman said he assumed this was for residential doors, and there were no other materials that you can think of except glass.

Mr. Hardt questioned the need for this paragraph if almost every material a door could be made of was listed.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (F) Entrances & Pedestrianways (3) Entrance Design (d).

Mr. Fishman said this seemed to restrict creativity for commercial doors. He said there could be very attractive solid doors proposed containing no glass installed adjacent to large display windows on either side. He questioned the need to require commercial doors include glass.

Mr. Hardt said the purpose of this paragraph was unclear. Mr. Langworthy explained that it was preventing blank, inoperable doors along the sidewalk. He said this would require even interior emergency doors to be consistent in design with other entrance doors from the exterior.

Mr. Hardt asked if it was for all doors, or just principal entrances. Mr. Phillabaum said the principal entrance is what this is primarily addressing, but added the total number of entrances required is dictated by the individual Building Types.

Mr. Hardt asked if there had ever been a problem with the principal entrance to a business not having hardware on it.

Mr. Phillabaum said the issue is not the door lacks hardware, but the hardware was not operable by patrons. He pointed out Mr. Sushi at BriHi Square as an example has two entrances—one on North High Street and one adjacent to the upper plaza. He said although the entrance door on North High Street is inaccessible to the public, they worked with the owner to maintain the appearance of an entrance door given the prominence of that door location. He explained an objective of the Bridge Street Code is for functional entrances along the public right-of-way.

Mr. Hardt said this says one of two things. He said if the intent is that all doors to a business must be operable and have hardware on it, he disagreed because he did not think many businesses will want every door to be operable. However, he said if they are just talking about the principal entry door, then it is a requirement without a problem because a principal entry door is always going to be operable.

Mr. Taylor said he disagreed with Mr. Hardt that there was a problem with the first sentence because to him, the intent was that if there was a door required in a location that looked like it should be an entrance, it should at least look like an entry door.

Mr. Hardt said he was okay, now that he had heard the explanation.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (F) Entrances & Pedestrianways (4) Mid-Building Pedestrianways.

Mr. Taylor said he had commented at the previous meeting that this requirement should be coordinated with Mid-Block Pedestrianways.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (G) Articulation of Stories on Street Facades.

Mr. Hardt asked about the sentence: *Unoccupied stories are permitted only under the roof eaves.*

Mr. Phillabaum said that would be deleted.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies

Mr. Zimmerman pointed out windows with glass divisions or grids were not addressed in the Code. He said if this was a quality they wanted to achieve some language should be added.

Mr. Hardt said language should be included that windows shall have architecturally or historically appropriate lite patterns.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (1) Windows (b).

Mr. Hardt pointed out this seemed to be in conflict with Section (N) Building Types General Requirements (4) Façade Requirements (a) Façade Transparency (1) on page 34. He said both refer to transparency percentages but were not the same number.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (1) Windows (d).

Mr. Zimmerman noted this section referred to wood window frames. He explained the frame of the window holds the glass in place, so *frames* should be struck and replaced with wood windows.

Mr. Zimmerman said in the Historic Core, specific window materials are required, but beyond that District fiberglass windows were not listed as being permitted. He said they were superior to vinyl windows and should be included as a permitted window material.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (1) Windows (e)

Mr. Hardt said the 3-inch recess dimension noted went back to a conversation they had at the last meeting.

Mr. Phillabaum said they had discussed this requirement with Mr. Tyler and others in the Building Department. He said they understand there may be certain restrictions to achieve a three-inch recess in all instances, but it was a standard they would like to keep. He said they are discussing how these restrictions can be accommodated while still achieving the expression of wall thickness that recessed windows can provide. He said they would include their alternate language in the revision.

Mr. Taylor said he agreed with the intent, and said the more you can push the window in, the better the appearance. He said Mr. Hardt's comment was regarding the practicality from a construction detail standpoint, and a typical residential window cannot meet that requirement, unless you have a masonry clad building.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (1) Windows (f).

Mr. Zimmerman asked if they were doing away with transom type windows. He said transom windows are getting more use in the residential setting for bathrooms and living areas where the homeowner wants more wall space on the interior.

Mr. Phillabaum said transoms could be included in the paragraph.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (2) Shutters (a).

Mr. Hardt pointed out a typo, *...whether the shutters are operable or not*. He explained if we are requiring operable hardware, then they are, by definition, operable. He said he thought it should say, *...whether they are operated or not* instead.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (3) Awnings and Canopies (a) General (1).

Ms. Krumb referred to the last sentence, and suggested, *...provided the bottom of the canopy is at least eight feet from the sidewalk*, to make it clear where the measurement was from.

Mr. Phillabaum suggested adding *...the lowest portion of the awning*.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (3) Awnings and Canopies (a) General (2).

Ms. Krumb asked if we were saying you cannot have a canopy or awning by a door and the only place you can mount them is the window. She asked if they could be mounted on door frames.

Mr. Taylor suggested removing the word *windows*, and say openings.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (3) Awnings and Canopies (b) Awnings 1.

Mr. Hardt said this requires awnings to be triangular in section. He pointed out there are some retail centers in Dublin where the awnings are semi-circular in section. He asked if there was an issue with including those.

Mr. Phillabaum said awnings that were semi-circular in section were not necessarily a problem and the reference to awning shape could be removed.

Administrative Business

Ms. Amorose Groomes called a short recess.
The meeting reconvened at 8:05 p.m.

Mr. Langworthy reported the Code was reviewed by three residential home builders in central Ohio who provided point-by-point comments and were provided responses to each point by Planning. He said some areas were modified to reflect their comments, explanations were given where they had questions. He said a couple of typographic errors were called to our attention, one of which will be pointed out when we go through the tables with the eight-unit single family attached units. He said they are still working through several of their issues, and those that cannot be resolved may be brought back to the Commission to have additional discussion. Mr. Langworthy said some of their issues we were unwilling to bend on, so we explained our reasons why, and hopefully they will understand and accept it.

Mr. Hardt asked at some point after all the changes are made to the text, whether they are initiated by a third party or by the Commission, they come back to the Commission in a marked up format where they can see the changes.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (3) Awnings and Canopies (c) Canopies (1).

Mr. Hardt said the materials listed, specifically called out iron and steel, which are two kinds of metal, but do not include aluminum and several kinds of metal that are common. He asked if they just mean 'metal' or if there was a conscious decision to include just those two.

Mr. Phillabaum agreed to change it to metal.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (3) Awnings and Canopies (c) Canopies (2).

Mr. Hardt noted the section said canopies can be of any shape, but at the end of the paragraph, it says *they should principally project outward from the building in a rectangular shape.*

Mr. Phillabaum said they would clear up that inconsistency.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (H) Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies (3) Awnings and Canopies (c) Canopies (3).

Mr. Hardt said he understood the intent of them being supported by cables, but in reality they are rarely cables, they are more typically rods and he thought that was what was meant.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (I) Entrances and Balconies (1) Balconies.

Mr. Phillabaum clarified that through the different versions, a Juliet Balcony had one requirement that was accidentally omitted that dealt with *Juliet balconies built in conjunction with doors may project up to 24 inches, and may be up to five feet wide, and Juliet balconies used in construction with windows may not exceed the width of the windows...* He said it will be included in the next version.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (I) Entrances and Balconies (2) Porches (b) Façade Coverage.

Ms. Krumb asked if the porch had to cover exactly 50 percent. She said it seemed odd to prescribe. Mr. Phillabaum clarified it was a minimum of 50 percent.

Ms. Krumb asked if there was a reason for requiring porches on every residence. Mr. Langworthy explained that was part of the 'eyes on the street' common to more urban styles of residential buildings.

Mr. Hardt asked why we were stipulating a minimum size of a porch. Mr. Phillabaum said in order for a porch to be functional, they needed to be of a minimum depth, and in order for porches to not be treated as an afterthought by designers, they should be a substantial component of the residence. He explained the width requirement was based on the narrowest potential residential building type and how wide a porch would need to be to be functional.

Mr. Hardt suggested it be simplified to require a porch be incorporated of sufficient size to be functional.

Ms. Krumb said you could have a porch a little narrower than the building façade, but because it was deeper it would be used.

Mr. Taylor said there are examples of porches that were extremely important architectural features in a building, and are not near 50 percent of the width of the building. He said that seemed like one of the more arbitrary things here. He said he understood the goal was for porches to be incorporated into the design of the building and be appropriate to the style, but thought prescribing the width went too far. He said the stipulation of the 50 percent is what concerned him.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested going back to Mr. Hardt's suggested language.

Mr. Taylor said he got that they did not want someone to stick something on an elevation that looked like a porch.

Mr. Phillabaum said he believed they had some other requirements in terms of the depth farther into this. He said a minimum six-foot depth was functionally what was needed for that to be usable space to have a chair and walk around.

Mr. Taylor clarified the six feet was the clear dimension inside the porch to allow for a chair and someone to be able to walk past it.

Mr. Phillabaum said they could change the minimum 50 percent requirement and might still achieve the objective through intent language, as long as the minimum depth requirement is maintained.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (I) Entrances and Balconies (3) Stoops.

Ms. Krumb noted they began using the acronym, RBZ here and it was the first time she recalled using it. She asked if there was a place where acronyms were defined in this text. Mr. Phillabaum said that was introduced in Lots and Blocks. He said if this was the first reference to it in the Building Types, they can spell it out and parenthetically say RBZ to establish it in this section.

Mr. Langworthy said they could carry that style through the document.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (J) Treatments at Terminal Vistas.

Mr. Taylor recalled discussing this during the last meeting as it related to lots, blocks and streets. He said the concern would be how they deal with a situation where the building exists and then the street comes later and terminates at the building. He said unless the street locations were locked in, and they knew where terminal vistas would be located, a building design could not anticipate meeting the terminal vista treatment. He said he did not know how they can deal with that.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (J) Treatments at Terminal Vistas (2).

Ms. Krumb asked when the term, 'bay' is used in the list of elements that can be used to terminate the view, are they referring to a window or door, and if not, to what they are referring. She said the term bay was not clear.

Mr. Taylor said to him, it meant a structural bay. Ms. Amorose Groomes said they needed to work on that.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (K) Building Variety

Ms. Kramb said in general this paragraph was awkwardly written, because the first sentence said *...at least two of the following materials*, and then nothing is listed for a while.

Ms. Kramb said the reference to *Figure K* was also incorrect.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (L) Vehicular Canopies (3)

Mr. Hardt referred to the last sentence, *...supporting columns shall be composed of or enclosed by materials matching the primary materials of the principal structure*, and said that was another example of his issue with prescriptiveness. He said earlier tonight, they had a case where a canopy and its supporting material were entirely different than the primary materials of the building and they approved it as a consent item. He reiterated his point that generally, trying to legislate architecture is a failed endeavor.

Mr. Phillabaum said that it could be reworded to coordinate with the architecture of the principal structure.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (M) Signs (2).

Mr. Hardt asked if the section was talking about signs that were contemplated initially upon building opening or about all of the signs that might ever be installed on a building.

Mr. Phillabaum said it was the latter, because in most cases the buildings are constructed speculatively, without all of the tenants lined up.

Mr. Hardt said it needed to be clarified to say, *...locations of all signs intended to be affixed initially, or in the future*, or something like that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested adding *...by subsequent occupants*.

Mr. Taylor said that was an issue they had in the past where there was not a clear sign panel on the building and the signs got placed anywhere they could fit, with poor results.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (N) Building Type General Requirements (2) Height (a).

Mr. Hardt asked if that was really what they wanted, or did they want the portion of the building in the RBZ to be the tallest part of the building. He said he thought if you had a building in which some portions were taller than others, you would want the tallest part on the street.

Mr. Phillabaum said depending upon the degree that the building steps outside of the RBZ, it could look odd and fail to reinforce the streetscape if the shorter part of the building is permitted to count as meeting the RBZ requirement.

Mr. Langworthy said it would be preferable to be more specific such as *the portion of the building with the greatest number of stories*. He said they would work on that language.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (N) Building Type General Requirements (2) Height (e) (2).

Mr. Hardt said for measuring the uppermost floors of a building, using the ceiling height was irrelevant. He suggested finding a way to measure that uppermost floor to the eave, roofline, or something on the exterior that is more relevant to the height of the building.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (N) Building Type General Requirements (3) Uses and Occupancy Requirements (b) (3).

Ms. Kramb asked what *When parking is permitted within the building, a specified depth of space shall be occupied by users on a daily bases* meant.

Mr. Phillabaum explained that if parking is located within the building, it cannot extend to the front of the building. He said a portion of that building must be occupied space, and the required depth of this occupied space varies by building type.

Ms. Kramb confirmed that meant that parking could not go to the front of the building.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that it might be more clear if written the opposite way, *...from the front of the building, a certain distance back you have to have space that is occupied on a daily bases by people, not cars.*

Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (N) Building Type General Requirements (3) Façade Requirements (a) Façade Transparency (3).

Mr. Hardt referred to *...shall also be met on the upper stories of all facades with street frontage...* He said for a multi-story building with retail on the first floor, they would not likely want the same degree of transparency on the upper floors as required for the retail.

Mr. Phillabaum said they had noted this requirement needed to be clarified.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (N) Building Type General Requirements (3) Façade Requirements (a) Façade Transparency (5).

Mr. Zimmerman said he would like to see the in-wall HVAC units eliminated and if an applicant is unable to eliminate them, the Commission should determine how effectively the vents are hidden.

Ms. Amorose Groomes and Mr. Fishman agreed that should be really encouraged.

Mr. Hardt confirmed there should be a period after *...shall not be placed on any building façade*, and the rest should be stricken.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (N) Building Type General Requirements (3) Façade Requirements (a) Façade Transparency (6).

Mr. Taylor said this requirement was related to the previous discussions on Mid-Block and Mid-Building Pedestrianways and should be coordinated with those requirements.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (N) Building Type General Requirements (4) Façade Requirements (b) Building Entrances (1).

Mr. Hardt questioned the necessity of the last sentence.

Mr. Phillabaum said it went back to their discussion earlier. He said the principal entrances—those located adjacent to the sidewalk—could be potentially locked by business owners, forcing people to enter from the rear of the building to the detriment of an active street life.

Mr. Budde pointed out some banks with double doors will lock one of the doors for security purposes. He said in the event that something inappropriate happens, they might hit the wrong door and slow down.

Mr. Hardt said unlike the previous paragraph, this does not refer specifically to doors facing streets, so he thought it did not carry the same intent as what they talked about in the other paragraph. He asked why this needed to be repeated here if it was already addressed.

Mr. Taylor suggested that maybe the intent of the word 'principal' here was less the entrance that was used and more the entrance that appears to be the principal interest.

Mr. Phillabaum explained principal building entrances are going to be on the principal frontage street, or front façade of the building, and not off a parking lot or some other remote location.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested using the 'apparent' principal entrance.

Mr. Phillabaum said you could have two principal frontage streets, but only one principal entrance.

Mr. Taylor said this requirement is defining where the principal building entrance had to be located; not necessarily the door that is the principal means of access.

Mr. Hardt asked suggested 'architecturally significant' entrance doors.

Mr. Taylor said that would be another way to say it, but it was something that should be addressed.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (N) Building Type General Requirements (4) Façade Requirements (c) Façade Divisions

Mr. Taylor encouraged there be a lot of flexibility. He recalled mentioning there were plenty of great examples in this genre of 18th century commercial block architecture where buildings have one very long façade that is uninterrupted by regular vertical façade divisions as required in this Code. He said they need to keep an open mind so that they do not end up with buildings with artificial divisions.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (O) Building Types (1) Single Family Detached

Ms. Kramb commented that more distinguishable colors would help the graphics be more legible. Mr. Langworthy agreed.

Ms. Kramb said she was not sure what 'occupied space' meant. She asked if it was defined somewhere or was it a common term. Mr. Phillabaum said it was defined in the Definitions section.

Mr. Hardt pointed out the information on the right side of the table talking about façade requirements was appropriate with the exception of façade divisions. He said as they get deeper into other building types, he did not feel it was appropriate to dictate the spacing of Façade Divisions.

Mr. Taylor said he thought they could either define in the General Building Requirements section, what those requirements are and then allow flexibility in how they should apply to each building type, or specify the details of the building in a format like this and then they do not need the General Building Type Requirements. He said there seemed to be some redundancy.

Mr. Taylor said his particular comments on this page and most of the others, were that on all of the Residential Areas, the first floor is 2 ½ feet up from the adjacent sidewalk elevation. He said they need to make sure that they do not create a situation for handicap persons that will be an issue. He said he was more concerned about that on the larger buildings than for the single family.

Mr. Taylor said under (d)(3) Building Entrance, he wanted to know if '*front, corner, side; porches are required*' meant they had to have porches on three sides of the building.

Mr. Langworthy said it said the Principal Entrance Location could be on the *'front, corner, side; porches are required.*

Mr. Phillabaum said they could add the word 'or' to read, *...front, corner, or side...*

Mr. Taylor said anywhere but the back.

Mr. Taylor said under (d)(5) Façade Materials, if the same information is repeated in the General Requirements, there is the potential for conflict if the same requirement is in several places. He suggested it all be in a simple chart in one location that could be referred to.

Mr. Taylor referred to *...tower not permitted on single family*, and said he thought that would be one place they would want to have that because it completely rules out several prominent architectural styles for large residences.

Mr. Phillabaum said in the majority of architectural styles for single family homes that had that type of element, it did not extend far enough to be defined as a tower. He said it would just be an architectural feature and would not meet our definition of a tower, and there would be no issue.

Mr. Taylor said perhaps there are two different kinds of towers. He said maybe what they were talking about here as not being permitted were *roof* towers, as opposed to more integral towers. Mr. Phillabaum agreed to look at that how that could be addressed.

Mr. Langworthy said generalizing some of the language as they had done earlier would also help here.

Mr. Hardt asked about the Minimum Finished Floor Elevations, particularly as they related to residential. He said effectively, with that requirement, they are prohibiting slab on-grade construction.

Mr. Taylor thought they were requiring porches or stoops. Mr. Phillabaum said the intent is give vertical separation from the sidewalk to the windows of the unit. He said given the RBZ and where these buildings will be sited it provides a measure of privacy.

Mr. Hardt asked if there had been any feedback from the developers about that requirement. He said it dictates a certain construction method. Mr. Phillabaum said the potential ADA issue was raised, but as for the general requirement the bigger push back was on the whether it should be two and one half feet or a slightly lower height.

Mr. Taylor said he had no problem with it. He said there were a lot of good reasons to elevate the first floor of a house and he did not think ADA will have a problem with single-family, but with multiple-family, there are fair housing issues that are required 100 percent.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (O) Building Types (2) Single Family Attached (a) Building Siting

Ms. Krumb said it sounded like the two sentences were saying the same thing, but she was not sure what they were getting at. She noted that you are allowed to have a courtyard that is 35 percent and it counts as meeting the front property line coverage. She suggested changing the order of the sentence: *The courtyard, when enclosed by buildings on three sides, may contribute to the front property line up to 35 percent of the front property line.*

Mr. Langworthy said they would work on the language.

Section 153.062 BUILDING TYPES (O) Building Types - Diagrams

Mr. Hardt said what he commented about on the first table applied to all of the tables. He said he agreed with Ms. Kramb's comments about the colors. He apologized if it seemed petty, but the font of the letters in the small gray circles was difficult to read.

Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed. Mr. Phillabaum said they could use capital letters and a different font.

Ms. Amorose Groomes reiterated that Mr. Hardt's comments on the detached single family table stood for all the tables.

Section 153.063 NEIGHBORHOOD STANDARDS (Page 61)

Ms. Kramb pointed out that the descriptions for each Neighborhood District uses very informal language, for example in (A) (1), "it is a *singularly* unique area," for (B) (1), the Historic Residential Neighborhood is an "*important neighborhood*," for (C) (1), the Sawmill Center Neighborhood "offers a *unique opportunity*," for (D) (1), the Historic Transition Neighborhood also "offers a *unique opportunity*," and for (E) (1), the Indian Run Neighborhood "provides a *significant opportunity*."

Mr. Langworthy said the language is intended in some respects to be richer and more descriptive because these districts are not typical zoning districts.

Section 153.063 NEIGHBORHOOD STANDARDS (B) BSC Historic Residential (Page 61)

Mr. Hardt pointed out that there were many subparagraphs about lot width, height, and lot coverage. He asked if they already existed elsewhere in the Zoning Code.

Mr. Langworthy explained that these regulations are the same as what is currently required for the existing Historic Residential District, and they promised the residents in that neighborhood that nothing would change for them. He clarified that the existing Historic Residential District would be eliminated in lieu of the new BSC Historic Residential Neighborhood District, but nothing in effect would change.

Ms. Kramb asked if the neighborhood currently conformed to these requirements.

Mr. Langworthy said that when these standards were drafted, Planning completed an inventory to make sure that as much development would be conforming as possible.

Section 153.063 NEIGHBORHOOD STANDARDS (C) BSC Sawmill Center (Page 62-63)

Mr. Hardt referred to the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District graphic on page 62, and asked if the slivers of land along West Dublin-Granville Road and I-270 were deliberately left out of this district.

Rachel Ray explained that the graphics are intended to relate to the zoning districts. She stated that the land along West Dublin-Granville Road was recommended for BSC Office district zoning, while Planning does recommend that the land adjacent to I-270 be part of the Sawmill Center zoning district because its awkward dimensions may make it difficult to redevelop outside of a larger-scale, coordinated redevelopment. She said that the graphic would be changed for the final draft based on the recommended zoning.

Mr. Hardt referred to Table 153.063-B. He noted that the block size requirements were listed elsewhere in the code. He asked why the information was listed in both places, because it seemed redundant.

Ms. Ray said that Planning would review the tables to make sure that they remain consistent with the changes to the other section, but she explained that the intent with the Neighborhood District standards is for them to function as a "one-stop shop," just like the building tables, because these areas are intended to function as unified character areas and to maximize coordination over the long-term.

Ms. Kramb said that she would prefer that the regulations be listed as paragraphs in the column format rather than in a table format, which she found difficult to read.

Ms. Ray said that Planning would reorganize the text and eliminate the tables.

Mr. Hardt referred to Sign Plans. He said he thought it should read, "*Signs shall meet the requirements of 153.065.*"

Ms. Ray said there was an intent statement in the sign requirements, saying that signs are intended to create a vibrant urban environment, so with these particular districts, they wanted to give the Commission the ability to approve all different types of signs to provide the most flexibility. She did not think they would not want to limit to the requirements of that section, just to allow for future flexibility.

Mr. Hardt said he understood the intent, but he was saying that if you have to meet the requirements of that section, then the flexibility should be in that section.

Ms. Ray stated that Planning would look at the language to ensure that the intent was clear.

Ms. Kramb asked why shopping center size needed to be mandated.

Ms. Ray said the intent is to create a critical mass of commercial activity in each of these important districts. She said these areas should function as the anchors for the Bridge Street Corridor, so that they do not end up with a bunch of spread out use areas that do not relate to one another and cannot be accessed except by car. She said the objective is to make sure that there is at least 300 feet of commercial area on each side of the shopping corridor street to achieve that minimum critical mass area.

Mr. Hardt referred to the diagram. He said that he understood the desire for gateways on Sawmill Road and at the southern end of West Dublin-Granville Road, but gateways at the western edges of the district seemed to indicate that this is the end of the shopping area, and it shall not be located any farther west. He said that if this area were developed and was wildly successful, and someone wanted to expand the retail farther down the street to the west, he did not see why that would be a problem.

Ms. Ray explained that the gateways are also intended to indicate the boundaries between the zoning districts and should be located generally where the principal streets enter into that district. She said the intent is to signal your entrance into a special area. Ms. Ray agreed that if the area was successful, and more shopping corridors were desired elsewhere, that would be fine, but they could determine the locations later. She added that Planning has had ongoing discussions with the property owners for the Sawmill Center and Indian Run Neighborhood Districts, and the graphics are generally reflective of their preliminary thinking on what they would like to do on these sites, particularly with regard to the location and orientation of the shopping corridor area.

Section 153.063 NEIGHBORHOOD STANDARDS (C) BSC Historic Transition (Page 64-65)

Ms. Kramb asked why the 1919 Building was the only building shown on Figure 153.063-B.

Ms. Ray explained that it is a historic structure that is an important placemaking element of the Historic Transition District that should be preserved.

Ms. Kramb said that no other historic structure was called out in the text, and since no other structure is called it, she thought it made the 1919 Building seem more important than other historic structures.

Ms. Ray said the Vision Plan recommended that the site be preserved, particularly because as a civic use, the result is that it creates a cluster of civic uses with the cemetery, the church and the potential for

other civic uses in that area. She said for that reason, it is important that the 1919 Building be identified on the graphic.

Ms. Kramb referred to Block Length: "*Lots are not permitted between greenways and the street adjacent to Indian Run West and North High Street.*" She requested clarification for this requirement.

Ms. Ray said the intent was for developable lots. She said that land along the greenway should be open, with no building types to the north of that future street. She said Planning would check the language.

Ms. Kramb said it should say, "*buildings are not permitted.*"

Ms. Ray said they would need to check the language, because they may want to have other structures associated with a park or greenway in that area. She reiterated that the intent was that no development happens there, except perhaps park facilities or bikepaths.

Section 153.063 NEIGHBORHOOD STANDARDS (C) BSC Sawmill Center (Page 66)

Ms. Kramb referred to *Historic Sites and Structures* and said "Ohio Historic Inventory" should be struck, because any building over 50 years old can be eligible for the inventory, but that does not mean it is historic.

Mr. Langworthy said he would like to review the language with the Architectural Review Board before modifying the language.

Ms. Kramb noted that she would also like to make sure that road names are clearly and consistently defined on all maps and graphics.

Ms. Ray said that they would check all of the street names.

Section 153.064 OPEN SPACE TYPES (C) Provision of Open Space (1) (Page 70)

Mr. Hardt asked if Planning had any further discussions regarding a strategy for open space distribution.

Mr. Phillabaum explained that one of the requirements to deal with open space distribution is the provisions for subsection (D), Suitability of Open Space. He said that this section allows the ART or the approving body to determine whether the space that a developer wants to provide is appropriate, or whether they should pay a fee in lieu of land dedication, or whether they should be required to combine land with another existing open space where we want a larger park. He said the Parks and Recreation Master Plan will guide where we want to see some of the larger open spaces based on the anticipated development patterns and uses.

Mr. Hardt asked if it was the reviewing body's responsibility to determine which is route appropriate, or if

Mr. Langworthy said in the Review and Approval Procedures and Criteria section, it states that the Planning and Zoning Commission has to authority to approve a fee in lieu of land dedication. He said that applicants have to provide the open space unless the Commission (or the Architectural Review Board) says they can pay a fee instead, but the fee in lieu is not automatic.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not sure that was what the Commission wanted, because then, we might end up with all small parks, because no one would want to take the effort to request to pay a fee instead.

Mr. Langworthy said that was where the Suitability of Open Space subsection comes in, to help the reviewing body decide when we want to set aside land for a new open space, add to an existing open space, or pay the fee in lieu.

Mr. Fishman said he was not in favor of that approach.

Mr. Langworthy asked the Commissioners not to dismiss the Suitability of Open Space subsection, which does not allow developers to simply put 200 square feet here and 200 square feet there. He said there has to be some consistency and reasonable decisions, and the criteria helps ensure that happens.

Mr. Taylor asked if the Commission's review then would include situations where someone does not want to pay a fee because they have less building than land, and they just want a park there, and the Commission says that they will have to work to properly place the park.

Mr. Langworthy said that would occur through the site plan or development plan process.

Mr. Fishman asked if there was a plan for how much open space the City will end up with in the Corridor, so that they make sure that they end up getting that space. He said he agreed with the other Commissioners that he did not want small patches of park space everywhere, but they certainly did not want to end up at the end of the development of the Corridor, 20 years from now, with a lot of money and no open space. He said there has to be some way to make sure that it is required that they are going to reserve so much open space for every development that comes in.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that there is no way to know where every open space will go everywhere in the Corridor. He explained that we have a plan in terms of the greenways and some of the programmed open spaces we already have. He reiterated that there will be combinations of public and private spaces, and there may be future land acquisitions that are made, but that land cannot be shown on a plan unless the City is ready to buy the land. He said as part of the fiscal analyses, Planning has calculated generally how much open space will result from the densities we might expect.

Mr. Fishman asked if there was a way to assure that by the time that the Corridor is built out, that we actually have open space, and not just money.

Mr. Langworthy said the plan for open space planning, acquisition, and programming is the very same as what has always been done everywhere else in Dublin. He said the City has always made purchases and programmed the areas where they want open space, but they cannot show that land on a map because it would be 'taking' a property and would be a legal problem.

Mr. Fishman asked if the code could require open space to be provided in the Bridge Street Corridor.

Mr. Langworthy said that the code already require that open space be provided within 660 feet (a walkable distance) of the development it is associated with.

Mr. Hardt said he understood that it was not the developer's decision whether to pay the fee in lieu of land dedication; however, he was concerned that if the developer proposes an open space, and the ART reviews it and determines that the space is not suitable, and then it goes to the Commission for approval of the fee in lieu, then by the time the proposal reached the Commission, they would have no choice but to approve the fee in lieu.

Mr. Langworthy said the language should probably state that *a fee-in-lieu of open space may be paid to the City if approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission* rather than *shall*. He said anything involving a fee would have to be approved by the Commission.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for clarification about combinations of open space provisions and payment of fees in lieu of land dedication.

Mr. Phillabaum explained that there are dimensional and area requirements for all of the open space types, and if an open space does not meet one of them, then it cannot count toward meeting their open space requirement.

Mr. Fishman said he just wanted to make sure that the city ends up with decent open space within the Corridor, and it is hard for him to imagine that it is going to happen using this process.

Mr. Langworthy said what he thought would happen was that if several requests were brought to the Commission, and they flatly rejected all of them, then Planning is going to start suggesting to applicants that the Commission is not likely to just allow developers to pay fees without providing open space, so they better start looking for ways to provide their own open space.

Section 153.064 OPEN SPACE TYPES (C) Provision of Open Space (4) Civic (Page 70)

Mr. Taylor asked why civic uses are not required to provide open space.

Mr. Phillabaum explained that the civic building was the one building type where a building setback is required instead of a Required Building Zone, so the open space will be provided by the setback as a continuation of the streetscape. He added that typically, civic buildings are set into more of a campus-like setting or amongst other open spaces.

Mr. Taylor noted that there was a distinction between a civic use and a civic building type.

Mr. Phillabaum agreed to modify the text to require.

Section 153.064 OPEN SPACE TYPES (C) Provision of Open Space (5) Existing Open Spaces (Page 70)

Mr. Hardt asked if this requirement meant that if there was an existing open space, it can be used to meet the required open space provision, but if it is not big enough, then the applicant shall pay a fee in lieu of providing the balance of the land, or add to the open space.

Mr. Phillabaum said they would still have to potentially pay a fee, even if there is an existing open space that meets the 660-foot distance requirement. He said the reviewing body would make the determination that the existing open space has been adequately sized and is in close enough proximity where we do not need another open space, but they still would have to contribute a fee for provision of open space.

Mr. Fishman said his concern was that, since this will be a high density area, land is going to be very valuable, and it seemed that they are going to incentivize the developer to want to only pay the fees. He said if a developer has to build an acre park, that acre is going to be a lot more valuable than the fee will require, and so that is why they really need to make sure they require the right amount of parkland.

Section 153.064 OPEN SPACE TYPES (F) Open Space Types (1) Pocket Plaza (Page 71)

Mr. Phillabaum explained that they added this as a new open space type since the previous versions of the code. He said pocket plazas would typically occur with commercial uses. He said in those contexts, smaller, intimate spaces are generally more desirable, rather than large plazas that often go unused.

Section 153.064 OPEN SPACE TYPES (F) Open Space Types (2) Pocket Park (Page 71)

Ms. Krumb called out a typo on the very long second sentence, *...special care should be taken to minimize potential conflicts...*

Section 153.064 OPEN SPACE TYPES (F) Open Space Types (5) Plaza (Page 71)

Ms. Krumb corrected a typo, *Plazas are usually located in areas of where...*

Section 153.064-A – (Table) Summary of Open Space Type Requirements (Page 74)

Mr. Phillabaum pointed out that previously, for each open space type, there was a table that repeated the same categories of information, but Planning thought this was a better way to simplify the requirements all in one area.

Ms. Krumb said she did not like the two-page layout and that it would be better as one 11 x 17 sheet. She asked that at least the footnotes be fixed. She pointed out that the diagrams were very small and did not show much, especially the pocket plaza diagram.

Mr. Phillabaum said that they could work on the layout. He said the pocket plaza diagram was a new one they created and the graphics need to be made consistent.

Ms. Krumb asked if under the Maximum Percentage of Open Water requirements for Greenways, if the Greenway includes the river and streams.

Mr. Phillabaum said that the width of the Greenway would have to include usable open space, but otherwise, the open water percentage would not apply to the waterways.

Mr. Hardt said he did not know if fountains should be required in Central Ohio because they are empty seven months a year; however, he did not want to discourage them.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was any public comment with respect to the Bridge Street Corridor Development Code. [There was none.]

Mr. Taylor said he watched the City Council meeting that took place at the Dublin Chamber of Commerce on October 17, and he was impressed with what he saw. He said he saw a lot of progress towards many of the things that the Commission had discussed, although he was straining to see the slides that were shown that did not show up well on the screen. He said he could not wait to see those slides because it seemed there was movement in the direction that the Commission had been talking about for some time.

Mr. Langworthy referred to the flow chart that had been handed out earlier in the evening, and said he had a lengthy conversation with Mr. Hardt about the review and approval procedures. He said obviously, the language is going to be a large part of how this works, but Planning had made a flow chart to show the outlines of what we are thinking now in terms of the process. He said that the Commission had suggested for example, a mandatory pre-application review, which has been included in the revised process.

Ms. Amorose Groomes clarified that that was just one of the solutions that the Commission had provided.

Mr. Langworthy said the main conversation he had with Mr. Hardt dealt with the informal review, which was similar to what we do now for informal applications, although they would be required for any project except those that are defined as minor projects. He said he was still working on a definition on what is going to be a minor project. He said he was mindful of Ms. Krumb's comment about small things that come to the Commission that should not have to come here, and he was trying to out some distinctions. He said the only thing he made optional for an informal review was with ARB because the Board's cases seem to be so specific and small that a mandatory informal seems like a waste of time, but if a larger project came forward, like the North Riverview project, an informal would be useful.

Mr. Langworthy said the next step as you go through the development plan and/or the site plan review, the Commission had requested a two-track process. He explained that a new *elective* review track was proposed, where the ART would elect to send a plan forward to the Commission, and if the applicant chooses not to follow one or more of the provisions of the code like architecture, a path would be to come to the Commission for approval of those particular items. He said the difference between what he and Mr. Hardt had discussed was that Mr. Hardt talked about having a vote as to whether or not

something ought to be reviewed administratively. Mr. Langworthy said his push back to Mr. Hardt was that it was hard to call that process predictable if an applicant had to go through a process to decide what process to end up using. He said therefore, something applicant-driven would let the applicant make the decision where they chose not to follow the code, and if the applicant makes that choice, it would be his choice to go through an additional review process. Mr. Langworthy said if the applicant makes that choice, he will have to obtain approval by someone else other than an administrative approval. He reiterated that this applied to the development plan and site plan.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that there are time limits, as there are for every approval. He said it was in the code now and would stay there that an applicant and the approving body can mutually agree to extend those time limits if they wish. He said it could be longer than 28 days if the applicant and the reviewing body agree that a time extension is warranted.

Mr. Hardt confirmed that those were the minimums and they would not be guaranteed any more than that.

Mr. Langworthy said if nothing else happens, a decision on the application has to be made within that time period.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that they were not going to discuss this further tonight because they would rather see the actual language.

Ms. Kramb said this was a step in the right direction.

Mr. Langworthy said they tried to include as many of the Commission's recommendations as they could.

Mr. Taylor said there were probably places where this can be tweaked, but the big issue he had was in the lower right hand corner of the chart, where basically, a two-step process has been added to the things that this code already allows the Commission to review. He said he thought the Commission was asking to have this apply to everything, not just development plans with two or more principal buildings or five acres.

Mr. Taylor said as written now, the bulk of the Commission's jurisdiction to make decisions is on development plans with two or more principal buildings or sites with five acres or more, which obviously is not going to be everything that happens in the BSC of substantial scale. Mr. Taylor said that this process only applies to those two things, and he thought what the Commission wanted to see was a two-track process that would apply to everything and they would see everything that came in for the BSC.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that would allow the Commission to take public comment on everything.

Mr. Langworthy explained that was what the informal review did. He said that everything did come through the informal review, including development plans and site plans. He clarified that Development Plans are only required for developments over five acres or where there are two or more principal structures. He reiterated that the informal review was for all applications, unless it was a minor project.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see that made clearer.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the Commission wanted to see these plans in that informal review process. He pointed out that informal reviews are also publically noticed.

Mr. Hardt said he had a similar concern. He said that he did not necessarily understand and was not ready to agree with the notion that there are different submittal requirements, Development Plans versus Site Plans, for sites above or below five acres. He said it was a distinction that the Commission had not

really discussed. He said a 4.9-acre site is a pretty substantial development. He said generally speaking, his reaction was that what is labeled as *Development Plan Process* and the *Site Plan Process* are really one in the same, and he was not sure why. He said that for what was labeled *Informal Review*, his image was that it would look and feel a lot like what they now call an Informal Review in terms of the level of information that the applicant would submit, being fairly simplistic in terms of the fact that it is very early in the process so not a lot of time or money has been spent. He thought it should have a different name because he did not think it was informal at all, if it was given public notice. Mr. Hardt said his suggestion was that at the informal review, that should be the time when it is determined whether a project goes down the administrative review process or a process that ends up back in front of the Commission.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that we may not know how the project qualifies, because it may not be developed enough yet to determine which process it should take.

Mr. Taylor said he would guess that Planning would have a preliminary evaluation of the project in that regard.

Mr. Langworthy said clearly, their intent for this part of the process would be to get them into the BSC code, and he agreed that by the time they enter the informal review process, we will have a pretty good idea of how close they will be to meeting the BSC code requirements.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the Commission will look forward to seeing the text to supporting the concepts in the chart. She said the Commission needs to make a decision about additional meeting dates.

Ms. Ray said that since they reviewed everything they set out to review at this meeting, at the November 10 Commission meeting, they will be reviewing the Zoning Map. She said explained that on that Agenda, the remaining sections of the code, the Site Development Standards, pages 77-100 will be included, and if the Commission gets through that, a special meeting may not be necessary. She said however, if the Commission wished to schedule one to be safe, it would be cancelled if not needed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was concerned about the amount of time that will be involved with reviewing the revised document. She pointed out that as scheduled, they are planning to review the entire revised code in one regular meeting, of which they may even have applications to review. She said the potential special meeting dates offered were November 15th and 17th.

Ms. Kramb and Mr. Taylor said they could not do November 15. Mr. Zimmerman had no preference. Mr. Hardt and Ms. Amorose Groomes were not available on November 17.

Flora Rogers pointed out that the Architectural Review Board was scheduled November 15 in Council Chambers.

Mr. Langworthy said that they could move the ARB meeting to the Dublin Chamber of Commerce if the Commission met on November 15.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what public feedback had been received on the Zoning Map.

Ms. Ray said that approximately seven letters from property owners had been submitted, which were included in the meeting packets for the Commissioners to review. She said that they had tried to work with property owners to resolve as many of their issues with the code as possible.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they would have a lot of material to review at the next meeting on November 10. She noted that on December 1, there may be cases and they had to review everything they had reviewed to date. She asked when the code and the area rezoning were scheduled to go to City Council. She noted that December 1 was the Commission's only meeting in December.

Mr. Langworthy explained that it depended when the Commission took action. He said that December 8 or 15 were backup dates in case they did not finish by the target, December 1. He said he did not think it was possible to get everything to City Council by their last meeting of the year on December 12 because there will be no minutes or other items for the Council packets. He said even if the Commission finished in December, he did not think they would go to City Council until the first meeting in January. He said it would be helpful if the Commission took a consensus on the preferred date.

Jennifer Readler explained that they were setting up a Special Meeting and if they did not vote on a date, they could not have the meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not comfortable missing three Commissioners for a meeting with this kind of information. She suggested December 8 for the Special Meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.