


Final Staff Report

LAND USE STUDY: BRIGHT ROAD AREA



CITY OF DUBLIN, OHIO
Division of Planning
May, 1991

LAND USE STUDY: BRIGHT ROAD AREA

FINAL STAFF REPORT

Prepared by:

Lisa L. Fierce, Planner

Graphics Prepared by:

Mary H. Newcomb and Mark Jones

CITY OF DUBLIN

Department of Development

Terry D. Foegler, Development Director

Patrik G. Bowman, Planning Director

May, 1991

RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS

Duquesne Legal Blank Co. Form No. 100-115

Resolution No. 06-91

Passed

19

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE BRIGHT ROAD STUDY AS A GUIDE TO FUTURE LAND USE AND ROADWAY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE BRIGHT ROAD AREA

WHEREAS, The Bright Road Area poses complex land use and transportation issues; and

WHEREAS, Dublin City Council authorized the Dublin Planning Division to conduct a general planning process that would refine community policy with respect to the unique conditions of the Bright Road Area; and

WHEREAS, the Dublin Planning Staff conducted public meetings with civic association representatives, with property owners and area residents; and

WHEREAS, the Dublin Planning Staff formulated a document that is detailed enough to guide project planning to ensure that development occurs within the context of specific goals; and

WHEREAS, the Bright Road Area Study represents how the Municipality is likely to act on land use issues and in making capital improvements within this area; and

WHEREAS, it is the expectation of this Council that this plan will be used to resolve all final land use and transportation decisions to ensure appropriate private sector development and to take advantage of development opportunities that will result in mutual public and private sector benefit;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, 6 of the elected members concurring that:

SECTION 1. That the document entitled The Bright Road Area Study and dated May, 1991, be accepted as a guide to future land use and roadway developments within the Bright Road Area.

SECTION 2. That this Resolution shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Passed this 1st day of July, 1991

[Signature]
Mayor - Presiding Officer

Attest:

[Signature]
Clerk of Council

Sponsor: Planning Director

I hereby certify that copies of this Ordinance Resolution were posted in the City of Dublin in accordance with Section 731.25 of the Ohio Revised Code.

[Signature]
Clerk of Council, Dublin, Ohio

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....1

Site Analysis.....2

Planning Analysis.....3

Subarea Descriptions.....5

Recommended Planning Policy Statements.....8

Public Participation.....9

Figures.....:

- * Figure I - Existing Conditions
- * Figure II - Site Analysis
- * Figure III - Proposed Land Use
- * Figure IV - Composite Plan

LAND USE STUDY - BRIGHT ROAD AREA

Introduction

In June of 1990, the Dublin City Council requested that the Dublin Planning Department undertake a planning analysis that would result in more detailed land use recommendations for the remaining unzoned parcels in the Northeast Planning Area of Dublin. The Northeast Planning Area is bounded by the Delaware County Line, Sawmill Road, Interstate 270 and the Scioto River. The request to develop a plan came immediately after approval of a major rezoning request of nearly 500 acres within the planning area. The rezoning accomplished many major land use and public service objectives which the City had identified in the Community Plan. In recommending approval of the Planned Unit Development rezoning, the Planning Staff made it very clear that approval of the rezoning was predicated upon land use assumptions on parcels not included within the rezoning. The determination of the proposed bridge location north of Interstate 270, the Bright Road waterline plans, and the stormwater detention issue along Billingsley Stream also served as the impetus for the plan. It was Staff's recommendation to complete a Northeast Area Plan that would build upon the positive aspects of the future planned development and would also minimize the potential negative impact of unplanned development that often follows major rezonings. The Dublin City Council agreed with that recommendation and voted unanimously to enact a rezoning moratorium until a land use plan was prepared and approved.

This document is part of a study submitted to Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission dealing with land use and development within the Northeast Planning Area. This study focuses on the Bright Road area which is situated roughly between the Scioto River on the west, Sawmill Road on the east, Interstate 270 on the south, and the proposed extension of Hard Road to Riverside Drive on the north. Much of what is contained in this report has been discussed by Staff, City Council, and citizens over the last two years. Staff met with representatives of the East Dublin Civic Association to see if there were any misrepresentations or omissions needed to be addressed before preparing for public hearings and, ultimately, submitting a final recommended plan to Council. General land use and development concepts were discussed. The residents of the area prepared plans to express their land use desires for this area and the public reviewed the report and made comments at public meetings. Those meetings were held in January and February, 1991 and the comments from participants are included herewith. Staff also met briefly with the owners of the larger undeveloped parcels.

Site Analysis (See Figures I and II)

The area is best characterized as a rural oasis surrounded by a very urban environment. Both the very busy Sawmill Road area and Interstate 270 exert significant impacts on the area. Although originally designed to serve local, residential traffic, Bright Road has become an east-west connector road serving thru-traffic between Sawmill Road and Riverside Drive. Conversely, Riverside Drive, the Scioto River Corridor, Billingsley Stream, existing large-lot residential development, and large parcels still devoted to agriculture, are very positive attributes of the area in need of specific planning actions to ensure their longevity and protection. As is typical of low-density, residential development, the existing residential areas are somewhat isolated from each other and each area contains relatively few houses as compared to modern suburban development.

The physical features of the land change from the river east toward Sawmill Road. The land around Riverside Drive and Bright Road is very scenic and rural. Billingsley Stream has carved out a very scenic gorge just north of Interstate 270 at Riverside Drive. To the north of the Billingsley Stream is an ancient Indian ceremonial location with Indian mounds. The land slopes at about 10-12 percent from the river to about Grandee Cliffs Drive. From there the slope flattens to about 4-6 percent to Sawmill Road. Billingsley Stream has a very large tributary area extending east of Sawmill Road. Rain storms within the last two years have caused flooding within the planning area. Culverts under MacBeth Drive and Grandee Cliffs Drive are not sufficient to handle the storm water. An engineering report entitled "Quieting the Waters" was prepared by Wilbur-Smith Associates to examine the stormwater problems and propose various solutions. The floodplain along Billingsley Stream is approximately 150 feet wide. A pond, known as Kiplinger Pond, was created by a spillway just east of MacBeth Drive. There is a high-voltage, electric transmission line that runs north and south through the study area approximately 1,000 feet west of Sawmill Road.

The existing residential development is spread out along Bright Road. Grandee Cliffs Estates is a 23 lot subdivision south of Bright Road built in the 1960s. Glenbriar and Kiplinger Estates, which were developed in the 1960s and 1980s respectively, north of Bright Road, contain 30 lots. Billingsley Stream on the north and Bright Road on the south form the boundaries of 11 narrow single-family lots lined up along Bright Road east of the transmission lines. The Village at Inverness, located on the southwest corner of Sawmill Road and Bright Road, contains 43 condominium units, a day care, and three office buildings. The development is accessed entirely from Bright Road. North of Bright Road, there are five parcels with Sawmill Road frontage. The largest is nearly 21 acres and the smallest is 2.6 acres. The Perry Township administration including police, fire, and maintenance facility is located on Sawmill Road just south of Inverness Court. A large commercially-zoned tract of land, used for agriculture, is located just northwest of the Interstate 270/Sawmill Road interchange. The east side of Sawmill Road, within the City of Columbus, has been predominantly developed with strip-type commercial uses.

The site analysis for this area also accounted for major proposed public projects. These include the proposed bridge across the Scioto River immediately north of Interstate 270, and a proposed seven-acre detention basin along Billingsley Stream east of the electric transmission lines. The proposed land uses of the Planned Unit Development, north of the study area, were also included in the analysis as well as the proposed configuration of roadways of that planned development. (See Figure IV: Bright Road Area Composite Plan).

Planning Analysis (See Figures III and IV)

This area presents a significant planning challenge. The large undeveloped parcels south of Bright Road only have access from Bright Road at the present time. Any development of these parcels would substantially change the neighborhood. Developing these parcels into multi-family or office uses could result in the generation of large traffic volumes through established residential areas. An effort to blend single-family and office development using the existing Bright Road may yield mediocre products of both development of these parcels types. It is not reasonable to expect the area to be developed, fully, with single-family uses. This strategy runs the risk of being too fragile. What is most clear is the fact that unplanned development could have a significantly detrimental effect upon the entire area.

This report presents, for consideration, a study that builds upon existing residential development and also creates areas that may be developed with high-quality office uses. The study identifies a new Connector Road that creates an "expressway transition zone" separating Sawmill Road and Interstate 270 from the existing and proposed single-family development. The Connector Road is needed for traffic purposes to provide east-west movement between Riverside Drive and Sawmill Road. This transition zone is an element of the City's Land Use Plan found in the Community Plan. Frantz Road and Perimeter Drive serve the same traffic function elsewhere in the City. The purpose of the transition zone is to enhance the existing community "corporate" image along the expressway. In the case of Bright Road area, the zone does much more. If as the study proposes more single-family homes could be built north of the proposed Connector Road, the Grandee Cliffs Estates and Glenbriar subdivisions would be connected and be associated more with the Riverside Drive corridor and the proposed single-family neighborhoods to the north. Bright Road becomes less of a barrier and more of a scenic local road. The proposed Connector Road improves access to the large freeway parcels and increases the likelihood of attracting a more prestigious type of development.

An important determination must be made as to whether the existing single-family homes along Bright Road east of the transmission lines will remain as such or be redeveloped to other uses, before the suggested land use study is considered for adoption. Cul-de-sacs may be extended east from the proposed Connector Road or west from Sawmill Road. There are many options to reconfigure the existing Bright Road, and the decision need not be made until the proposed Connector Road is actually developed. However, it is important to design the Connector Road and reduce or eliminate thru-traffic.

City Council recently studied and selected a location for a detention basin to provide stormwater control management. The proposed Billingsley Stream detention basin, just east of MacDuff Way, is one of the major factors determining the proposed Connector Road location. The proposed Connector Road must be located at the west end of the basin. Any other locations farther to the east will either diminish its detention capacity or be too close to Sawmill Road to provide safe traffic design. It is strongly recommended that the basin be designed as a well kept amenity which enhances the utility of the adjacent properties to the maximum extent possible.

Another major objective of the study is to confine retail/commercial development to the designated areas within the planned development to the north. The commercial uses of that area were well planned with interior roadways designed to utilize existing traffic signals on Sawmill Road. The proposed commercial area also creates a commercial center with similar development just across the street within Columbus on the east side of Sawmill Road. Permitting additional retail commercial development south of the proposed Hard Road extension would serve only to create an undesirable commercial strip effect and negatively impact the area. It is recommended that suburban office uses be developed along Sawmill Road in order to provide a compatible transition between the existing commercial uses along the east side of Sawmill Road and the residential uses to the west. There is already an abundance of better located commercial development elsewhere in the area.

Other aspects of the proposed plan include the preservation of the Indian mounds located near the southeast corner of Bright Road and Riverside Drive, the expansion of the Interstate 270/Sawmill Road interchange, the desire to consolidate points of ingress/egress along Sawmill Road, a common frontage treatment along Sawmill Road and for architectural consistency within the proposed office and multi-family areas.

Subarea Descriptions (See Figure III)

The following narrative generally describes the type of development envisioned for the various subareas identified within this report.

Subarea 1 - Park - +22 Acres

This area is characterized by the three geometric earthworks constructed by an ancient Indian tribe dating back from 300 B.C. to 500 A.D. These consist of a large, rectangular, round-cornered enclosure, about 290-feet by 220-feet, and two circular bank-and-ditch enclosures with 130-foot and 180-foot diameters. These ceremonial mounds are most notable for being the northernmost major earthworks identified in Ohio for the Hopewell Indians. This site is interpreted by archaeologists as an arrangement of earthen enclosures of symbolic forms which was a locus for periodic mortuary or other rituals of a local social group. This area also contains a portion of the Billingsley Stream running along the southern boundary, which is heavily wooded and provides a great scenic amenity with its waterfalls and ravines. A passive park for this area should be developed to protect the archeological features and natural amenities. Access may be provided from Bright Road or Riverside Drive.

Subarea 2 - Multi-family/Office - +4 Acres

This subarea is bounded to the north by the wooded ravine, encompassing the Billingsley Stream in Subarea 1, and the proposed Connector Road to the south. The topography of the area lends itself to cluster-type, multi-family development. Special attention should be given to preserve the gorge area to the north within Subarea 1. Multi-family development or small-scale offices, with a limited density, could be developed in this area with pedestrian access to the park to the north and single-family area to the east in Subarea 3A. This area could also be developed as an extension of Subarea 3A. If this area is developed residentially, a buffer should be provided to the south to lessen any negative impacts from the proposed Connector Road. Access to this area should be only permitted from the proposed Connector Road or extension of Subarea 3A. Access should be prohibited from Riverside Drive.

Subarea 3A - Single-family - +5 Acres

This subarea is located just west of the existing Grandee Cliffs Estates subdivision, south of the proposed park within Subarea 1, and north of the proposed Connector Road. Single-family residential development in this area would be a logical expansion of the Grandee Cliffs Estates and a compatible adjacent land use. Single-family development within this subarea should have a similar density to Grandee Cliffs Estates, which is one dwelling unit per acre. Special emphasis should be given to preserving the Billingsley Stream area to the north. Access to this area would be provided by an extension of existing Jenmar Court, which lies to the east. The extension could terminate with a cul-de-sac, along the western end of this site, or continue into Subarea 2 if that area is developed with single-family lots. No access would be provided from the proposed Connector Road to the south. Pedestrian access should link this subarea with the proposed park.

Subarea 3B - Single-family - +20 Acres

This subarea is impacted by the residential nature of the existing Grandee Cliffs Estates subdivision to the west, Bright Road to the north, and the proposed Connector Road to the south. This site should be developed similarly to Subarea 3A in order to help preserve the existing residential characteristics of the low-density, single-family development to the west of this subarea. The preferred density is two to three dwelling units per acre. An extension of MacBeth Road to the south of Bright Road, is proposed to the east of this site. Access to the site would be provided by local streets stemming from either Bright Road or the MacBeth Road extension; no access would be provided from the proposed Connector Road to the south. A buffer should be provided between this site and Subarea 4A (office development) to the southeast and pedestrian access should integrate this area with any surrounding residential development and the park.

Subarea 4A/4B - Office - +4 Acres/+7 Acres

These subareas are located at the northwest and northeast corners of the proposed Connector Road and MacBeth Road extension. Small-to-medium scale office uses are proposed within these two sites with one to three-story buildings, similar to those existing along Bradenton Avenue within Llewellyn Farms, where there is a logical transition of land uses. Access to these sites may be provided along MacBeth Road extension or the proposed Connector Road. Buffers should be provided between these sites and any surrounding (proposed or existing) residential uses. Special attention should be given to create a unified character between these areas, both in architectural design and building material use.

Subarea 4C - Office - +45 Acres

This is the largest subarea within the study area and is located between the proposed Connector Road to the northwest, Interstate 270 to the south, and Sawmill Road to the east. There is a 100-foot easement bisecting the property, from north to south, which contains electric transmission lines and metal lattice towers. The Interstate 270/Sawmill Road interchange, located on the southeast corner of the study area, is planned to be widened to provide a westbound Interstate 270-to-southbound Sawmill Road loop. The existing zoning on the easternmost portion of this subarea, closest to Sawmill Road, is commercial. However, in light of this study, that zoning is inappropriate due to access problems along Sawmill Road and incompatibility with surrounding development. Development for this area should include medium-to-high scale offices similar to Metro Center development. This area includes portions of three separate parcels which will need to be consolidated or developed in a highly coordinated fashion. Architectural consistency will need to be emphasized within this area. Development of this subarea is dependent upon the installation of the proposed Connector Road. Access points along the proposed Connector Road should be minimized and should align with those proposed in Subareas 4A and 4B. Points of ingress/egress should be consolidated along the Sawmill Road frontage. A buffer should be installed between this subarea and Subarea 5 to the north.

Subarea 5 - Multi-family - +10 Acres

This subarea is characterized by the existing older, low-density residential uses along Bright Road, which are most currently used as rental property. These existing residential units include single-family units to the north and the Village at Inverness Condominiums to the east. Development within this subarea should be similar in density and architectural design to that of the Inverness site. An assemblage of the separate parcels is encouraged. This area should be preserved for residential use and the use of Bright Road as an east-west quadrant connector should be eliminated. Bright Road should not remain as a thru-street and should be reconfigured with one or more terminating cul-de-sacs. Access should be provided by the proposed Connector Road to the west and/or an extension of the existing private drive at Inverness Circle.

Subarea 6 - Office - +23 Acres

This subarea is located at the northwest corner of Bright Road and Sawmill Road, just south of the proposed Hard Road extension. A portion of the proposed detention pond to the west overlaps this area. This subarea serves as a logical extension of the approved office area to the north. Office development within this subarea should be small-to-medium scale, with one to two-story buildings which have consistent architectural features. Special buffering treatment should be implemented for the existing residential area to the west. It is expected that the Sawmill Road landscape buffer standard, adopted with the planned development to the north, will be incorporated within this subarea. Access points along Sawmill Road should be consolidated and the use of Bright Road should be deemphasized. A primary access road, running north from Bright Road to the proposed Hard Road extension, should be installed to provide traffic with access to signalized intersections along Sawmill Road.

Subarea 7 - Single-family - +14 Acres

This subarea is located on the southwest corner of the Hard Road extension and the proposed Connector Road. It has already been designated for single-family development within the ±500 acre rezoning to the north which was approved 1990. Approximately 42 single-family lots are expected to be developed within this area.

Recommended Planning Policy Statements

To provide a sound basis for planning decisions, the following is a list of Planning Policy Statements:

1. Implementation of key elements of the plan will require initiative on the part of the public and private sectors, mainly in pursuing planned capital improvements.
2. The plan recognizes the need for capital improvements, including the proposed bridge, east/west connector, detention basin, and waterline improvements.
3. The City should use capital improvements as a catalyst for desirable private development. The timing of these improvements will depend on the project selection criteria established as part of the City's Capital Improvement Plan.
4. The vacant parcels south of Bright Road should be consolidated for planning and development purposes. The City will discourage rezoning requests for these parcels until the rezoning includes enough land area to generally conform with the Bright Road Area Study.
5. The proposed Connector Road is to be an important east/west thoroughfare. It is unlikely that the roadway will be developed until there are land use commitments on the larger vacant parcels. The Hard Road extension will be the primary east/west roadway until the proposed Connector Road is built.
6. Access should be limited onto the proposed Connector Road and pavement should be minimized where possible to help preserve the existing residential character of the area.
7. In keeping with the goals of the Community Plan, it is the City's desire to create a people-oriented pedestrian environment within this area.

Public Participation

This portion of the report deals generally with public participation in the planning process for the Bright Road area. The public has had the opportunity to review the report and make comments at meetings. Those meetings are discussed below and the general comments recorded at the meetings are included. Participation at the meetings posed a number of questions which are included in this report and answered where possible.

A series of citizen review meetings were held for the Bright Road Area Study in January and February, 1991. All were open to the general public, although the last two meetings dealt with specific locations within the study area affecting particular residents.

Public Meeting - Bright Road Area Study - January 28, 1991

The first meeting regarding the Bright Road Area Study was conducted by the Land Use Committee of the City Council on January 28, 1991. Persons signing the attendance sheets at the meeting totalled 72. The primary purposes of the meeting were:

- * To display the study and present information within that document to the public;
- * To provide an update on the progress of the detention basin design;
- * To record comments and concerns from citizens for inclusion within the study;
- * To answer citizens' questions about the study; and
- * To describe the future course of the study to citizens.

General Comments Recorded at January 28, 1991 Meeting:

At the meeting, Development Department Staff made a presentation and individual questions and comments were noted for consideration within the study. The following represent the general comments at the public meeting:

- * There needs to be a meeting with the people who live on Jenmar Court.
- * The detention basin will obstruct property and take the value of my property.
- * Not everything has been studied. The bridge connector would be better served if it went to Tuller Road - nobody has studied this.
- * The bridge connector is not cost effective. It will cost more to take the houses.
- * There should be a buffer between the Grandee Cliffs houses and the proposed single-family development to the east (subarea 3b).
- * The East Dublin Civic Association would like to unite Grandee Cliffs with MacBeth/MacDuff. There is a need for 60-80 more single-family lots in the area.

Questions and Answers at January 28, 1991 Meeting:

In addition to the foregoing comments, the following questions were noted and answered where possible:

- Q. What is the proposed timing of the adoption of the study?
A. The intention is to provide City Council with a final land use plan for the Bright Road area and seek formal adoption in the Spring, 1991.

- Q. Will the treeline be cut along the southside of the Jenmar Court properties, with the Connector Road?
- A. Engineering plans for the proposed Connector Road have not been completed.
- Q. What is the proposed size of the detention basin?
- A. The detention pond will be approximately seven acres.
- Q. What will be the response time of emergency vehicles to MacDuff/MacBeth with the proposed changes to Bright Road?
- A. The response time for emergency vehicles should not change significantly. Bright Road would not be reconfigured until an alternate access route is provided to the MacDuff/MacBeth area, specifically the new Connector Road.
- Q. How will the detention basin be maintained?
- A. There is little required maintenance for this type of basin. The aim is to keep it natural looking. City maintenance crews will be on site on a regular basis, however.
- Q. When will the City do the engineering to determine what land area is needed for the basin?
- A. Consultants for the City are currently working to obtain that engineering information.
- Q. Is the basin wet or dry? Isn't wet better?
- A. The basin is designed to be dry to get the maximum detention capacity.
- Q. Won't there be a problem with mosquitoes at the basin?
- A. The basin is being designed to drain so there should not be any more of a (mosquito) problem than there is currently at the stream.
- Q. How do we get notified of future meetings and when you take our property?
- A. The City's Law Director's office will notify effected residents by mail. The City cannot do a quick take of anyone's property.
- Q. Has the City received any feedback from large property owners?
- A. Representatives of the large property owners are concerned that the Connector Road does not provide the most convenient access to their parcels. They also questioned the viability of the proposed single-family land use.

Other questions which will be addressed when the final engineering plans are completed include:

- * What is the timetable for implementing the detention basin?
- * Will the City buy the properties effected by the basin or will there be easements?
- * What kind of dam will be created?

Proposed Connector Road Meeting - February 11, 1991:

Development Department Staff conducted a second meeting on February 11, 1991. The meeting was attended by 10 area residents. The purpose of the meeting was:

- * To further discuss the impacts of the proposed Connector Road upon the Jenmar Court and other effected residents;
- * To record comments and concerns from residents for inclusion within the study;
- * To answer residents' questions about the study; and
- * To describe the future course of the study to residents.

General Comments Recorded at February 11, 1991 Meeting:

The following represent the general comments at the meeting:

- * I need to know what is happening to make my own plans.
- * We (the residents) are in a no-win situation because the proposed road is not on the Capital Improvements Plan for five years.
- * Concern that the City will tear down the house across the street (south side of Jenmar Court) and leave mine exposed.
- * It is not fair to the residents to make us wait for the City in making a determination regarding the study. We cannot do any home improvements without a date set.
- * Feel as though the City is waiting for a large developer to make the first move.
- * It does not make sense to put in a bridge without a road or vice versa.
- * If there is a decision not to build the bridge, I want it clearly stated for 10 years that it will not get built.
- * We are all in agreement that it is a good plan.

Questions and Answers - February 11, 1991:

The following questions were recorded and answered, where possible:

- Q. When will the decision be made to adopt the study?
A. A decision to adopt the study should be made by City Council this spring, 1991.
- Q. Has there been any indication from McKitrick that he would partially fund the road?
A. After informal meetings with a representative of Mr. McKitrick it was indicated that, if the final plan enhances his property, he would contribute to the development of the proposed Connector Road.
- Q. Is the bridge being planned separately from the road?
A. The bridge and proposed Connector Road can work independently but are being planned comprehensively.
- Q. What do we do to lessen traffic on Bright Road before the study is implemented?
A. The City can look into providing speed bumps, no through traffic signs, etc. to lessen traffic impacts.

Proposed Detention Basin Meeting - February 12, 1991:

A third meeting was conducted by Development Department Staff on February 12, 1991. Consultants from Wilbur-Smith also attended the meeting and helped answer questions. The meeting was attended by 21 area residents. The purpose of the meeting was:

- * To further discuss the proposed detention basin within the Bright Road Study Area and its effects on surrounding residents;
- * To record comments and concerns from residents for inclusion within the study;
- * To answer resident's questions about the study; and
- * To describe the future course of the study to residents.

General Comments Recorded at February 12, 1991 Meeting:

The following represent the general comments at the meeting:

- * The City is taking the best part of my property with this basin. The City can just buy the whole piece.

Questions and Answers - February 12, 1991:

In addition to the preceding comments, the following questions were noted and answered where possible:

- Q. Why not make it a wet basin?
- A. There is a capacity problem in designing a wet basin. Capacity is limited if water is permanently stored on site. Higher maintenance and safety problems are also associated with wet basins.

- Q. How deep will the basin be at its deepest point?
- A. The basin will be about 13 feet deep at the center at its maximum level.

- Q. Was the design for the proposed Connector Road interrelated with basin design?
- A. The basin design was created independently of the road design. The proposed Connector Road placement was limited by the basin.

- Q. Is the City willing to take all of the property effected by the basin?
- A. That determination would be made during negotiations with the property owner.

- Q. When will the City know what property is to be taken?
- A. After April 1, 1991, the City will have legal descriptions of the site affected by the detention basin.