



CITY OF DUBLIN.

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

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

*Creating a Legacy*

## DUBLIN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 10, 2011

#### AGENDA

- 1. Bridge Street Corridor – Code Modification  
11-020ADM  
(Discussion – No vote taken)** **Administrative Request**
- 2. Bridge Street Corridor – Area Rezoning  
11-021Z  
(Discussion – No vote taken)** **Area Rezoning**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Amy Kramb, Todd Zimmerman, Warren Fishman, John Hardt, and Joe Budde. Richard Taylor was absent. City representatives were Jennifer Readler, Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Rachel Ray, Jennifer Rauch, Dan Phillabaum, Justin Goodwin, Eugenia Martin, Rachel Beck and Flora Rogers.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Hardt made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fishman, to accept the documents into the record as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Ms. Kramb amended the October 13, 2011 meeting minutes, on page 8, paragraph 7. Ms. Kramb said to add to the second sentence that "instance where the accessory dwelling" and change "has" to "have".

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Fishman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Zimmerman, to approve the October 13, 2011 meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that with regard to the October 20, 2011 meeting minutes, she requested that page 6, paragraph 2, 5th sentence be amended to include the word "not" before "look".

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hardt, to approve the October 20, 2011 meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that a Special Meeting date was proposed for December 8, 2011. She asked Mr. Langworthy to explain the purpose of the meeting and what would be on the agenda.

Mr. Langworthy indicated that the agenda may depend on the progress made at tonight's meeting, but the intent is for a vote and recommendation to City Council on the proposed Bridge Street Code and area rezoning as well as an opportunity to discuss anything that is not finished on December 1, 2011.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fishman, to approve the Special Meeting date of December 8, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, no; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes, Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes, Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 5 – 1.)

#### **Administrative Business Communications**

Rachel Ray said the Commissioners will be receiving the meeting packet for December 1, 2011 meeting on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, instead of Friday. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked that her packet be held until Monday, November 28, 2011.

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She determined that the order of the cases would be 2 and then 1. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.]

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

#### **Administrative Request**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this Administrative Request for a review and recommendation to City Council of proposed amendments to the Zoning Code to establish a number of new zoning districts and regulations for the Bridge Street Corridor. She said the Commission is scheduled tonight to continue with review with Site Development Standards, Section 153.065, pages 77 – 100.

Justin Goodwin said the Site Development Standards cover a few broad topics, including parking, landscaping, screening, and signs. He said there are references to other code sections such as stormwater and utilities.

Mr. Goodwin said a few of the sections they had already discussed were being moved to or referenced in this section based on the Commission's comments. He said the Building Types section included provisions for parking for Existing Structures, and the Commission had recommended this language either be incorporated back into the Parking section or that a reference be provided. He said Planning was working on that revision. He said a comment regarding the Street Types section dealing with loading spaces will also be coordinated in the parking section as well.

#### **Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (1) General Provisions (a) Applicability 3. (Page 77)**

Mr. Hardt said he interpreted this section as saying that if there is a change in use that requires a change in parking of less than 30 percent, the property owner is not affected by the parking requirement. He asked how that would apply to a multi-tenant building. He asked whose problem it would be if a retail tenant in a multi-tenant building becomes a restaurant and effectively uses up the 30 percent leeway, and then the next tenant turns over and becomes a restaurant, tipping the whole site over 30 percent. He asked if that had been contemplated.

Mr. Goodwin said Planning tried to address this in the second part of the provision which states that when a use changes in a portion of a multi-tenant building, only the parking dealing with that use shall be considered. He said he was not sure that fully addressed Mr. Hardt's concern.

Mr. Langworthy said that was typical and similar to when there are sign provisions for a multi-tenant panel sign and one tenant uses two-thirds of the panels. He said it is first in, first served and it becomes the building owner's problem.

Mr. Goodwin said this draft of the code includes provisions for shared parking plans specific to some districts, including the BSC Commercial District which includes existing shopping centers. He said the intent was to deal with the issue on a case-by-case basis as needed.

Mr. Hardt said part of the reason he was asking the question was because in the BSC, a shopping center could be a completely different animal than what the city is used to. He said he imagined a four-story building that filled an entire block with retail on the first floor, and after a couple of retail stores went out of business or turned over, maybe a restaurant comes in and wants to take over the entire first floor. He pointed out that they could have a substantial impact in these tight sites where there is not as much latitude to deal with it as there is in a greenfield development. He said he had no particular request or solution, he just wanted to know what the mindset was when they were thinking about that.

Mr. Goodwin said Planning has had much discussion internally and with the consultants about what is the proper balance between regulating parking by specific use as the city has been used to, while also recognizing that if the Bridge Street Corridor develops as intended, there is likely to be a high turnover of uses throughout the area that are going to have their own different parking demands, and the city will not be able to anticipate all of those situations. He said that is one of the reasons they have included shared parking provisions and other methods to accommodate those changes. He said another example is the allowance for parking off-site within certain distances to provide more flexibility for property owners who may determine that a certain location works for their business, but they may need to provide parking somewhere else because the previous use was not set up to accommodate the same amount of parking on that specific site.

Mr. Hardt asked that the thought be held because he had a question about this when they get to that section.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (1) General Provisions (a) Applicability 4. (Page 77)**

Mr. Hardt asked for clarification regarding the extension for unfinished parking areas. He said he understood the purpose and he thought the development community would love it. He asked if this only included instances where in the construction phase, the contractor cannot get the second layer of asphalt or striping down, but there is a hard surface there, or if it also included situations where they cannot get asphalt down at all.

Mr. Goodwin said his understanding was that there may be cases where they simply cannot get the asphalt down at all.

Mr. Langworthy said he thought it would be a variety of situations. He took the example Mr. Hardt mentioned about the building taking up substantial, if not all portions of the block, and said the contractor may stage construction in the area intended for parking. Mr. Langworthy said the expectation is that parking will still have to be provided somewhere if the normal parking area is used for staging.

Mr. Hardt said he understood what they were trying to do, but opening a building with no asphalt down at all seemed a step too far. He said that for any construction project that lasts more than six or eight months there will be the opportunity to get something down on the ground, but it may not be the final course of asphalt. He said he was comfortable with some latitude where something is not quite complete, but when the paving is not even started, that may be going too far.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (1) General Provisions (a) Applicability 6. (Page 77)**

Mr. Hardt asked if the phrase "shall be determined by the Director" was appropriate with regard to uses not addressed in the parking section because other portions of the code refer to the approving body or other similar language.

Mr. Goodwin explained that unless specified as a different department, *the Director* meant the Planning Director. He said it was purposely called out this way here because use determinations are specifically attributed to the Planning Director elsewhere in the code.

Mr. Langworthy explained that *Director* was a defined term.

Mr. Hardt asked if it was the intent that such a decision would be based on some kind of submitted parking study or data.

Mr. Goodwin said it would be permitted in this case, and supporting documentation was specifically mentioned later with regard to parking plans, but perhaps it could be clarified here.

Mr. Hardt said he would like to give developers the opportunity to submit data and make the argument. He said the way it reads now, it looks like it is at the discretion of one person.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (1) General Provisions (b) Parking Location (Page 77)**

Mr. Hardt asked if there was a presumption that all parking structures will be publically available.

Mr. Goodwin said that they have allowed parking structures to be partially used if a property owner desires to provide public parking or parking to other sites, but there could be entirely private parking structures for specific property owners.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (1) General Provisions (b) Parking Location 4. On-Street Parking (Page 77)**

Ms. Kramb noted that a building can use on-street parking spaces in front of the building. She said in some circumstances that can lead to a presumption of ownership. She thought it should be made clear that those cannot be signed for just that building owner.

Mr. Goodwin explained that could be specifically stated in the Code. He said they want to make sure that those parking spaces are publically available. Mr. Goodwin said it is appropriate to allow a building to count those spaces because on-street parking is critical to making the streets function properly, but they also did not want any property owner to have the expectation of ownership over those spaces.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (2), Required Vehicle Parking (a) Minimum Amount Required and Maximum Amount Permitted 2. (Page 78)**

Ms. Kramb said as written, it is not clear that the items listed in the paragraph describing a parking plan are actually review criteria. She suggested restructuring the paragraph to read "*the required reviewing body shall consider*" or "*subject to the following review criteria*" and then listing them out individually.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (2) Required Vehicle Parking (a) Minimum Amount Required and Maximum Amount Permitted 4. (Page 80)**

Mr. Hardt pointed out the paragraph referring to Table 153.065-A, was after the table.

**Table 153.065-A: Required Vehicle Parking (Page 78-80)**

**General Comments**

Ms. Kramb requested that the numeric requirements be reformatted using the word 'per' and not a '/' (slash), because the slash is also used to indicate fractions and it is very confusing. She said as an example, it was unclear if the requirement for *'religious or public assembly'* is 1 space per 6 persons or 1 space for each 1/6 of a person.

Mr. Goodwin said it was *'one per six persons,'* but the requirement should work out to the same number under either interpretation. He said that change could be made to clarify the intent.

Ms. Kramb said regarding *'dwelling two-family,'* she did not understand how that differed from a multiple family dwelling that would have two families.

Mr. Goodwin explained that a multiple family dwelling is three units or above as defined in the Code.

Ms. Kramb asked why two parking spaces would not be required if there were two families.

Mr. Goodwin said because the requirement is one space per unit and a two-family dwelling includes two units, it does require two parking spaces.

Ms. Kramb asked if it would be appropriate to require some type of service vehicle parking space for uses such as an energy plant or community garden that are marked 'not applicable.' She said some parking was needed for those who work in the garden.

Mr. Goodwin said that depended on the uses. He said Planning had discussed that for community gardens, on-street parking may be sufficient depending on the location. He said it was difficult to anticipate what that requirement would be depending on the specific conditions, but they could require a parking plan rather than stating 'not applicable.'

Ms. Kramb referred to the numbers on the table. She said some of the maximum numbers did not seem high enough to her. She said the church and conference center maximums seemed low and may need to be reconsidered.

Mr. Goodwin said it is difficult to determine exactly what ranges are appropriate, but Planning maximums are important to ensure there is not excessive parking on individual lots. Mr. Goodwin said Planning wanted to make sure that they did not necessarily allow properties to automatically develop with parking to accommodate their absolute peak use during the year because that may only be for one day, such as the day after Thanksgiving for retail uses, and there is otherwise a lot of parking that is not regularly used. He said the same argument could be made with some institutional uses like churches. He said the code also provides a mechanism for property owners to request adjustments based on their own specific needs, and that is another way to potentially get additional parking above the 150 percent maximum.

Ms. Kramb said she thought the city needed to be careful since it is trying to create such density. She said it will not necessarily be easy for a property owner to come back and keep asking for more parking because there will not be any space. Ms. Kramb said if a use is going to need more than what is permitted in the future, she thought the code should somehow accommodate or allow for a greater maximum up front.

Mr. Hardt said that in some of the subsequent paragraphs, his interpretation is that for any site, for any use, there is the opportunity to do a parking demand study to prove something different.

Mr. Goodwin indicated that was correct.

Ms. Kramb said that a parking demand study seemed costly for a church.

Mr. Hardt said that a basic parking study could be done in a day.

Mr. Fishman said he noticed that two family units were allowed one car per unit, which is less than the two cars per unit the city currently requires. He said regarding community gardens, when a park is constructed, which is similar, we require that there be parking. He said he thought this needed to be reworked. He noted that there was no square footage on the units.

Mr. Goodwin pointed out that for some residential developments, depending on the price point of the unit, there may be an expectation that one of the tenants parks on the street. He said Planning wanted to make sure that the on-street parking was used as well, which is more common in urban environments.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it would be more likely that they would pursue another kind of living arrangement in other parts of the city where they might have two or maybe three parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Fishman said they were lowering the standards. He said sometimes economics require people to live in a 1,200 square foot unit and they often have three drivers per unit. He said if the builder is only required to provide parking for one car, it would be advantageous to the developer because it was less expensive. He reiterated that he would like to see parking based on the square footage of the units.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would like to see the minimum parking for live-work dwellings increased from one to two parking spaces because if someone came to see that person, parking should be available.

Mr. Hardt said he had that comment also. He said either a customer coming to that business or an employee who works there as well needs to park.

Mr. Langworthy agreed to review the single family, two family and the live work unit parking requirements.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that Mr. Hardt had suggested it might be more appropriate to base the parking requirement on the number of bedrooms than by the square footage.

Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Fishman agreed and said that was a good point.

Mr. Goodwin said they would look at that option. He said there may be some additional administrative issues with requiring parking at a per bedroom level.

Mr. Hardt said he shared Ms. Kramb's comment about the use of 'per,' and suggested using a more consistent formatting for the numeric calculations as well. He said for example that the requirement for Handicapped Housing is 0.5 space per dwelling unit, but a use on the next page is formatted as 2 spaces for every 3 guestrooms. He said those were two different ways of expressing fractions and he suggested one be chosen and used consistently. He said similarly, there were places in the table that refer to square footage, gross square footage, and indoor square footage, and he suspected that those were all the same thing.

Mr. Goodwin said all of the calculations are intended as gross square footage. He said there are a couple of places where it specifies indoor square footage based on the type of use. He said for instance, that if a personal, repair or rental service included an outdoor component, they did not want that to have to be included.

Mr. Hardt said that made sense, but gross floor area and square footage being used interchangeably is confusing.

Mr. Hardt said for community centers, he could not confirm or dispute that 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet is the right number, but it occurred to him that a community center could be a lot of different things such as a satellite of the DCRC, a large meeting hall, or something else. He suggested it instead require a parking plan, depending upon exactly what is proposed, similar to the community garden, but on a larger scale.

Mr. Hardt said regarding hospitals, tying parking to beds and treatment rooms does not work. He said it is difficult to define exactly what a treatment room is and these facilities convert offices to exam rooms and back to offices daily. He said it will be difficult to keep track of how much square footage applies to each of these areas within those buildings. Mr. Hardt suggested that Planning refer to the parking requirement used at Dublin Methodist Hospital. He recalled having the discussion specifically, and he thought the requirement was based on overall building gross square footage and industry standards. He said as far as he could tell it was working okay.

Ms. Kramb said she had a similar comment on schools being based on classrooms. She said some schools have converted service areas to classrooms and it is constantly changing. She said there are many Dublin schools where the parking is not sufficient for times when parents are invited for activities. She suggested parking plans could be used, or it could be based on the number of students. She said especially, at the high school level, there are usually a student parking lot and a staff parking lot.

Mr. Goodwin said Planning hoped that if there are students going to school in this area that they will walk or ride a bike to some extent, but obviously, parking also needs to be accommodated. He said he had seen school parking requirements dealt with in many ways and Planning could research to see if there is a better option.

Ms. Kramb said she had similar concerns about day cares. She suggested some type of parking plan requirement that would show where people park when they are dropping off and picking up students.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (2) Required Vehicle Parking (b) Adjustments to Required Vehicle Parking Table 153.065-B: Shared Parking Plan Approval (Page 80)**

Ms. Kramb asked why there was a distinction on the table between individual lots and multiple lots.

Mr. Goodwin said the difference was specifically to address the BSC Commercial District to accommodate shopping centers that typically are one lot onto themselves with multiple uses, whereas in the other districts, they would anticipate a greater dependence between different buildings and lots. He said in those cases the lot did not have to be owned by the same person.

Ms. Kramb said it was not clear if it could be one person who owns multiple properties or if it has to involve separate property owners.

Mr. Goodwin said it could be either of those situations. He said he thought it was implied, and maybe they should clarify that they would have to establish some sort of formal agreement. He said they could not tell the city they are going to use their neighbors' parking without asking their neighbor.

Mr. Hardt said that spoke to something he was getting at three pages ago. He said there was a lot of language in the code about shared parking, nearby parking, documenting that sufficient parking is available to meet projected demand, and other adjustments. He said it seemed that in a dense environment when there are uses with cross agreements and maybe a public garage nearby, there could be a lot of different arrangements and documents produced that suggest a given business has enough

parking available, and then a year later someone a block in the other direction asks to use the same parking. He asked how the city will keep track of all of this.

Mr. Goodwin said that Planning recognizes that this could lead to a lot of administrative issues. He said they think it is important to provide for this flexibility and short of having a better answer right now, they recognized that they may, for a time have to be prepared to keep detailed track of all of these different conditions.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that they do a lot of that already because for a lot of the planned unit development districts, for example, shopping centers they do parking calculations differently. He said some are for all the square footage and some are for each use and as each use changes they have to recalculate every time.

Ms. Krumb asked if they had anticipated people putting up signs saying 'this is my parking'. She asked if they had allowed for or considered that type of signs.

Mr. Goodwin said he did not recall anything in the code now, which specifically dealt with that, but they would look into it.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that it was a Historic Dublin problem and people now are resistant to the notion of sharing parking. He said they had an opportunity to fix that problem here before it starts by discouraging that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes, Ms. Krumb, and Mr. Hardt said they did not know how to discourage that.

Mr. Langworthy said the only time you could do that is if they had a shared parking agreement that they agreed, for example two businesses could say on their sign that those two businesses have that parkign because those were the only two that had a shared agreement. He said apart from that, if they provide their own parking on their own site, they have a right to use it themselves.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said you would think they would like to rent out the parking to generate revenue if the parking was not being used.

Mr. Goodwin pointed out that depending on where the sign was placed on the lot, if the sign was visible from a public right-of-way, it may not be a permitted sign.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (2) Required Vehicle Parking (b) Adjustments to Required Vehicle Parking (Page 80)**

Mr. Hardt asked if there had been any discussion or contemplation of bicycle sharing in the same vein as auto-share parking, or was that something that could just organically happen if it decides to happen. He clarified that he was talking about systems in other cities where there are bicycles available to borrow.

Mr. Goodwin said that had not specifically been dealt with in the code and he was not aware of anything that would prevent that from happening. He said they would look into other regulations that they should consider facilitating or not making that detrimental, if the Commission wanted.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (2) Required Vehicle Parking (b) Adjustments to Required Vehicle Parking 5. Transportation Demand Management B. c. (Page 81)**

Ms. Krumb suggested that the last line should be: "*on-site office, or project-specific website*", because it was not an on-site website.

Mr. Goodwin said she was correct.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (B) Parking and Loading (2) Required Vehicle Parking (b) Adjustments to Required Vehicle Parking 5. Transportation Demand Management C. (c) Accessible Parking Spaces (Page 81-82)**

Mr. Hardt noted that there were many other places in the code including the right hand column on page 82 where they refer to the Uniform Building Code and reference the Americans with Disabilities Act. He said he did not agree that in the case of accessible parking spaces, they should stipulate the number rather than referring to federal standards that already exist.

Mr. Goodwin explained that they had that discussion and it was carried over directly from what was in the existing code today. He said he thought it might be appropriate to simply refer to the appropriate regulations.

Mr. Hardt said if the federal standards get updated, he did not think anyone would make sure that the Commission sees it, processes it, and changes the code.

Mr. Goodwin said including it there may be more user-friendly for someone looking at the code, trying to determine how many spaces would be required and how many of those had to be accessible. He said however, he saw the reasoning to not include that here.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (3) Required Bicycle Parking (c) Facility Type (Page 82)**

Mr. Hardt asked everyone in the room whether we ought to have a city standard for the type of bike rack placed in front of buildings and on streets, even if they are on private property. He said his logic was that as a person who uses his bicycle frequently, there is nothing more frustrating than having a particular kind of lock and figuring out the right way to lock up your bike and secure it in public and you do it six times, and you go to another business that has a different kind of bike rack and your lock does not work. Mr. Hardt pointed out that even in downtown Columbus most bicycle racks are the same type and style.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought by district, particularly in the Historic District, some kind of standard would be appropriate.

Mr. Goodwin said there were two competing interests because Planning had also heard some interest at the policy level of encouraging a variety of bike racks to create an interesting streetscape with street furniture. He said there are some basic standards included here. He said the racks have to be designed to provide two points of contact to the bicycle frame which allows the bicycle to be supported and it tends to make it easier for a variety of locks to work. He said it was a balancing act that they were trying to achieve.

Mr. Langworthy said in the Historic District, Parks and Open Space is working so that there are not 50 different rack varieties, but there is a consistency.

Mr. Goodwin said he thought as they developed a better understanding of what type of street furniture in general applies in the different portions of the corridor, maybe there could be a palette of recommended or specific types of racks.

Mr. Zimmerman said he agreed about the standard functionality of bicycle racks and locks.

Mr. Fishman, a member of the Bicycle Task Force, said that they recommended the racks be artsy, but consistent in the way they were locked.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked that the issue be addressed when they come to the next revision.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (3) Required Bicycle Parking (d) Location 2. (Page 82)**

Mr. Hardt said that "*Outside bicycle parking shall be located in a well-lit area*", was all that needed to be said because the remainder is redundant.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (4) Off-Street Parking Space and Aisle Dimensions – Table 153.065-D: Off-Street Parking Space and Aisle Dimensions (Page 83)**

Ms. Kramb said her issue was the figure which she thought they were trying to use as part of the table or something because there was a footnote after it.

Mr. Goodwin explained that it needed clarified and a figure reference added.

Mr. Hardt noted that the 90-degree parking stall has the width indicated at 8½ feet, and the city standard was 9 feet. He asked if that was due to today's SUVs and Escalades.

Mr. Zimmerman pointed out that when doors are swung open on small cars, they are 40 inches wide. He said they needed to be opened wide to get in and out. He said he was a firm believer in the 9-foot wide space.

Mr. Hardt said shrinking the regular parking spaces was questionable to him.

Mr. Goodwin agreed it would be appropriate to change the dimension for regular spaces from 8½ feet back to 9 feet, but suggested they maintain the reduced dimensions for compact spaces.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (5) Parking Structure Design. (Page 83)**

Mr. Hardt said the first paragraph and continuing throughout the rest of this portion of the code, talks about the minimum requirements established by the City Engineer, and the subsequent paragraphs elude to the existence of parking garage design standards of some sort. He asked if the City of Dublin had or established parking garage design standards.

Mr. Goodwin said not yet.

Mr. Hardt suggested that if there were such a thing they would not need to go into such a detailed list of design requirements. He said he would expect to find that in the Design Standards.

Mr. Langworthy agreed. He said they wanted something in place right away. He said once they get Engineering to do that, they will probably come back and take some of that out of the code. He said this was in anticipation of not knowing exactly how long it may take for Engineering to get that finished. He said it actually came from the original COIC code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that the phrase "*established City Engineer requirements*" needed to be removed.

Mr. Langworthy agreed to do so, until they are established.

Mr. Hardt referred to **(c) 4. (Page 83)** where it refers to a clearance height of 8 ½ feet. He said that was big for a parking lot clearance.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she had experienced difficulty in getting snow clearing equipment to the top deck, and when they are substantially lower, it is difficult to get the equipment to the snow.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed, but wondered why that was a zoning issue.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would expect to see that in the Engineering requirements.

Mr. Hardt referred to the top of Page 84, where it talks about pedestrian flow, security and cameras which he said all sounded like great ideas and smart things to do, but that they did not seem like a land use issue.

Mr. Goodwin explained that until they have other standards to reference, they thought it was important, but this is subject revision for sure.

Mr. Langworthy said he did not know of another place they could put it. He said they do not really address parking structures anywhere else.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought they should get some sort of urban safety guidebook together, but until then, they should probably address it.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (4) Surface Parking Lot and Loading Area Design and Construction (c) Driveways 3. (Page 84)**

Ms. Kramb noted *... "driveways shall be limited to one per lot or parcel,"* and asked if there was a difference.

Mr. Langworthy explained that a lot was considered a single lot, but a parcel is a group of lots.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked how it was determined if it was a parcel.

Mr. Langworthy said it could be either by ownership or by use. He said more often, it was by use. He said a shopping center with multiple lots would be considered a parcel.

Ms. Kramb said that this should read *... "one per lot or parcel, whichever is fewer."*

Mr. Langworthy agreed to work on it.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (4) Surface Parking Lot and Loading Area Design and Construction (d) Curbs and Wheel Stops (Page 84)**

Ms. Kramb noted that there was no mention as to what materials curbs can be constructed of, and she assumed they want concrete curbs. She said it did not reference any type of material.

Mr. Langworthy said those did exist in other regulations.

Mr. Goodwin said they could say concrete.

Mr. Hardt said it was his understanding that asphalt curbs were not allowed anywhere in Dublin.

Mr. Goodwin said there were existing asphalt curbs. He agreed to research it, and if it needed to be specified here, they could.

Ms. Amorose Groomes, Mr. Zimmerman, and Ms. Kramb agreed that they did not want to see asphalt curbs in any of these districts.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (7) Required Loading Spaces (Page 84)**

Ms. Kramb suggested this section be named, *Required Off-Street Loading Spaces*.

Mr. Goodwin said Planning and Engineering had discussed whether or not it may be appropriate to allow, at least for a small truck situation, to use an on-street space rather than always requiring an off-street space.

Ms. Kramb said that it really did not distinguish between the two here.

Mr. Goodwin said they could clarify that.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (7) Required Loading Spaces (a) Applicability 2. (Page 85)**

Ms. Kramb noted that loading was based on the size of the building and the use. She said as long as it is a small building, even if it generates a lot of loading, it would not be required as written because of the word 'and,' She said if a building was 24,000 square feet, but received deliveries every day, she did not know that the size-based requirement will be sufficient. She said that went to her point across the page, in paragraph 3, "*Loading areas are permitted in the alley*," which she did not think they should be allowed to do.

Mr. Goodwin said he saw the point about the type of use. He said some uses may have a lot of need for loading space all the time. He said there may be uses that only get occasional loading or deliveries, and it may be appropriate to allow the alley to serve that function rather than requiring a dedicated space that is not used often. He said maybe they could fine-tune that.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (7) Required Loading Spaces (b) Location 2. and 3. (Page 85)**

Mr. Hardt noted that this does not allow the loading space to be in a vehicular circulation area, even off-street.

Mr. Goodwin said there may be cases where that is actually okay.

Mr. Hardt said if there is a truck parked there all the time, it is a problem, but it is for a business that gets a delivery once a week at 2 a.m., he would argue that having them unload in their parking lot is preferable to creating this 30-foot long space that never gets used. He said it seemed there was some massaging needed.

Mr. Goodwin agreed to look at that.

Ms. Kramb said that she did not understand the six-foot height requirement for the screening because it would not screen a semi delivery truck.

Mr. Goodwin explained that it was to screen the loading dock area.

Ms. Kramb said that it was talking about a loading space in general, not necessarily a loading dock.

Mr. Goodwin agreed to clarify that it was not every single space.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (b) Use Descriptions 3. and 4. (Page 86)**

Mr. Hardt asked if this was covered elsewhere in the code already.

Ms. Ray said they would check the language to see if it was exact, but it was close to what we do require in other residential districts.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (2) General (c) (Page 86)**

Ms. Kramb pointed out that the definition of *'protected tree'* was not found in this chapter.

Mr. Langworthy said the definition could be found in Chapter 153 of the Zoning Code, Section 002.

Ms. Kramb asked if the Commission would see the definitions again.

Ms. Ray said they would be given a new copy of the definitions.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (2) General (j) (Page 87)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she agreed with the concept of diversity in the District, but not necessarily on a site.

Ms. Martin said that was correct and something they would look into more.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (3) Street Trees (b) (Page 87)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked why the tree lawn was 7 feet in width.

Ms. Martin said that they had found that width of tree lawn to work well throughout the city, and they were trying to maintain that general roadway standard. She said the tree well is not necessarily precluded from being covered by a paving material. She said the goal is to create more of a planting zone with structural soil.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (3) Street Trees (c) (Page 87)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what would be a similar treatment to structural soil.

Ms. Martin explained the phrase *or "similar treatment"* was meant to define that the material makeup would have similar characteristic or composition as structural soil.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said rather than *"similar treatment"* she would like it to say *or approved equal*.

Ms. Martin agreed to make the change.

Mr. Hardt said they needed then to say who did the approving.

Ms. Amorose Groomes added *"...by the City Forester."*

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the comment *"licensed and qualified producer"* opened the door for anyone who had licenses.

Ms. Martin said they would look at rewording that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred to the last sentence and said she thought that was really weak language to say *"...as far as they permit."*

Ms. Martin said they would change it to "*as far as physical conditions would permit.*"

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (3) Street Trees (d) (Page 87)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that a depth of three feet was very shallow for a tree, particularly something that we would expect to grow to maturity.

Ms. Martin explained that would be the minimum depth they would excavate for the well. She said a well is not necessarily a concrete structure, but is intended to describe where the structural soils would be located. She said depending upon the caliper size and species of the installed trees, the tree root ball may not necessarily be three foot in depth.

Ms. Amorose Groomes recalled seeing the requirements for structural soil to be a five-foot depth. Ms. Martin agreed to look into that further.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked why this said "*Structural soils shall not be used in the street tree planting area.*" Mr. Martin said the intent was to have friable soil with the structural soil surrounding the pit. Ms. Martin said further internal discussion was needed in the best way to address that.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (3) Street Trees (e) (Page 87)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she assumed the urban tree wells were the street trees themselves. Ms. Martin explained that it was going to be applicable to the Street Type, so in areas which are to be more of the urban/downtown treatment, not necessarily the residential areas, there would be that type of treatment within the tree well.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that she thought they needed to call out a standard tree grate and probably engage someone to commission an ornamental grate so all the tree wells would have a similar grate.

Ms. Martin said that they could do that with the street site furnishings as far as having a complete package, to ensure it all coordinated and made sense.

Mr. Hardt said he read this as if every single street tree shall have a grate around it. Ms. Martin said the tree grates would be applicable to the urban tree wells.

Mr. Hardt pointed out in other parts of Central Ohio he saw tree wells, in downtown Columbus for example, where the base of the tree has a ground cover of annuals or something around it as well as uplighting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this does not take into account the raised planters in medians. She said it demands everything have something, but there are a number of instances where you probably would not want them. She suggested it should be ... "*where appropriate or where they are likely to have foot traffic.*" She said if it is not subject to foot traffic, then it should not have to be covered.

Ms. Martin recalled that previously, it referenced street types, and that must have been taken out. She said they will look into clarifying it.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (3) Street Trees (f) Species and Size (1) (Page 87)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this referenced the *Approved Urban Street Tree List for Dublin Ohio, (available in the Bridge Street Corridor's Applicant Guide)*. She said the Commission has not seen it yet and cannot vote on this until they do. She asked if the reference should be left here.

Ms. Ray said that it was referenced throughout, and she thought there had been a universal comment to delete it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred the last sentence and commented they would certainly want diversity within a district, but not necessarily on a street. Ms. Martin said it could be by block.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that 300 feet might be short and they might need three blocks. She said they do not want to create a monoculture, but want to look down a street and see a consistent canopy over the street. Ms. Martin agreed it has to be similar in form and character.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they needed to define how the mix is done so that it is not every other tree or something like that. She said there has to be some delineation of how they arrive at that.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (3) Street Trees (f) Species and Size (3) (Page 87)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes questioned why only small trees were permitted in the medians, which is the one place where larger trees are likely to have the greatest chance of surviving. She pointed out that the median is going to be some of our best growing locations.

Ms. Martin said the comment was to avoid having small tree species within the urban tree lawn against the back of the sidewalk. She said small street trees would only be permitted to be located in the median. She explained it was not excluding larger street trees being planted there, it was just saying that if you use small street trees, that is where they would be located.

Ms. Krumb said she read this as that a median was the only place you could put small trees. Ms. Martin agreed to clarify the language that it is not precluding medium to large size trees.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (3) Street Trees Table 153.0065-F: Street Tree Spacing Requirements (Page 87)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted three feet was required between the edge of the street and sidewalk. She pointed out that a lot of our islands are eight to ten feet wide and if there is three feet on either side, you lose six feet, so you really have only two feet left to locate the tree.

Ms. Martin said she understood Ms. Amorose Groomes' comment. She said they considered vehicle door swing and vehicle parking when making that requirement, but would look at how it impacts the medians. She said to think about how the tree canopy may overhang into the roadway so too much varying may not be a good thing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was thinking about islands at the end of a parking lot where you would stack snow. She said they will have to consider street trees requirements. Ms. Martin said this was not necessarily speaking to parking lot islands.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there were still areas where there was head-in parking essentially on the street. Ms. Martin said a back-in parking situation would be the same as far as bumper overhang. She explained current code requirements for parking includes a provision prohibiting two-foot overhang.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted the chart addresses street trees may be planted within ten lateral feet of overhead utilities which will probably be problematic. She said hopefully, all those overhead utilities will be moved underground.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (3) Street Trees (i) Prohibited Activities 3, 4, and 5. (Page 88)**

Ms. Amorose Grooms noted that in 3 and 4 as well as in other places, it talks about the City Forester, and in 5 when it talks about "*No person shall buy any type of construction reduced size of a tree lawn or tree scape planting zone without prior written approval of the Director*", it should read the City Forester instead.

Ms. Martin agreed that it should be changed from *Director* to *City Forester*.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (3) Street Trees (j) Municipal Rights 3. (Page 88)**

Ms. Amorose Grooms referred to "*To ensure that street trees thrive, property owners are encouraged to contact the City Forester and provide care for trees as needed*" and said there was really no reason to have this language as it does not really say anything.

Martin agreed to look at it.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (3) Street Trees (j) Municipal Rights 5. (Page 88)**

Ms. Amorose Grooms referred to "*The City Forester shall have the right to cause the removal of any dead or deceased tree(s) located on private property within the city and/or cause the removal of branches of trees located on private property that overhang public property,...*" She suggested adding "*...or impede*" because there was a greater chance of tree branches being an impediment.

Ms. Martin agreed.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (4) Perimeter Landscape Buffering (a) 1. (Page 89)**

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if we really wanted fences and things like that along I-270.

Ms. Martin explained the type of buffering option used would be reviewed by the ART as far as what would be applicable and what they are screening. She said there may be cases where a wall for screening is appropriate. Ms. Martin said if residential uses were located along I-270, it could function as a sound barrier wall, in which case there would be a dual function to the screening.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she had never seen a sound barrier wall that she liked and she would prefer to change the use next to I-270 rather than put up a sound barrier wall.

Ms. Kramb confirmed they were saying buffering along I-270 is required.

Mr. Hardt said he would be concerned if someone constructed a building that is residential in nature, and for whatever reason, it requires a wall, and the next building does not, and as you go along I-270, you will see a wall, a bunch of trees, and then shrubs, then a fence, and then a wall.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she did not know that we should include I-270 in the same vein, because she did not think any walls should be seen along I-270. She said it would be a shame to build something that does not belong there to the extent that we would have to put a wall in front of it to hide it.

Mr. Hardt posed the question of would the wall be to hide the building from I-270 or I-270 from the building. He said they needed to figure out what kind of treatment was wanted along I-270.

Ms. Martin said it was consistent with current code requirement for buffering along I-270 and gave Verizon and Cardinal as examples of sites which adhere to this requirement.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not recall any walls mentioned in their language. She said she would be happy, as long as walls are not being built along I-270.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (4) Perimeter Landscape Buffering (b) 2. Option B, C. (Page 89)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked why we would plant shrubs at eight feet on center in front of a wall.

Ms. Martin said code requires the pretty side of a fence or wall to be facing the neighbors. She said the plantings provide an evergreen buffer to the non-BSC District Residential-Only land use, so there is a bit more of a visual appeal to it. She explained eight feet allows for clumping the plants instead of creating an absolute hedge and provides a little more design freedom.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it could be really ugly with one shrub every eight feet. Ms. Martin said the landscape plan would be reviewed by the ART in order to avoid that look.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested something be added like a small ornamental tree which she would rather see than a taxus. Ms. Martin agreed.

Mr. Hardt said this seemed to be more a prescriptive provision versus an intent provision. He said if the intent is for clumping of plantings with design integrity, then that the code should say that.

Ms. Martin said they could add something as far as the intent, but at the same time, developers want to know what is required and has to be provided.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (4) Perimeter Landscape Buffering (f) (Page 89)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were places where curbs in parking areas would not be required. She said she did not want to give them the option of putting in a wheel stop over a curb.

Ms. Martin said in cases of bio swales or rain gardens, there is a possibility of wheel stops so water to be able to sheet flow into those locations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes recalled someplace it talked about openings in the curbs.

Ms. Martin said that could be done as well. She said there are a couple of different options to do stormwater management with rain gardens under bio swales, it depended upon how it was treated. She said for instance, a roadway with on-street parking, could opt to sheet flow out into a depressed well, and at that point, you would want to make sure that there are wheel stops so that the vehicles do not back off into the area as well. Ms. Martin said she was commenting without being able to refer to the Stormwater Regulations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not think wheel stops should be allowed in any of these districts. She said she thought we should have concrete curbs with breaks in them to allow the water to move. She said we create a host of problems for the city in terms of maintaining wheel stops.

Ms. Kramb noted that it said that they needed to be installed "...where necessary to avoid vehicle conflicts."

Mr. Hardt pointed out wheel stops were required for handicap parking spaces.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (4) Perimeter Landscape Buffering (b) 2. Option B, D. (Page 89)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for an explanation as to why we would not want to go with a living screen versus some of these non-living screens.

Ms. Martin said in some cases, it depended upon how the development occurs, whether it is architecturally appropriate to use something which might be more of a structure. She said an example would be Waterford Commons, where the applicant had proposed a physical structure adjacent to the cemetery to provide a separation and privacy between the two different spaces. She said there could be cases where it made more sense to have a physical barrier for privacy and/or security.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (5) Vehicular Use Area Landscaping (a) Street Frontage (Page 90)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said rather than trying to say what the requirements are, it needs to say what the intent is because the requirements could come up with something attractive, but she thought they were more likely to get something really ugly. She said in every 40-foot section, you could have a tree and five shrubs, planted at 8 or 9-foot on center. She reiterated that they needed better direction and this was no better than no direction at all.

Ms. Martin agreed to look at this more clearly. She referred to (a) 3 which were the standards applied for HCR ManorCare and said she thought they captured it well.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (5) Vehicular Use Area Landscaping (a) Street Frontage 1. (Page 90)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if they were looking for specimen type material.

Ms. Martin said the intent was to have clear views as it related to the parking lot. She said it was similar to the existing code which requires a 3 ½-foot high mound or screening material.

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred to "*three deciduous shrubs or evergreen shrubs per 25 linear feet,*" and said it was not an opacity thing by any means. She said she would like to see some intent language here to help everybody.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (5) Vehicular Use Area Landscaping (a) Street Frontage 3. (Page 90)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred to "*The property owner shall install at least three deciduous or evergreen shrubs per 25 linear feet or fraction thereof of parking lot boundary facing the public street, and trees are permitted to be installed, but not required.*" She asked if we would not rather have trees than shrubs.

Ms. Martin said it depends upon how close the parking is going to be to the existing street trees. She explained the intent was to not create a condition where there will be overcrowding and potentially compromising the health of our street trees. She said if the applicant is required to mitigate any trees, this would allow them opportunity to use this area if they were set back 20 feet or greater from the right of way.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought there was the presumption in the writing of this that this green area is adjacent to the street, but she did not think it was necessarily there. Ms. Martin said they could try to define that more clearly.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (5) Vehicular Use Area Landscaping (c) Interior Landscaping 2. A, B, and C. (Page 90)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought it was proven at this point that parking lot islands do not work for tree plantings. She said there are no great examples of trees doing well in those islands and she has not seen any which were thriving and reaching maturity. She said she did not think that was something they wanted to keep in this district, particularly in the Historic District and in the very high density districts. She said she did not know if the ten-foot parking lot island was appropriate. Ms. Amorose Groomes said an island that size was going to eat up a lot of parking spaces and was not going to provide big, old beautiful trees. She said they should look at a more creative approach.

Ms. Martin said they were trying to make sure they still maintain at least the peninsula planting area at the points of ingress and egress, which provides some protection for the cars parked on the end. She said they would rather not see it striped and Option A permits some islands which can count toward meeting interior landscape requirements and help reduce the heat island effect.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not disagree with that at all, but maybe a large deciduous tree is not the right tree to plant there. She said she was not saying the islands cannot be there, but they cannot support the kinds of trees which tend to be put in them. She said we need to come up with something different to put in there.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the interior tree lawn, Option B, was a better way to go.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said regarding Option C, she would like the lawn areas limited to a maximum of two large consolidated islands for parking lots with less than 30,000 square feet in area. She said they may want to have two squares and we should encourage the size to be at least 20 foot by 20 foot for survivability as well as possibly more of them in the larger parking islands.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (5) Vehicular Use Area Landscaping (c) Interior Landscaping 3. (Page 90 and 91)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there would be overhang issues with this, but she did not know exactly how to address them. She said it was hard to legislate something you know is going to be a problem.

Ms. Martin explained when they talk about where trees may be located from the back of the curb, it actually ends up putting them more at 42 inches which accommodates car bumper overhang or car door swing. She said this was addressed the same in the current code.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (5) Vehicular Use Area Landscaping (c) Interior Landscaping 5. (Page 91)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted a reference was made to the Applicant Guide.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if "*Trees shall have a clear trunk of at least seven feet above the ground*" was new language. She said she thought it was good for our street trees as well and we should legislate they have a seven-foot clear trunk as it will alleviate a lot of plant/person conflict. She reiterated the language should go in the Street Tree section.

Ms. Martin agreed.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (5) Vehicular Use Area Landscaping (c) Interior Landscaping 6. (Page 91)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the language, "*If a curb is located at the edge of a landscaped area, planted areas shall be installed at a lower grade than the parking lot pavement and curbing shall have openings and gaps allowing drainage from the pavement to enter and percolate through the landscaped areas,*" was more appropriate than the wheel stops language.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (7) Foundation Planting (b) (Page 91)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was pretty sure she did not want to see a shrub every ten feet on a building façade and she would rather see the sidewalk go up to the foundation of the building.

Ms. Martin said that was not the intent and would clarify the intent better.

Mr. Langworthy said it was explained in (a) where it stated if there was not hardscape against the building, then there would be foundation plantings. He said the intent was for those areas to have foundation plantings, but it may not say that very clearly.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she read it as if she had a 100-foot building and 10 feet of stoop, she would have 90 feet of landscape area and she could sprinkle nine shrubs in those 90 feet. Ms. Martin said they would clarify it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if they were going to get into structural soils and things, she read this as all plant beds are required to be 42 inches deep. Ms. Martin clarified that meant the distance away from the facade of the building, not the depth.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said in the Historic District now, they were far from 42 inches, although she liked that because it was a more survivable condition. She said they needed to define what the plant bed widths are going to be in the Historic District so they were all consistent so and there is not a change in the width of the sidewalks.

Ms. Martin said they could look at language to specifically address the Historic Core which may end up being associated with the Building Type.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (8) Credit to Preserve Existing Trees (Page 91)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out the American Standards for Nursery Stock talked about methods of measuring caliper and in the glossary, it said, "*Caliper in the landscape industry trade is the diameter of a tree measured at a point of six inches above the ground line if the resulting measurement is no more than four inches. If the resulting measurement is more than four inches, the measurement is made at a point twelve inches above the ground line. This is in contrast to the method to use to measure caliper in the timber industry, which is to make the measurement at a 4 ½ feet above the ground line, or the diameter at breast height.*" She said we use *diameter breast height* instead of the landscape industry term and she did not think it was used properly.

Ms. Martin explained diameter breast height is a term used in the current code and is how protected or preserved trees were established throughout the city. She said the term has been used in the zoning code as long as there has been a tree protection code section.

Ms. Amorose Groomes did not think the term should be continued.

Mr. Langworthy concluded the timber industry term was used for tree stands, not individual trees, as was being referred to in the code. He said caliper and diameter breast height were both defined in the definitions section.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (9) Tree Preservation (a) General Provisions 1. Applicability (Page 92)**

Ms. Kramb pointed out this does not apply to "*all public and private properties in the BSC zoning districts.*"

Ms. Martin agreed to make a clarification.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (9) Tree Preservation (b) Exemptions 1. and 3. (Page 92)**

Ms. Kramb pointed out this did not specify it had to be a new site, only that if they cut down a tree where the building was to be, they would not be charged.

Ms. Martin agreed to look at combining or clarifying 1 and 3.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested it say something like during the course of redevelopment which would give it a trigger.

Mr. Hardt said he did not understand why 1 was needed if the intent was to say a tree that exists in the footprint of where we want the building to go did not need to be preserved whether it was a new site or a redeveloped site.

Mr. Langworthy said paragraph 1 was requested by some of the reviewers of the code.

Ms. Kramb said 3 satisfied it and 1 just created the opportunity to cut down all the trees on the property if it was a redeveloped PUD or something earlier.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out it could become very significant if they were ash trees and they would not be required to be replaced and redevelopment had not happened.

Ms. Martin agreed to work on this.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (D) Landscaping and Tree Preservation (10) Maintenance and Replacement (b) 1. (Page 93)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes questioned who was to determine if the required landscaping was in good condition.

Ms. Martin agreed to add, "*as determined by the City Forester.*"

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (E) Fencing, Walls and Screening (Page 93)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she recalled the last time they saw HCR ManorCare, the wall in front was not going to be stone, but another material which was more modern. She said the big picture is this is Dublin, and our history and nomenclature goes back to the stone walls. She said if there are going to be walls they should be of stone. She said she thought it was a place-making concept. She said she understood if it was a restaurant or something and a dining space needed to be enclosed and she could see wrought iron if there were some extenuating circumstances. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought

all walls in the Bridge Street Corridor which were 36-inch in height should be dry laid stone with bookend top. She asked for the Commissioners' thoughts on that.

Ms. Martin said the intent was to have the walls be incorporated as part of the architectural character of the area where they are located, so they coordinate with the building, not necessarily have the same thing everywhere.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would argue the opposite, that the dry laid stone walls should be incorporated because streetscapes were what they were trying to create.

Ms. Kramb said if the wall is screening something on the building, or protecting a patio or something along the street or parking lot, she thought it should be the limestone.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if it was engaged in the public realm, it should be dry laid stone walls with bookend top.

Ms. Martin clarified Ms. Amorose Groomes meant if it was in the public right-of-way, it should be stone. She said from a design standpoint, it provides a cohesive tie to whole site if the street wall is associated with the building, or in cases where there is screening of the parking lot, the building façade is continued so it blends into the background rather than calling attention to the different material. She said the intent is to give the ART the ability to review how the street wall makes sense within the fabric of the street and site.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she had a different theology. She said she thought the cohesiveness is not generated by the site, it is generated by the whole.

Ms. Kramb said historically, in Dublin, the stone wall's purpose was to divide properties. She said it ran along the frontage of the property with a gate for the driveway. She said the stone wall would still serve the same function if they were trying to say this property went with this building.

Mr. Zimmerman said he liked what Ms. Martin was saying about continuing the design of the building between the walls.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what if the two buildings were of different materials.

Mr. Fishman said he agreed with Ms. Amorose Groomes. He said people remember the white fences of New Albany and the stone walls in Dublin. He said he thought any perimeter walls should be stacked limestone walls which were a character of Dublin.

Mr. Zimmerman said he saw the white fences in New Albany as streetscape.

Mr. Fishman and Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed a wing wall or dumpster enclosure should coordinate with the building or anything which was a structure related issue should be the same material as the building.

Mr. Fishman said they needed to create as much character as possible in this high density area, and stone walls are a character of Dublin.

Ms. Martin explained they were not precluding anyone from having the ability to have dry stacked stone walls with the bookends on top, but it was going to come down to how it architecturally ties into the site. She said for instance, if there is a retail center with parking located against the building with a wing wall or street wall coming off the building to screen some of the parking, the material should be the same as the building, so there was a continuance of the façade. She said if we follow the principle of using only a dry stacked stone wall, there would be a break for the drive aisle and then the dry stacked stone wall

would begin. Ms. Martin said she appreciated the passion for the stone walls, and they were not precluding anybody from being able to use them, but it was more of trying to make sure they were used when it was appropriate.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she wanted to mandate them.

Mr. Langworthy said he thought that was admirable, but he had the feeling if they gave absolutely no ability to change that in any way, there are going to be some circumstances where that is really not going to look very good and will look out of place. He reminded everyone that this was not a suburban area and consisted of straight stretches of blocks and sidewalks.

Ms. Krumb said we have urban treatments and long stretches of sidewalks in Historic Dublin.

Mr. Hardt said he was having a hard time imagining a building architecture or building material that is incompatible with stone.

Mr. Langworthy said he was not saying that stone, as a material was bad. He said he was saying a stacked stone wall in every single circumstance was probably not appropriate.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not saying that every inch had to be walled, but if they are meeting the wall requirements, the wall had to be a dry laid stone wall. She said she was only one of the seven Commissioners and that was how she felt.

Mr. Hardt said for the record, that he came down on the side of Ms. Amorose Groomes.

Mr. Langworthy said he thought this would have some unintended consequences which would not be good.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that there had to be a creative way to work it out. She said she thought just driving through some of these areas and seeing different kinds of walls against the street is going to look very disheveled.

Mr. Langworthy asked to put some thought into it, that maybe there are some character districts or character areas which could be established where the wall style could be flexible and other character areas where it could be mandated to be dry laid stone walls instead of creating acres of stone walls. He suggested trying to come up with language to make it appropriate in some places and mandate it in others.

Ms. Martin agreed it made sense in the Historic District, that was how that district had been established and it was appropriate.

Ms. Krumb pointed out there were stone walls all along Riverside Drive and Dublin Road.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she read this as the walls are not required everywhere.

Ms. Martin said they are not required everywhere, but if they choose to do a street wall, by saying it has to be dry laid stone, it was saying that all street walls which have parking lots within the 20 feet of the street frontage would be required to have a dry laid stone wall according to Ms. Amorose Groomes.

Ms. Amorose Groomes reiterated she did not want to see many different treatments. She suggested there might be minimum requirements, if they wanted a different wall, it had to be over 600 feet away or something of significance to justify it, although she would not make any promises.

Mr. Langworthy said he could work on that language.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards B. Parking and Loading (8) Maintenance and Use (E) Fencing, Walls and Screening (1)(b) 2. (Page 93)**

Ms. Kramb suggested this say six-foot fences were allowed for residential patios only.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (E) Fencing, Walls and Screening (1)(c) Signs (Page 93)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked why management signs were permitted on fences and walls. She said normally, for maintenance issues, it was on an entry door. She said if it was located on a front wall, it was more of an advertisement.

Ms. Ray said they would want it in a visible location, but could work on language to clarify it.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (E) Fencing, Walls and Screening (2) Street Wall Standards (b) Street Wall Design and Location (Page 93)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she had already mentioned that (2) should be stricken and it all should be dry laid stone walls with bookends.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (E) Fencing, Walls and Screening (2) Street Wall Standards (c) Types (Page 94)**

Mr. Hardt noted for all three types, the paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 refer to landscape requirements, and if he was using this code, he would have never found it there. He said he preferred it placed back in the landscape section.

Ms. Ray said they wanted to keep the language consistent because if an applicant just had to do a masonry street wall, it would not have the hedge requirements along with it. She said they wanted to include it here because it would be used to screen not only parking areas, but also vehicular circulation areas and other limited applications as well.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out if the masonry street wall were dry laid stone walls, you would not need to plant anything in front of it.

Ms. Martin explained in cases, like the Dublin Road Bikepath, there are sections where there are dry laid stone walls against the bikepath with a bit of a planting strip. She said the dry laid stone wall creates an uneven surface and if you brush up against or hit it, you could disrupt the wall or hurt yourself so some separation was desired.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she could see it in those kinds of situations, but if it were in a turf panel or something, there would not be a need for an additional planting.

Ms. Martin said under those circumstances, Ms. Amorose Groomes was correct.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (E) Fencing, Walls and Screening (2) Street Wall Standards (c) Types 3.(Page 94)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not know if we wanted vines growing over them, but perhaps groundcover like Boston ivy or something might be appropriate in some areas.

Ms. Martin said living screens or walls was intended to be something softer which adds a different character and texture.

Ms. Amorose Groomes recalled where it talked about living walls elsewhere.

Ms. Kramb pointed out it was under (c) Ground Mounted Mechanical Equipment B.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they might want to look at adjusting the opacity.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (E) Fencing, Walls and Screening (3) (d) Outdoor Waste and Storage Containers and Enclosures (Page 94)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it gives landscaping as an approval method of enclosure. Ms. Martin said that was what currently was permitted as far as screening.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she could not imagine in this dense of an environment that you could have a living enclosure and she did not think they should have landscaping permitted as an enclosure in these districts.

Ms. Martin said they could look at that.

Mr. Fishman wanted it noted that they did not want the enclosures to be made of wood.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this was confusing.

Ms. Martin suggested "*where permitted it could be incorporated into the footprint,*" similar to like Building A and B at Bri Hi Square. She confirmed they did not want to permit something like a Skyrocket juniper.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (E) Fencing, Walls and Screening (3) (e) Off-Street Loading Areas (Page 95)**

Mr. Hardt pointed out the Off-Street Loading Area was the 30 by 12 parking space for a truck to sit in and we are saying here we want a wall around that entire thing.

Ms. Krumb said she had the same concern.

Ms. Martin said they would make it consistent. She said it was meant to reference the dock area.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (F) Exterior Lighting (9) Wall Lighting (a) (Page 96)**

Mr. Hardt said he understood what they were trying to do with decorative incandescent lighting, but 100 watts was very bright. He said a retail building with multiple doors with a 100-watt light fixture over every door would be pretty bright. He recommended they be no more than 40 watts and if they were really decorative, not much more than 15 was needed.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (F) Exterior Lighting (10) Canopy Lighting (a) and (b) (Page 96)**

Mr. Hardt pointed out that paragraphs (a) and (b) required the same thing.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (F) Exterior Lighting (10) Canopy Lighting (c) (Page 96)**

Mr. Hardt said "*highly reflective material*" seemed difficult to define.

Mr. Langworthy said they would add a clarifying statement saying that the intent is to avoid creating glare.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (G) Utility Undergrounding (Page 96)**

Mr. Hardt said he thought they meant "*That in BSC districts, all utility lines, including but not limited to...*"

Mr. Hardt said the sentence "*Unless otherwise dictated by the needs of the building,*" was too subjective. He suggested striking the sentence and let an applicant make the argument if they need to do it.

**Section 153.065 - Site Development Standards (H) Signs (Page 96)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that, due to the late hour, she preferred to postpone the discussion on signs.

Mr. Hardt said that he felt ill-equipped to review the sign requirements in a text-based format. He said as part of the review, he would like to see some examples and pictures of how the regulations are applied.

Mr. Langworthy agreed to provide some illustrations.

Ms. Kramb commented that she found the sign requirements table confusing.

Ms. Ray said Planning would look at an alternative way to organize the section.

**2. Bridge Street Corridor – Area Rezoning  
11-021Z**

**Area Rezoning**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced the area rezoning of 388 parcels totaling approximately 808.7 acres for the Bridge Street Corridor. She announced that this is the Commission's first review of this application, and public comment on the area rezoning is intended to be received at this meeting.

Rachel Ray stated that the land in the Bridge Street Corridor area is recommended for zoning to 10 zoning districts that are only applicable to the Bridge Street Corridor. She said that the 10 zoning districts will be governed by the Bridge Street Corridor Development Code, which is currently under review by the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the purpose of the area rezoning is to encourage coordinated development and redevelopment in the Bridge Street Corridor consistent with the Vision Plan, while recognizing the need for flexibility and adaptability to transition the character of the corridor over time to a mixed use area with a variety of commercial and residential densities.

Ms. Ray referred to a graphic of the Bridge Street Corridor and identified the area rezoning boundaries, which generally include the area south of I-270, west of Sawmill Road, and along State Route 161. She stated that all of the Historic District is included in the Bridge Street Corridor area rezoning.

Ms. Ray said in October 2010, City Council approved by resolution a Vision Plan for the Bridge Street Corridor to demonstrate the general land use character that might be expected in the Bridge Street Corridor. She explained that in preparing the area rezoning, Planning looked at the general land use character that might be expected in different parts of the corridor. Ms. Ray said from there, Planning derived a variety of different zoning districts generally consistent with the Vision Plan:

1. **Bridge Street Corridor Residential District** is intended to be a mixed residential district with mid-rise development generally interior to the Bridge Street Corridor with a small pocket along the southern boundary of the Bridge Street Corridor east of the Scioto River.
2. **Bridge Street Corridor Office Residential** is concentrated along I-270 on the east side of the Corridor. She said that this district is recommended to have flexibility for both residential and commercial uses, and will benefit from the visibility and access to I-270.
3. **Bridge Street Corridor Office District** is concentrated along West Dublin-Granville Road on the east side of the corridor. She said that the intent is to establish a signature urban office corridor along State Route 161 as development leads up to the Historic District.
4. **Bridge Street Corridor Commercial** is intended to accommodate a variety of low-rise commercial uses at the eastern and western gateways to the Bridge Street Corridor.
5. **Bridge Street Corridor Historic Core** is intended to replace some of the older zoning districts that currently exist within the Historic District that do not apply to anywhere else in the City. The purpose of this district is to apply to the commercial uses in the historic center of Dublin.

6. **Bridge Street Corridor Historic Residential** is concentrated along South Riverview Street and Franklin Street and is intended to preserve the existing Historic Residential District zoning regulations for the existing neighborhood.
7. **Bridge Street Corridor Neighborhood Districts** are intended to create signature places in the corridor while accommodating longer term phasing plans. She said that Planning recognizes that these districts will not redevelop all at once, and the Neighborhood Districts allow development to occur time with greater consistency. She said that the three Neighborhood Districts include:
  - a. **Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood**, which is intended to have a mixed use entertainment focus a regional center in the area west of Sawmill Road.
  - b. **Bridge Street Corridor Historic Transition Neighborhood**, which is partially within the Architectural Review District that the Architectural Review Board reviews. She explained that this district is intended to allow mixed use development and additional residential uses to transition from the scale and character of the Historic District of greater development scales and densities to the west.
  - c. **Bridge Street Corridor Indian Run Neighborhood**, which is a mixed use district with more employment and supporting services.
8. **BSC Public District** is intended to be applied to the existing public uses throughout the corridor, including the school site, library, cemetery, open spaces, and the AEP substation.

Ms. Ray indicated since the map was initially published in April of this year, Planning has met with a number of property owners to discuss what the proposed zoning districts mean for their properties and discuss any of the property owners' concerns. She reported that several property owners have submitted requests to change zoning districts, or to be excluded from the corridor. She said that the properties include the LaScala restaurant, LaScala apartments, Acura Columbus, the Bridge Pointe Shopping Center, and Oakland Nursery.

Ms. Ray said the recommendation for the LaScala restaurant is to be zoned to the Bridge Street Corridor Office District. She said that Planning has worked with the owner to develop the Existing Uses and Existing Structures provisions to address many of their concerns. She said that the LaScala apartment site is recommended to be zoned Bridge Street Corridor Residential, which is an equivalent zoning district based on their current zoning of R-12, Urban Residential District.

Ms. Ray that the recommendation for the Acura site and the Bridge Pointe Shopping Center is also Bridge Street Corridor Office District to establish the signature office corridor along State Route 161. She noted that the Bridge Street Corridor Office District is important for the Bridge Pointe Shopping Center site because of the strong relationship this site will have to the Historic District as well as future uses to the north along Riverside Drive.

Ms. Ray said the Infiniti Columbus site has requested that they be part of the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District in order to better coordinate with future development on that site. She reported that planning also recommends that some of the surrounding parcels along Tuller Road, including the three hotels on the north side of Tuller Road and the AMC Theater site, also be included in the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Neighborhood for the same reason.

Ms. Ray indicated the Cardinal Health South Campus, which is currently zoned PUD, was originally recommended for zoning to the Bridge Street Corridor Office Residential District. She stated that Planning recommends that this site be part of the Bridge Street Corridor Indian Run Neighborhood District to allow greater ability to transition over time with coordinated development on the OCLC campus to the west. She said that the three residential lots wrapped by the Cardinal Health site are also recommended to be part of the Bridge Street Corridor Indian Run Neighborhood District as well.

Ms. Ray noted that the property owner at 155 South High Street has requested Bridge Street Corridor Historic Core District zoning for his property, which is currently recommended for Bridge Street Corridor

Historic Residential District. She said that the Architectural Review Board will review this request at their meeting next week and will make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission on this site. She continued that on the west side of the cemetery, Planning is recommending the whole block of land be zoned Bridge Street Corridor Historic Transition Neighborhood District to coordinate with any future development that may happen across Bridge Street to allow for a more coordinated transition from the interchange into the Historic District.

Ms. Ray presented a summary list of all of property owner requests for zoning district changes or exemptions, with Planning's recommendation for each property, along with a list of the properties that Planning has recommended a change since the April 14, 2011 draft of the proposed zoning map. She said Planning has reviewed this application with respect to the considerations for a request for an area rezoning, approval of the area rezoning is recommended at either the December 1, 2011 or December 8, 2011 meeting with the modifications noted following the recommendation on the Bridge Street Corridor Development Code.

Ms. Ray asked that the Commission discuss the draft zoning map, the property owner requests, and the changes to the April 14<sup>th</sup> zoning map that Planning has recommended.

Ms. Amorose Groomes clarified that although there are two possible target dates for a vote on this application, and she wanted to be clear that the Commission will not vote on the area rezoning until they are satisfied with the development code and have voted on that item.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment on the proposed Bridge Street Corridor area rezoning.

Ben Hale Jr., Smith and Hale, 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, said he represents two properties in the Bridge Street Corridor that he would like to discuss. He said he has worked with staff on the Code, since staff has given the business community the opportunity to review draft document. He said that he worked with staff to draft provisions for existing businesses so that they will remain conforming and not become nonconforming, which will allow them to continue to operate as they do currently and even replace existing tenants in the future. He said he appreciated staff's cooperation in resolving this issue.

Mr. Hale said that the Bridge Pointe Shopping Center recently received approval for remodeling the existing buildings, while the proposed zoning is for Bridge Street Corridor Office District. He stated that this site has been a commercial shopping center for 25 years, and with the changes to the code to address Existing Uses and Existing Structures, the owners will be able to continue to change out tenants; however, one of their concerns is that there is an outparcel that at one time had a bank on it. He said that the outparcel building no longer exists, and building a new building on that site that complies with the BSC Office District will be difficult if not impossible. He said he believes that the center should be zoned BSC Commercial because the development standards would allow the existing uses to remain within this classification. He noted that all other shopping centers in the corridor received BSC Commercial and asked that the Commission make a recommendation to City Council for Bridge Street Corridor Commercial for the Bridge Pointe Shopping Center site.

Mr. Hale said the second site he represents is the Byers dealership on Village Parkway, which is located across from the AMC Theater. He said the dealership has been there for a while operating a car dealership within two existing buildings. He said Byers lost their Chevy dealership, and now they are primarily a used car dealership. He requested that the Commission consider the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District instead of the BSC Residential District for this site due to the nature of the current uses and how the site could be reused. He reiterated that the zoning should be either BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District, or the site should be exempted from the area rezoning and remain zoned PUD.

Mr. Hale said the other clients he represents, including Cardinal Health and OCLC, are generally satisfied with the proposed zoning classifications, with some changes in the zoning requirements that he has recommended to staff.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that Cardinal Health is satisfied with their re-classification to the BSC Indian Run Neighborhood District and asked if there are any others that Mr. Hale represents that may have concerns.

Mr. Hale said he has worked with the Leo Alfred Jewelers, the Lexus dealership, Cardinal Health, Byers, an office building along Tuller Road, the driving range site, and the Bridge Pointe shopping center. He said he has made suggestions with regard to the language of the draft code, but generally seem to be okay with the rezoning.

Amy Kramb asked if the difficulty with redeveloping the Bridge Pointe Shopping Center had to do with the permitted uses or the building types.

Mr. Hale said the outparcel is small, and when they look at the BSC Office District building types, he believed the value of the outparcel would be destroyed, compared with the building types permitted in the BSC Commercial District, which are still difficult, but may be possible.

Ms. Kramb said that she wanted to clarify, because the use table includes a nearly identical list of uses for the BSC Office and BSC Commercial district, but the permitted building types are much different.

Mr. Hale indicated that the property owner's biggest concern was with the potential for a restaurant, since there are severe limitations on size.

John Hardt inquired about the size of the outparcel.

Melanie Wollenberg, Equity Inc., 445 Hutchinson Avenue, Worthington, said the vacant outparcel site is approximately half an acre, and they also own a second outparcel containing the building that used to be occupied by a Mark Pi's restaurant.

Scott Phillips, Frost Brown Todd, 9277 Center Point Drive, Suite 300, West Chester, Ohio, 45069, said that he represents the Joseph Auto Group, which is the former Hummer dealership located at 4300 West Dublin-Granville Road. He indicated that he had written a letter dated June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2011 and that he has been in constant communication with staff about their concerns with the proposed rezoning. He said that they are recommended for zoning to the BSC Office designation, which would move the car dealership from a conforming use to a non-conforming use, and therefore the property owner has requested to be excluded from the area rezoning.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he had been practicing for over 20 years and had never had a better or more responsive experience than working with Dublin's Planning staff on his client's concerns. He said the car dealership will become a "conforming" non-conforming use, or an Existing Use, which he thought was a creative approach to dealing with nonconformities. He said he had not received notice of the previous meeting to discuss the draft Development Code; however, the good news is that they are happy with the language that has been drafted. He said his client would prefer not to be rezoned, but if it is necessary, they are happy with the language provided. He said that he was concerned that their objection had not been duly noted.

Paul Reiner, 5875 Kilbannan Court, Dublin, Ohio, said he is the president and owner of Oakland Nursery. He said that Oakland had moved to Dublin approximately 5 years ago after they had purchased and restored the old Frank's Nursery building. He said that they spent a tremendous amount of money, and they are spending more money to build a greenhouse. He said he firmly believes that if their zoning is

changed to BSC Office, it will result in a by making the use nonconforming and limit future expansions. Mr. Reiner said that he had not expected this when he moved his business to Dublin and after they had spent so much money, time, and effort on what he feels is the most viable business in the area. He stated that the site is perfect for his use, and in the future, he would have liked to expand, but he is concerned that with the new zoning regulations, they may not be able to do so. He said that the "downzoning" from commercial to office will debilitate their opportunity for growth, and he felt that he should be compensated for the lost value and creditability with their lenders.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that the Commission has now heard several comments about how the zoning designations will cause an existing corporate citizen a hardship, and asked how Planning had considered this site in their zoning recommendation.

Steve Langworthy said that the Existing Uses and Existing Structures language will apply to this site just as all of the others, allowing the owner to maintain the existing use and even allow them to be eligible for some expansion. He stated that Mr. Reiner had pointed out to staff that the code did not address outdoor use areas, so Planning is looking at language to accommodate outdoor use areas as well to accommodate this site and others in the area.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked Mr. Reiner if there is any way he could become more comfortable with the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Reiner said it is difficult for him to get comfortable, because regardless of whether he is thinking short term or long term, he has spent a sizable amount of money building a green house on this building, so it is not as if he is looking to redevelop this site in 10 or 20 years. He said that the building has been built for its current operation. He said if the zoning is changed, then it will demean the value of the property and ability for banks to lend to them in the future because they are no longer commercially zoned. He said he has been working with Planning on the zoning text as it refers to the uses outside of the building, because otherwise, it would have meant the death of his business. He said that he is trying to make this as clean as possible because he doesn't want to contend with problems in the future.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked Mr. Reiner had explored the BSC Commercial District, and what he thought of that zoning district.

Mr. Reiner agreed that the BSC Commercial District would be much more satisfactory.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if all the properties along State Route 161 that are currently zoned Community Commercial were satisfied with the BSC Office zoning, or if they all preferred BSC Commercial zoning.

Ms. Ray indicated Planning has only received letters from Mr. Reiner with Oakland Nursery, and the owner of the LaScala restaurant and the LaScala apartments, but Planning has not heard from the owner of the Tommy's Pizza site.

Mitch Grant, 5075 Galway Drive, said he is a concerned Dublin resident and that he has been involved in the recent discussions regarding the bicycle paths and other improvements to Brand Road. He said that he was very disappointed in Council's decision to severely restrict and destroy eight properties on Brand Road. He thought the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Plan is very enticing and exciting on the east side of the Scioto River where Dublin Village Center is in need of redevelopment, and he thought that this plan shows a lot of foresight. He said that he is not so sure about the west side of the Scioto River however, and if the City staff's and Council's ideas of infrastructure with respect to Brand Road is any indication, he felt that the scenic nature of the area around Historic Dublin may be destroyed, and Dublin as it exists today will be changed forever.

Mr. Grant said that this plan is a really big deal, and it needs to be very well thought out. He stated that the rights of tax payers and citizens who have bought homes in this community need to be respected. He said he has listened to all of the consultant presentations on the Bridge Street Corridor website, and the word that keeps coming up is "urban." He said that Dublin is an exurban, rural community, and not in his opinion, "urban." He said that Dublin was developed as a community of single family homes, neighborhoods, and an excellent school system. He noted that there is no new school shown in the Bridge Street Corridor, which will do nothing to help the existing schools, which will need help in the future. He said that Dublin is going to expand in the future, probably with more single family homes. He stated that he believes this plan would be great on the east side of the river where the Dublin Village Center is located, but he questions the traffic and the density and the historic nature of Historic Dublin. He said that he believed that the surrounding area could be compromised and destroyed forever if it is not handled very carefully.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that Mr. Grant's comments are valid and that it is the Commission's desire to engage the public as much as possible in this process. She said that as it is today and in the future, one of the Commission's greatest desires is to keep the public engaged in the process as the Bridge Street Corridor develops. She said inevitably, there will be some redevelopment on the west side of the Scioto River on the OCLC site, and the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Plan will act as a guide to redevelopment that will be driven by property owners. She said that the intent is to make all development as great as it can be for everyone living in Dublin. She said that she feels that it is pivotal that the community be engaged every step of the way so that folks can come forward and be heard. She reiterated that the Vision Plan is a guide, and not something that will be forced on anyone. She said that the Commission will do what they can do to allow whoever is in the Corridor to continue doing what they are doing for as long as they care to do it, with the knowledge that the needs of the citizens already living in Dublin should be balanced, since they have certain expectations of the community that they have moved to. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that redevelopment is going to happen, and there is nothing they can do about that, but the best thing they can do is to structure the redevelopment in a way that is well thought out and well planned like the balance of the community.

Mr. Grant said he appreciated Ms. Amorose Groomes' comments and said his family loves Historic Dublin and that they love to come downtown to the Indian Run Park. He said that Dublin is a high quality place to live and he loves Dublin and wants to see Dublin continue to grow strong.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone else who wished to comment. [There was no one.]

Joe Budde said he likes the concept of the Bridge Street Corridor, but he understands the concerns expressed by the property owners, and he said he wanted to make sure that their concerns are addressed. He said that he was surprised that others in similar situations were not present to voice their concerns, although he thought that staff has done a great job of putting this information together.

Warren Fishman said that he is confused by the conforming/nonconforming issues, because as he understood it, Mr. Reiner's use would always be conforming.

Mr. Langworthy agreed with Mr. Fishman's statement and said that the existing use has been protected along with the outdoor areas, and the code also allows for the ability to expand the building. He said that the language is important between *conforming* and *nonconforming*, because the code currently allows for a fair amount of expansion for Existing Uses and Existing Structures, as well as protects the uses that are there. He pointed out that the code also gives property owners the ability to change ownership. He stated that existing property owners will be able to exist as long as they choose, and that they can opt in to the Bridge Street Code when they choose to do so.

Mr. Fishman asked why the zoning on the nursery site should not be changed to commercial.

Mr. Langworthy said that the objective is to avoid turning State Route 161 into another commercial strip like Sawmill Road. He said that this area is intended to be a distinctive "address" street with a high quality office presence and a different kind of look, and not a commercial strip. He said that that is why the building types are restricted to more mixed use and office buildings as opposed to single story commercial building types, to create a different atmosphere along State Route 161.

Mr. Fishman asked if zoning to BSC Office was a downzoning, and if the property owner had the right to exempt himself from the area rezoning.

Mr. Langworthy said that the Commission has the right to make that recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Fishman said he is worried about the Indian Run Estates neighborhood and the higher density, mixed use development expected around it.

Mr. Langworthy said that there is a provision in the existing zoning for the Cardinal Health South Campus for a substantial landscape buffer between that neighborhood and whatever may happen on the Cardinal property.

Ms. Krumb asked why the Bridge Pointe Shopping Center should be recommended for zoning to the BSC Office District when the Shoppes at River Ridge site is recommended for BSC Commercial. She thought the Bridge Pointe Shopping Center and Oakland Nursery should be zoned BSC Commercial. She noted that it seems as though the objective is to limit car dealerships along State Route 161 in the future, because those uses have been excluded.

Ms. Krumb agreed with Mr. Hale with regards to the Byers dealership, and felt that the zoning map goes too far with showing BSC Residential. She thought that the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood should be permitted on the Byers site west of Village Parkway.

Ms. Krumb said that she did not understand why there is a sliver of land with the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District that reaches south to State Route 161.

Ms. Ray stated that the land is part of an existing parcel recommended for zoning to the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District, and currently contains a driveway with access from State Route 161.

Ms. Krumb said it seems odd to have two small parcels recommended for BSC Office on the north side of State Route 161 on either side of that driveway. She recommended that the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District be extended south to State Route 161.

Mr. Hardt said he would like to see a version of the zoning map that shows the proposed street network to see how the maps relate to one another. He agreed with Ms. Krumb with respect to the zoning along the north side of State Route 161, because he thought that the development in the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District would want the visibility from one of the largest and most highly traveled roads in the city.

Mr. Hardt said when this process began, one of the stated intents was to create a mixed use development with a variety of uses, where people could live on one side of the street and buy a cup of coffee on the other side of the street. He said that the City has decided to accomplish this by using a form-based code. Mr. Hardt said that his understanding was that, as he had learned from the consultants, form-based code regulations are intended to govern the size and shape of buildings and how they interface with the street and public realm. He said that he is concerned they are getting back into a use-based code by dividing the Bridge Street Corridor into these use-centric districts. He thought that this approach would be detrimental to property owners, contrary to the stated intent of the Bridge Street Corridor, and that the names of the districts are misleading. He recommended that the BSC Office and

BSC Commercial districts be combined to address some of the concerns that had been raised at the meeting and put more focus on the building form instead of the uses.

Ms. Ray mentioned that, since the discussion on uses at one of the Commission's previous meetings, Planning is in the process of reviewing the districts and their list of permitted uses to allow a greater mix of uses. She said that regulating which building types are permitted in each of the districts will contribute to the character of each zoning district.

Ms. Kramb that there are few differences between the BSC Office and BSC Commercial districts on the use table, but the permitted building types are much different. She suggested that more building types should be permitted in more districts to help address some of the issues raised at this meeting.

Mr. Hardt recommended that Planning revalue the zoning designation for the Bridge Pointe Shopping Center to understand the impact of the BSC Office designation on that property, particularly with regard to the outparcels.

Jennifer Readler said that through a rezoning of a property, uses and structures that are no longer permitted in the new district would default to the existing nonconforming uses section of the Zoning Code, which is very limiting. She said that the Existing Uses section is unique because it is much more expansive than what these property owners would otherwise be entitled to. She stated that the conformity of those uses and structures are preserved; however, the use and/or structure has to be existing at the time of the rezoning.

Mr. Hardt said that he voted against the special meeting on December 8, 2011 or earlier because of the timing. He was concerned that with the remaining number of pages left to review, in addition to the new copy incorporating all of the revisions, it does not seem that there will be adequate time to prepare and review all of this material by December 8, 2011.

Ms. Amorose Groomes assured the Commission that they would not vote on either the code or the area rezoning until they are ready, and they have the ability to cancel the meeting on December 8, 2011 if they are not ready. She said she appreciates the sense of urgency that City Council has applied, but they also feel an urgency to get all of this right.

Ms. Kramb referred to the BSC Office Residential zoning district along I-270 and said that she could not imagine residential uses overlooking I-270.

Ms. Ray indicated that the intent of that district is to allow office and residential uses, because the district could go either way depending on market opportunities. She added that the existing development in that area will probably be there for a while as well.

Mr. Fishman said he was surprised that, considering the magnitude of this rezoning, there are so few people present to comment on the rezoning. He said he thought that the room would be packed. He said he would like to have another meeting with an opportunity for the public to provide comment.

Mr. Langworthy said that Planning has met with a lot of property owners, many of whom are satisfied with their proposed zoning designation and the language written for the Existing Uses and Existing Structures, and that is why there is not more activity or letters requesting different zoning districts – because of the work Planning has done to accommodate as many of property owners as possible.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that there will be additional meetings to discuss the code and area rezoning, and property owners would be notified of those meetings. She said that she agreed with Mr. Hardt's comments on draft code, that the regulations seem to be more function-based than form-based, and she said she did not understand why it would make a difference to anyone what happens behind the

façade of a building, and whether it is a shop or a parking area, as long as the building is properly interacting with the street and the traffic is functioning properly.

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred to the comment that they are trying to change the character of State Route 161 so that it feels different from that of Sawmill Road. She said she disagreed that Sawmill will continue to be very commercial and auto-oriented, particularly if we get the type of mixed-use, regional redevelopment that is anticipated for that site. She envisioned that to be very different from State Route 161 now and in the future. She said she thought that State Route 161 is a natural place for businesses like Oakland Nursery.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that the other Commissioners agreed that the zoning map should be modified to be consistent with the requests made by the property owners this evening, including changing the Oakland Nursery, La Scala restaurant, Bridge Pointe Shopping Center, and others along State Route 161 to BSC Commercial, and changing the Byers and Charles Penzone's sites to the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District.

Mr. Hardt thought there should be no distinction between the BSC Office and BSC Commercial districts.

Ms. Krumb thought that the Fifth Third office building and others along the north side of State Route 161 should be part of the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the public in attendance for providing comments on the proposed area rezoning. She confirmed that the Commission would take a short break before moving onto the discussion of the Bridge Street Corridor Development Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 10:25 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.