

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

MAY 16, 2013

AGENDA

CASE

NEW ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM CASE

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center

**Edwards Apartment Building
Tuller Road and Village Parkway
Basic Plan Review**

13-031BPR

(Approved 7 – 0, Development Plan Waivers)

(Approved 7 – 0, Basic Plan Review for the Development Plan)

(Disapproved 7 – 0, Site Plan Waiver for Façade Materials)

(Approved 7 – 0, Basic Plan Review for the Site Plan)

(Disapproved 7 – 0, Open Space Fee-in-Lieu)

PREVIOUSLY TABLED CASE

2. Community Plan Update

12-046ADM

(Approved 7 – 0)

Administrative Request

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 Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Warren Fishman, John Hardt, Victoria Newell, and Joe Budde. City representatives were Claudia Husak, Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Jennifer Readler, Rachel Ray, Justin Goodwin, Terry Foegler, Fred Hahn, Ray Harpham, Alan Perkins, Dan Phillabaum, Barb Cox, Aaron Stanford, Jeff Tyler, Sue Burness, Sharonda Whatley, Jonathan Lee, Jordan Fromm, and Libby Farley.

Motion and Vote

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

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any comments or corrections regarding the April 11, 2013 meeting minutes. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the April 11, 2013 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Taylor, abstain; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes. (Approved 6 – 0 – 1.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the draft minutes are dated May 3 and should be corrected to reflect May 2, she asked if there were any other comments or corrections regarding the May 2, 2013 meeting minutes. Mr. Fishman said the middle of the page 8 related to his comment changing the word sending, to giving.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the May 2, 2013 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Hardt seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes (Approved 7 – 0.)

Administrative Business

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She determined that the cases would be heard in the order of the published agenda.

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center Edwards Apartment Building Tuller Road and Village Parkway 13-031BPR Basic Plan Review

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application Basic Plan Review to construct a 324-unit podium apartment building on an 8.32-acre site, on the north side of a new public street in the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District northeast of the existing AMC Theater. She said this Basic Plan Review application is in anticipation of Development Plan and Site Plan Review applications and is proposed in accordance with the Zoning Code. She noted that this application also includes requests for Site and Development Plan Waivers and a request for Open Space Fee-In-Lieu. She said the Commission will be required to make five motions.

Rachel Ray said that they are pleased to present this Basic Plan Review for the Edwards Podium Apartment Building within Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. She explained that this is the first step in the development application process and includes requests for Development Plan and Site Plan Waivers that have been identified at this early stage of the proposal that require review and determination by the Commission, and involves a request to pay a fee-in-lieu of providing the full public open space dedication requirement.

Ms. Ray presented a site plan of the location of the Dublin Village Center shopping center located west of Sawmill Road, south of I-270 and Tuller Road, with the AMC Theater in the western portion of the shopping center and the Applebee's restaurant in the eastern portion facing Dublin Center Drive.

Ms. Ray provided an outline of the presentation as this is the first significant Bridge Street District project of this nature and scale, and she said she wanted to review the application and process to clarify the current stages and status of the project, the steps that will follow, and what is going to be requested of the Commission as part of the request for Basic Plan Review. She said that at the end of the presentation she will have the applicant spend some time discussing their project as well as responding to some of the issues that have been raised in the ART Report to the Commission.

Ms. Ray explained that as staff had been meeting with potential developers, architects and designers and presenting the Code in various forums, potential applicants were encouraged to meet with staff early and often, the purpose of which was to make sure that when they are ready to bring forward an application that they have a substantial understanding of the Code requirements and how that impacts their project. She said that this applicant has embraced that "early and often" process and are pleased to let the Commission know that the applicant has been meeting with staff on a regular basis even before the application was filed. She said if, however, an applicant doesn't meet with staff prior to submitting an application, there is a Pre-Application Review process built in to the Code that makes sure that once an application is ready to be filed that they have all the appropriate materials that are necessary to make sure they have a complete submittal for review.

Ms. Ray said the first step is the Basic Plan Review application, and this requires an Administrative Review Team review and recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission with a determination within 28 days from the submittal of the complete application. She said the purpose of the Basic Plan

Review is to outline the scope, character, and nature of the proposed development, and the process allows the required reviewing body (which in this case is the Planning and Zoning Commission, but might end up being the Architectural Review Board for projects in the Historic District) to evaluate the proposal for its general consistency with the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Plan as well as the Bridge Street zoning regulations. She noted that the Basic Plan Review also provided the opportunity for public input at the earliest stages of the development process.

Ms. Ray said the Basic Plan Review is required prior to submission of applications for Development Plan and Site Plan Review and since the applicant will be filing both those applications in the near future, this Basic Plan Review application includes the Basic Plan Review for both. She said the Commission is required to make a determination on the Basic Plan Review proposal to either approve, approve with conditions or deny the request.

Ms. Ray said since the applicant has already identified some of the Development Plan and Site Plan Waivers and their desire to pay a fee-in-lieu of dedicating all of the required open space, all of which require Planning and Zoning Commission review and determination, those requests have been combined with the Basic Plan Review process. She said following the Commission determination on the Basic Plan Review the next steps are the Development Plan and Site Plan Review applications and they can be filed concurrently or separately and are only required to receive Administrative Review Team review with a determination required within 28 days from the submission of a complete application.

Ms. Ray said the Development Plan Review looks at development project elements including the street network, the lots and blocks, and elements typical of what would be included in a subdivision plat which also requires review and recommendation to City Council by the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said Site Plan Review is required for all other developments that do not qualify as Minor Project Reviews. She stated that the Site Plan Review includes the specific building design and materials, open space details and all other site development standards including landscaping, parking, building materials, signs and lighting. She reported that the Administrative Review Team's review is the final step before building permitting.

Ms. Ray said the provision of publically accessible open spaces are intended to be planned and incorporated in concert with proposed development projects to the extent possible, rather than purchased by the City after the fact, using those park land funds generated by those fee-in-lieu of open space dedication payments. She said there might be circumstances in limited situations where payment of a fee might be appropriate, and as such it was included as a process in the Code, but that process does require Planning and Zoning Commission approval.

Ms. Ray presented the proposed development project overview describing the shopping center as a typical auto-oriented center with surface parking located in front of the theater, and noted that the site is served by a series of private drives coming off the public streets that circumscribe the site including Tuller Road to the north, Village Parkway to the west and Dublin Center Drive to the east. She said that a portion of the existing shopping center structures will be demolished as part of this project moving forward. She pointed out an electric transmission line easement along the western portion of the site running in front of the theater that bisects the theater from the rest of the site. Ms. Ray explained that there are new streets proposed to serve the development on the east and west sides of the new building, with the new public street serving as an east/west connector through the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. She said that this street as proposed is to be a District Connector street that will ultimately continue on west and down toward Riverside Drive that will establish the public street network and connect to a new portion of the street recently approved as part of the Vrable Skilled Nursing project.

Ms. Ray said the proposed building is on an approximately 8-acre site and will contain approximately 324 apartment dwelling units making the project approximately 40 dwelling units per acre. She stated that

there are about 519 parking spaces shown at this time to be provided in a private off-street parking lot on the western portion of the site west of the apartment building as well as on-street and principally within the parking structure within the ground story of the proposed building. She reported that in addition to the building and the parking, approximately ½ acre or so of publicly accessible open space has been provided with this development as well as 1.6 acres of privately owned and operated open space within the courtyard interiors of the building.

Ms. Ray said this building is referred to as a “podium” apartment building and has two to three stories of apartments on top of the parking garage at the first floor of the building. She explained that the building will be three stories on the southern and northern portions of the site and four stories in the center. She pointed out that there is a clubhouse and management leasing office proposed along the new principal frontage street that will help provide greater pedestrian activity along the street in that area and across from the theater. She noted that there are a few ground level apartment units proposed in the pockets of the ground floor adjacent to the proposed Pocket Parks. She said the materials proposed at this time include brick, glass and siding as primary building materials and they plan to incorporate a higher level of architectural detailing and landscaping along the ground floor where portions of the parking structure would be visible from the street.

Ms. Ray said the portions of the application for consideration under the Development Plan Review include the street network and the blocks created as part of the new streets as shown. She said that anything interior to the new blocks that are being created are not under review as part of this application, since those areas will come forward as future Basic Plan Review applications once the applicant or the owner is ready to develop those particular blocks. She reiterated that the Site Plan Review portion of this application includes the proposed use, the building type, site development standards and the provisions of open spaces.

Ms. Ray said the Administrative Review Team has reviewed the Basic Plan Review application with respect to the review criteria applicable to the Development Plan Review and determined that the proposed block layout is consistent with the objectives of the Code, which is to achieve the walkable block dimensions that place a high value on pedestrian movement and safety and a street network that appropriately distributes vehicular traffic, with the exception of the Waiver requested for the maximum block length. She said the proposed street network is consistent with the conceptual street network shown in the Bridge Street Code, with conditions relating to the coordination of intersections, spacing and alignment and also driveway spacing, which are details that will be determined through the Development Plan Review in coordination with the City Engineer and others on the Administrative Review Team.

Ms. Ray said this proposal is the first significant step toward the redevelopment of the Dublin Village Center shopping center and is being coordinated with other improvements in this center. She said this new residential site development and corresponding street networks are going to set the conditions for future development opportunities in this Neighborhood District. She stated that the Neighborhood District standards here have some other requirements for minimum amount of mixed use shopping corridor, the purpose of which is to help define a critical mass of commercial activity to anchor development in this area. She explained that since the shopping corridor is not proposed with this development, a Waiver is required to be approved by the Commission to not meet this particular requirement.

Ms. Ray referred to the proposed Waiver request to exceed the maximum block dimensions for Block B, where the Edwards site is located. She explained that the request is to have 660-foot long north/south block dimensions, which exceeds what Code allows, which is 500 feet or less for block faces or a maximum block perimeter of 1,750 feet. She said due to the configuration of the podium apartment building and the fact that it is not practical to run a street through the center of that building, the applicant is requesting a Waiver for the block dimensions for Block B. Ms. Ray stated that the dimensions for Block C, which is the theater block, are created by existing conditions, and while the maximum block perimeter is met, the 658-foot or so of Village Parkway does exceed the 500-foot limitation, but because

of preferred intersection spacing and the existing theater building footprint it's not possible to reduce the block segment along Village Parkway to meet the requirement.

Ms. Ray said this site is located within the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District, which is one of the three neighborhood districts included in the Bridge Street Code. She explained that the Neighborhood District Standards were developed to address some of the master plan elements desired in these areas, recognizing that actual development is likely to occur in phases. She explained that certain elements that would be incorporated into larger scale areas as development phased in were intended to be addressed by the Neighborhood District Standards, and for example, the oval shaped area is where the mixed use anchor, or "shopping corridor," was expected to be provided. She pointed out that since this is a primarily residential development in the northern portion of this district, it is not appropriate that the shopping corridor be provided in the northern portion of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District at this time, but the shopping corridor should be provided with future development that does occur throughout the rest of the shopping center.

Ms. Ray said the Site Plan Review criteria has been reviewed by the Administrative Review Team and based on the information that the applicant has developed at this time, and all appropriate Code sections represented have either been met, met with conditions, met with approval of the Site Plan Waiver that is being requested, or are details that are anticipated to be worked out with the development as the project moves forward.

Ms. Ray said there is one Site Plan Waiver that is being requested with this application and that is a request to use vinyl siding as a permitted primary building material in limited applications on each of the building facades. She said the primary materials as defined by Code are any materials that comprise more than 20 percent of an individual building elevation, although the Code actually requires two different primary building materials to make up that 80 percent to help break up the building facades and provide greater architectural interest. She noted that the Code does say that other high quality synthetic materials can be approved by the required reviewing body with examples of successful high quality local installations. Ms. Ray stated that the Waiver, if approved, would permit the use of vinyl siding as a permitted primary material. She reported that since the Administrative Review Team had made their recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission, staff had been meeting with the applicant and they have agreed to reduce or eliminate the use of vinyl siding but they are including this as a request for the Commission to make a determination on this since the materials were included in the materials that Administrative Review Team reviewed and based their recommendation to the Commission.

Ms. Ray referred to the request for payment of an Open Space Fee-In-Lieu. She said that while this residential project includes a sizable amount of private open space, including 1.6 acres of land provided within the courtyards of this development, the intent of the open space requirement is to achieve public open spaces that enhances quality of life and fosters a sense of community of the neighborhood at large. She explained that the desire is to provide these public open spaces scattered throughout the Bridge Street District to help provide greenway connections and also community spaces for visitors and residents.

Ms. Ray stated that staff would like to continue to work with the applicant to identify and provide the required open space within a walkable distance of this site as permitted by the Code and consistent with the open space character and network considerations as described in the Neighborhood District Standards. She said based on the number of dwelling units (324), the Code requires 200 square feet of publicly accessible open space for each of those units which ends up being about 1.5 acres of open space required. She stated that the applicant has provided some of that in the pocket parks on the west and east sides of the building and the pocket plazas on the south side of the building. She said that the applicant has also been meeting with the City to discuss strategies for providing the required open space either on-site or within the walkable distances permitted by the Code, and they are exploring opportunities to make sure that the open space is provided in a suitable manner. She said the

Administrative Review Team is recommending disapproval of the request for open space fee-in-lieu of actual land dedication, and an additional condition has been recommended that as this proposal moves forward to Development Plan and Site Plan Review, that the applicant work with the City to execute a suitable agreement that provides the full amount of required open space as required by Code as part of the next phase of development of this neighborhood district. She said the applicant has expressed a willingness to work with the City to achieve this objective, and they have begun to explore opportunities to meet this condition.

Ms. Ray noted that the Administrative Review Team's comments have been summarized and included in the ART report for the Commission's review and consideration, in addition to an Engineering memo that was provided as an attachment to the report. She said there are five determinations with five motions.

Development Plan

1. Basic Plan Review (Development Plan): The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 8 conditions:
 - 1) That the applicant coordinate driveway access along John Shields Parkway (Street Segment 1) to direct pedestrian activity, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
 - 2) That driveway access points along the neighborhood streets (Street Segments 2 and 3) be coordinated and aligned, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
 - 3) That heightened architectural detailing and an open space node be provided at the intersection of Street Segments 1 (John Shields Parkway) and 2 at the southwest corner of Block B;
 - 4) That the applicant work with the property owner to reconfigure the proposed open space to provide the required open space "node" at the intersection of Street Segments 1 and 2, with open spaces (pocket plazas or pocket parks) at a minimum of three, if not all four corners of the intersection and provide the minimum required 1.49 acres of open space on-site and/or within 660 ft. of the development site;
 - 5) That the applicant submit a demolition plan in addition to a plan for the interim site conditions, including grading, seeding, parking lot reconfiguration, etc. as part of the Development Plan Review;
 - 6) That the applicant coordinate the timing of the improvements to Tuller Road with the City Engineer;
 - 7) That the applicant provide a phasing plan as part of the Development Plan Review; and
 - 8) That the applicant provides all necessary public and private infrastructure plans as part of the Development Plan Review.

2. Development Plan Waivers: The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **approval** of the following:
 - 1) Maximum Block Dimensions, for Block B (Edwards Apartment Building site) - Table 153.060-A, to exceed the maximum permitted block length of 500 feet at approximately 658 feet, and exceed the maximum permitted block perimeter of 1,750 feet at approximately 1,987 feet, and allow Block C (AMC Theater site) to exceed the maximum permitted block length of 500 feet at approximately 658 feet.
 - 2) Placemaking Elements, Shopping Corridor - 153.063(C)(5)(a), to not be required to provide the minimum 600 linear feet of mixed use "shopping corridor" development as part of this Development Plan/Site Plan Review, and instead ensure that the shopping corridor is provided on the blocks south of Street Segment 1 (John Shields Parkway).

Site Plan Review

3. Basic Plan Review (Site Plan Review): The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 9 conditions:
 - 1) That the ridge lines parallel to the streets be interrupted to meet Code Section 153.062(D)(2)(c);

- 2) That the applicant provide a pedestrian circulation plan demonstrating safe access to the building for residents and visitors;
 - 3) That the building's architecture be modified to provide the appropriate vertical façade divisions (no spans greater than 40 feet), horizontal façade divisions (detailing required within 3 feet of the top of the ground story), and required change in roof plane (changes required every 80 feet) to meet the Podium Apartment Building Type requirement;
 - 4) That Pocket Park D be redesigned to eliminate the proposed bioretention facility and reconfigure the stormwater management facilities (if needed) to maintain usable, accessible open space area;
 - 5) That the applicant provide publicly available bicycle parking facilities within the streetscape and within the pocket parks and plazas for visitors and residents;
 - 6) That the applicant provide additional details regarding the parking structure operation and circulation at the Site Plan Review;
 - 7) That the surface parking lot plans be modified to provide a street wall consistent with Section 153.065(E) with the landscape treatment required by Sections 153.065(D)(5)(a) and (c);
 - 8) That the applicant work with Planning and Engineering to reevaluate the proposed dumpster location in relation to the proposed right-of-way, prior to Site Plan Review; and
 - 9) That the applicant work with the City to execute a suitable agreement that provides the full amount of required open space as required by Code as part of the next phase of development of the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District.
4. The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **disapproval** of the Site Plan Waiver for Section 153.062(E)(1), Façade Materials – Permitted Primary Materials, as the criteria for the Waiver are not met.

Open Space Fee-in-Lieu

1. The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **disapproval** the request for payment of a Fee-in-Lieu of open space land dedication.

Ms. Ray said it is important to note and to recognize that the redevelopment of the center has been a priority for many in the community, and City Council has been made aware of the development plans that are in the works for this project. She reported that the shopping center has been assembled over the years to provide for a larger scale more coordinated master plan for this site, however there is no master plan in place at this point in time. Ms. Ray stated that the City has been working with the property owner and is confident that future phases will be catalyzed by the new residential development that is proposed. She said that staff recognizes that this being the first truly urban project developing under the new Bridge Street District regulations, there might some pause due to the lack of an overall master plan to guide the center's overall development, but staff feels that this is a catalytic project, and with the adjacent street network and all of the adjacent blocks that are being created being very consistent with the character, they would like to see this project set a good precedent for future development in the Bridge Street District.

Richard Taylor asked for clarification regarding the process. He summarized that the Commission will be reviewing the Basic Plan Review, but they are voting on Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review Waivers, although the Waivers are only to the Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews. He asked how this was possible, since the applicant hadn't filed Development or Site Plans yet.

Ms. Ray said the applicant has identified these three Waivers for which a determination is requested from the Commission at this stage. She explained that because the applicant is required to receive Basic Plan approval from the Commission anyway, they have included the Waivers that they already know they need with this application. She said that if however the applicant identifies additional Waivers further in the process, those will have to come back before the Commission for review; these are just the Waivers that have been identified at this point.

Ben Hale, Jr., representing the applicant, Pete Edwards of the Edwards Communities Development Company, who is in attendance, said this property was purchased a few years ago by the Stavroff family, who he believes are making a leap of faith by tearing down half of the shopping center, but they are betting that they will attract new tenants and will build new buildings here as part of the shopping center. He said this is also a real leap of faith by the Edwards Company, who has done a lot of urban projects around the country as well as a lot of great developments here in Dublin such as Ballantrae, and now they want to be a part of Bridge Street. He said they have been working very closely with the City on the plans for the construction of the new streets, which will cost in excess of \$5.5 million dollars and is a huge undertaking. He said the apartments are on a fast track is because there are ideal times to open apartment projects, which is usually in the spring since the leasing season starts in March. He said that they will need to start renting apartments next March, and to make that timeline, construction needs to start by around July 1st.

Mr. Hale introduced the team, Stephen Caplinger, Creative Design + Planning; Brian Jones, architect; and Steve Simonetti, project manager.

Mr. Hale said the applicant is willing to drop the request for the vinyl on the exterior on this building. He said that Mr. Edwards has used beaded vinyl over the years and has not had any issues with it and found that it is a very good product requiring very low maintenance. He stated that the other products like Hardiplank need to be painted regularly, and since this is a three and four story building, it will not be cheap to paint. He said that from a maintenance and appearance point of view, the beaded vinyl is the best product out there, but they will agree to not use vinyl.

Mr. Hale said the property has in its interior courtyards 1.5 acres of open spaces with a pool and other places for the people who live here to use. He noted that between the 1.5 acres of open space in the interior of the building and what they're providing on the exterior, they have more than what is needed with 2.2 acres total. He added that there will likely end up being a park across the new public street to the south, and a plaza area at the theater, so there are a lot of other open spaces that will be usable. He stated that the owners will also have other open space requirements and he believes there will be plenty of other places to supply the open space in the area. He said that Pete Edwards is willing to pay the fee for the direct purchase of open space in the area and will put the funds into escrow. He said everybody believes that when this project is said and done, there will be adequate open space.

Mr. Hale said the owners have worked very diligently on the theater since they bought this site. He explained that the theater had been looking for a place to go and were even looking at Tuttle mall, but the owners have gotten the theater to agree to stay, which is important for the entire shopping center because it is a magnet that brings people in. He noted that the theater will also help with attracting good restaurants and will also help retailers. He stated that the interior is being updated with stadium seating and adding a bar, and although the theater is happy with the exterior of the building, the owners are planning to spend over a million dollars on the exterior of the building with a new design that will go to the City soon to upgrade the overall appearance of the theater consistent with the overall redevelopment plans for the shopping center.

Stephen Caplinger, said this is an ambitious project, and the owners have stepped up and been very fortunate to be part of the first phase with their project along with the AMC theater renovations. He said they took the lead with the Administrative Review Team and City staff and diligently met early and often, read the Code, did all of their homework, and put together a great design team with Brian Jones' office, Brad Parish with Architectural Alliance, and Kerry Reeds with MKSK, all of whom have been working with the owners on their master plan for the center, along with civil engineering services from EMH&T.

Mr. Caplinger said Edwards carved out an 8-acre parcel within the project and they have created a site that will net about 6 acres because of the new roads being carved out of the 8-acre site. He said the new

building will be about 5 to 20 feet from the property lines, with parallel parking on all the streets, street trees, new street lights, nice paving and an urban setting. He said it is their intent to create a new building type with a more urban feel, with a center hall corridor and elevators and much more of a dense urban project with three and four stories with ground floor parking. He said the street theme along the new John Shields Parkway will include the clubhouse entrance and will be very richly landscaped and will have sidewalks with fountain features as well as architectural elements that come out from the building. Mr. Caplinger said that the pocket parks are being used as entry ways into the building and will provide breaks in the longer east and west building façades. He said the building is shaped with three courtyards in the center of the buildings, which are very important feature of all the Edwards projects and are also planned to be richly landscaped, serving as an oasis for the residents to enjoy. He said they feel they have more than enough open space for this project with the public open space provided as well as the private open space.

Brian Jones, Jones Studio Architects, representing the applicant, said that over the last decade he has been working with Pete Edwards on a number of projects and they have been outside of central Ohio, which has been relevant to their understanding the objectives of the Edwards Companies. He said this is a big project and they looked at breaking down the scale of the buildings into very dynamic townhouse-style scale elements, and they see each of these styles with three or four key components that together give the project a wonderful texture and character.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to speak with regard to this application. [There were none.] She closed public comment portion of the agenda and invited the Commission's comments on the proposal.

John Hardt said he is excited about this project and since many people have been working on the Bridge Street District plan for a few years now and keep hearing about the potential redevelopment of Dublin Village Center, it's exciting that it's finally here, and it is exciting for him personally and he is glad to see it happening. He agreed that it is a strong step forward and he thanked the applicant for the work done to date.

Mr. Hardt asked about the warehouse site to the east of the Edwards project and how will it be handled.

Ms. Ray said the Development Plan application will deal with the new street rights-of-way, street landscaping, and other infrastructure, and she agreed that there is expected to be some impact to the adjacent parking lots as well as the side of the warehouse building where the adjacent buildings will be demolished. She said that at this time, they expect minor driveway relocations and minor parking lot landscaping modifications, and they anticipate those off-site modifications being reviewed as part of the Development Plan Review. She said if there is something that is specific enough to require additional review by the Commission in terms of either a Waiver or significant site modification requiring Basic Plan Review, it would be brought forward.

Amy Krumb noted that the existing theater parking to the east in front of the building will be removed with the new streets and blocks, and she asked when and how in the process they are going to factor in the change to the theater parking.

Ms. Ray said the theater was planning to allocate all their required parking to the north of their building. She said that with this development, a lot of the existing structures will be demolished, and the need for all of that parking is going to be greatly reduced. She said that staff will be looking at the required theater parking to make sure it is adequately provided and accessible as part of the next steps.

Mr. Hardt said there was a note in the engineering comments that the applicant is requesting to omit the bikeway on John Shields Parkway and asked for an explanation.

Ms. Ray said that comment is in reference to the cycle track planned through the Bridge Street District. She said that staff had determined that instead of having bike facilities up at sidewalk level in a highly pedestrian-oriented environment, ultimately the staff decision has been to re-route the plans for the cycle track down Village Parkway that would continue west along John Shields Parkway as additional development occurs to the west. She said that since a very different environment will be established at Village Parkway, the expectation is that bicycles would be primarily in the street at that point. She said that the cycle track is to be intended to be a commuter route connection with higher speeds and fewer interruptions, with more point A to point B travel, as opposed to pedestrian activity anticipated in this area with more potential for conflicts.

Ms. Amorose Groomes commented that with a 324-unit apartment building and the potential for 600-700 people living in this building with 500 parking spots could result in a high demand for bicycle activity.

Ms. Ray said bicycles will be accommodated at street level, with lower vehicle speeds because of the pedestrian-oriented environment, and the cycle track will be picked up to the west of this site and down along Village Parkway. She pointed out that a change of character occurs at Village Parkway as part of the overall neighborhood district standards.

Mr. Hardt said he did not agree with that, and noted that as the Commission went through the Bridge Street Corridor Code regulations, they extensively discussed the accommodation of bicycles virtually everywhere.

Ms. Ray agreed and said bicycle facilities will be provided on all streets.

Justin Goodwin said the intent for all of the streets within the Bridge Street District is that, regardless of whether or not there is a specific dedicated facility, all of the streets are intended to be bicycle-friendly. He explained that the overall design of the right-of-way itself should accommodate cyclists as part the street system, whether there is a sharrow marked on the street or a bike lane or a cycle track. He noted that they do not expect high speeds of traffic through what is going to become more of an urban core through this area. He stated that the intent is that cyclists should be able to share the travel lane with vehicles.

Mr. Hardt said they only have once chance to build the street and a cycle track will never be built later. He said he was not supportive of the proposed street without the cycle track.

Mr. Hardt said there is 1.6 acres of private open space provided on the site, and he thought it curious that a third of that is on the roof. He asked if green roof space could be considered open space if it were publicly accessible.

Ms. Ray said the Code requires a certain amount of right-of-way frontage to allow open space areas to be counted as required, publicly available open space. She supposed that there could be a circumstance that stairs could lead to a second level to a publicly accessible open space along a frontage.

Mr. Hardt said he was not inclined to consider the interior courtyards to be counted as public open space and would like to see the open space requirement met, but he wondered whether it would be possible.

Mr. Hardt said he is concerned with how to get the theater patrons across John Shields Parkway to the new designated parking areas to the north. He asked if the applicant had considered patterned pavement or something to alert vehicles that there is a pedestrian zone.

Dan Phillabaum said they have been working with EMH&T and with the grading changes that need to happen on the north façade of the theater, they are looking at means possible to steer pedestrians

toward the main intersection. He explained that there will be a four-foot drop from the sidewalk to the street and there will be barriers to direct pedestrian movement to the intersection crossing.

Victoria Newell said her struggles with the application are the process. She noted that the process is very different, and since the Commission doesn't yet have all the details about this project, they are being asked to make a leap of faith and trust that the project will turn out as they expect it to. She stated that the development will come, but she thought that everything needs to function in concert with each other to make this a truly spectacular and successful development, and not having all of the pieces makes this even more challenging for the Commission.

Joseph Budde said after all the work developing the streets, block requirements and the size of those blocks within the Code, the very first applicant is requesting excessive block sizes. He asked if there is a way to separate the building and have a part of this project on the other side of a street and build what was required to be built in terms of required block sizes.

Ms. Ray said that was a concern for staff as well, and they want this project to be as pedestrian friendly as possible and make sure there is a street network that appropriately distributes traffic the way it needs to be distributed. She said that while Planning was working on the Code, they had even worked with the applicant to develop the Podium Apartment Building as a building type as part of the additions made to make sure this type of building could be accommodated. She said that Planning recognized that there might be some areas that were more residential in character that might have this larger scale of development and still be appropriate. She said that it is the Administrative Review Team's opinion that this portion of the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District is set off to the edge of the overall area of critical mass of commercial mixed use urban core area. She noted that, while the block sizes are a concern, they feel it is appropriate to this site and this location. She said as additional development phases in over the long term, they would make sure they have the necessary street connections. She noted that there are entrances provided as part of the building so that pedestrians coming from this building could have shorter walks to the intersections from the middle of the development block.

Ms. Kramb said she was okay with the larger block assuming they were not going to break up the other adjacent blocks with new east/west streets that dead end into this block. She said if that was the plan for the streets, then she is against the proposal.

Mr. Goodwin said the streets would not be "dead ended," and they do expect that there will be streets that will terminate at "T" intersections. He pointed out that the Code allows for additional architectural details at those intersections with terminal vista requirements at the end of those streets.

Ms. Kramb said that if the intention is to put another east/west street north of John Shields, then she thought the building needed to be redesigned.

Ms. Ray said the new streets would be built as future development phased in, and they would be looking at intersection spacing with the new streets, as well as what happens to Tuller Road in the future. She stated that there are lots of factors that would be considered in terms of how those streets would be developed.

Warren Fishman said the streets as proposed make it difficult to walk around the building and crossing the main street from the movie theater to an intersection or a crosswalk is a concern. He said the open space requirement has to be met with publicly accessible space. He said they are encouraging bicycles and pedestrians and they need to put bicycle circulation in the plan and provide adequate bicycle parking.

Mr. Caplinger said there will be bicycle parking within the parking garage along with bicycle racks. He said their experience is that people carry their bicycles to their units, however it is not encouraged.

Ms. Ray said they would like some bicycle racks to be provided within the public open spaces as well. She stated that the Code requires one bicycle parking space for every two dwelling units.

Mr. Fishman said he is thrilled with this project and with Mr. Edwards because he has looked at many of his projects and have not seen a bad one yet, and he hoped that he feels that Dublin deserves the quality that was provided in Mr. Edwards' projects downtown.

Mr. Fishman asked if the existing shopping center use will be continued in the future. Mr. Hale said they are tearing down 125,000 square feet of the shopping center and they plan to rebuild 75,000-80,000 square feet of restaurant and retail.

Mr. Fishman asked for the total number of parking spaces provided within the parking garage. Mr. Caplinger said there are 324 units and approximately 325 parking spaces within the parking garage and the remaining is in the lot to the west. He said that Edwards feels comfortable with the amount of parking being provided.

Ms. Newell said the ratio is 1.64 spaces if they include all of the on-street perimeter parking and 1.4 spaces if counting the spaces being provided off-street.

Ms. Kramb said she is against the additional east/west street to the north and if they are giving a Waiver for a larger block size she does not want to see a street "T'd" into this building.

Ms. Kramb said there are mid-block pedestrian crossings into the parking lots, which makes sense, but the crossing to what might be to the east, she did not understand why it would be necessary at this time.

Kerry Reeds, MKSK, said the entrances will have pedestrian access from either the parking lot to the north end which is more the pedestrian portion of the open space, as well as from the east.

Ms. Kramb said the big parking lot will be connected to the little parking lot through one shared drive on the north side of the park.

Mr. Taylor said it is wonderful that the project being proposed is the high quality that it is and in many ways is an embodiment of the ideas that they have all been talking about and hoping to see in this district. He said the master plan does not have a lot of "plan" to it yet, but he understands and is okay with the idea that this part of the project does not having shopping associated with it, since that wouldn't make sense. He said, however, the next part of the area that gets developed better have a lot of retail associated with it to draw people.

Mr. Taylor said they need to make sure that as they are planning open spaces that the entire areas are planned as spaces with just as much thought as the buildings and that they do not become left over spaces. He wanted to make sure that if they are going to be doing a fee-in-lieu that it doesn't become a pile of money in a piggy bank, and that it is planned for spaces that will actually be provided within the district.

Mr. Taylor said the pocket parks are very interesting and when they are done they will be nice entrances to the building. He noted that pocket parks succeed because they are a relief to the urban density.

Mr. Taylor noted that the new John Shields Parkway extends to Sawmill Road, and on the plan it indicates a new entry feature at the new intersection. He said that, since this is not intended to be just a district or just a development, he would not want to see another clock tower or names of retail shops as part of an entry feature. He stated that this will be a major gateway for the city as a whole, discouraged the use of an entry feature. He said he is concerned with the extension of John Shields Parkway possibly

from I-270, across the river onto Sawmill Road and the potential for a two lane road to handle the volume of traffic that is likely to occur. He said he would like the right-of-way to be wide enough for future expansion.

Ms. Ray stated that the urban street grid helps to distribute traffic, avoiding the problem we currently have at the intersection of Bridge Street and High Street. She said that the challenge there is that there are no other options for vehicles to cross the river and they are forced to use Bridge Street to get across. She said that in the future, drivers will continue to use both Bridge Street as well as John Shields Parkway, but there is also Banker Drive and Village Parkway to help provide access onto Sawmill Road at signalized intersections to help distribute traffic demand. She said they are confident that the right-of-way and the lane configuration will meet traffic needs going forward.

Mr. Taylor said that the theater parking lot being separated by a roadway and getting people to use an intersection that is 100 feet away will be difficult, and he would like to see the access corrected now while there is nothing there and they have the opportunity to solve it.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said that she too is excited about this project and seeing the Bridge Street Corridor start to develop. She thought the theater exits should be relocated to the front and make the sides emergency-only exits, making the front exit into the courtyard with easier access to get to the parking areas.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she is concerned about only putting in six-foot side walks through these areas that are expected to be as busy as we hope. She said she did not know why we wouldn't want to put in a wider sidewalk where two people could walk together. She stated that it would be a huge mistake to make the sidewalks that narrow and would be more inclined to eliminate some of the other streetscape elements to get a bigger sidewalk.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she is concerned that they are not providing any accommodation for bikes, and even though the law says bicyclists can ride in the auto lane, in her opinion that is not "providing for" bikes and she thought the provision for bicyclists needed to be better than that in this area.

Ms. Amorose Grooms called for a short break at 8:27 pm.

Ms. Amorose Grooms resumed the meeting at 8:31 pm.

Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities, said they have been meeting with the theater even though it is outside of their 8-acre site. He reported that the theater is going from 3500 seats to 1500. He added that the theater has a contractual obligation for a certain number of parking spaces and they have contemplated and located the parking within an area relative to the theater and those factors have driven their site layout and parking.

Mr. Simonetti said that, with respect to the Edwards project, he said they exceed the Code-required parking because they know that if they can't provide adequate parking spaces for their tenants then the tenants will rent somewhere else. He agreed that it would be ideal if they could take the full 60 acres and master plan it all up front, including block layout and open space, but it is their belief that if they can come in and put in 324 apartment units (with roughly 70 percent one bedroom and the rest two bedroom units), there will be less than 500 people; however, if they can get 400-500 people in this area, then that is the catalyst that causes the rest of the development to occur throughout the center.

Mr. Simonetti said they are working with the Stavroffs and they are listening to their needs for their complex with an apartment perspective while they work with them to accommodate what they think they are going need for the rest of the development.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they will move their discussion to architecture.

Mr. Budde said this is a fantastic project based on what they have seen so far, however, he said he is not in favor of vinyl siding. He said his experience with one bedroom apartments is that they turn over rapidly, and it is not always that the tenant leaves, but that they often fail to pay rent. He said that he knows that single people with single incomes are faced with a more challenging financial situation, and with 70 percent of this project being one bedroom units, this concerns him from his experience.

Jennifer Readler said there are certain things the developer has to decide upon, such as number of bedrooms and payment of rent, and the Commission should not go into a review of that part of the application.

Ms. Newell said she likes this project and the renderings are lovely. She commented that the drawings in the back half of the packet include lovely renderings, and she heard a great presentation about the texture of materials. She noted that the applicant talked about how they were planning to change the materials across the facades, and yet she looked at the north building façade that appears very flat in the elevations that is in the packet. She asked how are they moving forward, knowing that staff has assured the Commission that they will get the quality and detail they desire.

Ms. Ray noted that the Administrative Review Team raised the same concern about the north elevation. She said that the podium apartment building type does have special detailing requirements for where the parking structure at the street level will be visible. She agreed that there is some concern that the design is not there yet, but they have made the applicant aware of their expectations and they will work with them on it. She said the Code has requirements for multiple different types of primary materials to help break up the façades and get more architectural interest in the elevations, and the applicant has heard and understands the concern.

Ms. Newell said the printed form is the record going forward and not necessarily what is stated at this meeting. She said she is bothered by the printed form, and wondered whether it would be referenced in the future and whether it would clearly convey the desire for quality and detail with respect to the architecture.

Ms. Ray said that concern was specifically documented within the report. She pointed out that as staff as research is done for each project, the reports and minutes from past Commission meetings are often referenced more than the graphics. She said the point is well made that this is all part of the overall record, and the Code requirements still have to be met.

Mr. Jones said this is part of the process, and as the plans move from the general to the specific, they are actually six weeks beyond what was included in the original submittal packet. He stated that they have solved a lot of the concerns, but the three dimensional renderings do the best job of showing some of the steps and surfaces and the massing and articulation that is a part of these buildings. He said that he has a long history of working with this team and this is representative of the projects this team has put together, and that is the strongest qualification and fundamental part of their product offering. He said that if there are things that are missing from the very extensive Code that has been established and they are subject to performing within, that they will bring those back to the Commission for review.

Mr. Simonetti said this is a process where the actual architectural detail is not submitted for review until the Site Plan gets submitted which is 28 days after the Development Plan gets submitted, which typically is after the Basic Plan is approved. He suggested they are ahead of where they might normally be, where the process is for the Commission.

Mr. Fishman said they have talked about no vinyl siding and they deserve in Dublin to get an all-masonry building like in Edwards' downtown development.

Ms. Krumb said that, from what she could tell, the renderings are improving and she likes what has been shown and not necessarily what was in the packet. She said she did not like the use of wrought iron gates along the first level along the east and west elevations and did not see as many in the newer drawings. She said she did not like the first floor treatments with the gates and the fake signage over the gates. She commented that the south elevation did not have a strong central focal point, but thought it might be fixed. She agreed that there should be no use of vinyl siding, and but overall, the architecture will get there.

Mr. Hardt said he shares the concern with the elegance in the renderings being missing from the submitted documents, but the displays presented at this evening's meeting demonstrate that the project is heading in the right direction and in fact look better than what was submitted. He asked about roof pitches of the front to back of the longer roofs, since they did not look to be a 6:12 pitch.

Ms. Ray said that is an element that will be refined as it goes forward, since Mr. Hardt is correct that the Code does have a range of permitted roof pitches.

Mr. Hardt agreed with Ms. Krumb's comments on signage. He said there is something a bit a "Disney-esque" with some portions of the elevation being made to look like a storefront. He said that, given the whole district is conceived to be an active and vibrant work place and play place, he is not in favor of that kind of architectural move; if it is an apartment, then it should look like an apartment.

Mr. Taylor said everyone has hit on his comments, but he wanted to know why they are all afraid of big buildings. He said he is uncomfortable with trying to make this big building look like a series of little buildings. He said he likes the north elevation of this building because it is the only elevation that looks like a building and not a collection of smaller buildings, but he agreed that it can be improved but it doesn't need bits of siding and other materials, and it looks good the way it is with a good concept.

Mr. Taylor said the south elevation is good and symmetrical, very clear and easy to delineate the parts that make it up, and if there is a part of the building that works as a collection of buildings, it is there. He said that on the east and west elevations, that idea falls apart because it's trying to be something like eight different buildings jammed together and he thought it would be better to make it two buildings with a piece in between, or three individual buildings, or one big building. He said he would love to see a simpler building with an overall concept and get away from "Disney-esque." He said the two corners of the buildings are detailed to look like shops, but they are in fact apartments, and should look like apartments and get rid of the signage that makes it look fake.

Mr. Taylor said he thought they should get rid of the siding altogether and make the building all brick and simplify the whole building. He said they need to work on roof pitches and window frames and the windows need to have a profile and be set back from the brick, as required by the Code. He commented on the cornice and trim details shown on the rendering presented this evening. He said there are other ways to create the detail without introducing new materials that are going to cause maintenance issues. He said the railings appear to have with details and a balcony railing with design characters add tons of life to a building. He said that with buildings like this in a district like this, you experience the building at different levels and cannot let the detailing fall down in any part. He said it has to be richer as they approach the building, so elements such as the type of brick, window frames, railings, cornices and materials are vitally important.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she finds it an attractive building and wanted to make sure the bar is set very high with this project. She said that this takes a tremendous amount of faith on the part of the Commission, far more than she is comfortable with, but it is the charge that has been set before the Commission, and the product better be good or this Commission will request Code changes. She stated that this is their chance to get it right, or they will do things differently in the future.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she would move on to the recommendations, if the Commission had no further comments at this time. She referred to the Development Plan Waivers and asked if the Commissioners had any concerns with the two requested Waivers for the block dimensions or the shopping corridor.

Ms. Newell said she is okay with the block design that is proposed and is also okay with the street “T-ing” into the building, since she thought the goal was to provide pedestrian-friendly streets, and she thought much of the conversation on this topic was on being car-friendly.

Mr. Taylor agreed with Ms. Newell and said he has no problem with the building size and is only concerned with the lack of a mid-block pedestrianway. He said he rejects the notion that the building looks like it has an inset on both sides and that somehow satisfies the intent of the Code for mid-block pedestrian access. He said he is in favor of the Waiver for block dimensions, but he doesn't agree with the stated reason. He said he thought the building being too big is not a reason for the Waiver.

Mr. Hardt said he agrees with Mr. Taylor, and the comment in the staff report that says that the Waiver request to maximum block size is caused by the proposed building type, and he said he cannot think of a worse reason to ask for a Waiver. He said the whole intent of the Bridge Street Corridor is to create a network of lots and blocks and streets, and then fill those blocks with buildings. He said that the notion that because the building is too big they want to leave the mid-block divisions out is not a good argument. He said he can support this Waiver because of the specific block. He stated that there are two specific characteristics about this lot that are unique; the bend in the road north of the theater, and the slight southward trend of Tuller Parkway. He said that if the mid-block alleys were omitted as development occurs to the west, the subsequent blocks (whether they have mid-block crossings or not) are going to fall into line with the required dimensions. He said that if that weren't the case he wouldn't support the requested Waiver because he was concerned that a precedent would be set that would carry on down to the river. He said that in sum, he does think this specific request meets the threshold of the unique site characteristics and that is why he supports the Waiver.

Ms. Krumb said she had the same comment and the reason for the Waiver.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see a terminal vista treatment at the areas where a street might “T” into the Edwards block based on the best information they have on hand at this time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that the second portion of the Development Plan Waiver regarding the Placemaking Elements, Shopping Center did not need conversation. The Commission agreed that all were in support for this Development Plan Waiver to not require a shopping corridor as part of this application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any questions or additional conditions to be considered for the Basic Plan Review.

Motion #1 and Vote – Development Plan Waivers

Mr. Taylor made a motion, and Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the two waivers. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes reviewed the additional four conditions added by Planning and Zoning Commission:

Motion #2 and Vote – Basic Plan Review for the Development Plan

Mr. Fishman moved, and Mr. Taylor seconded, to approve the Basic Plan Review for the Development Plan with 12 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant coordinate driveway access along John Shields Parkway (Street Segment 1) to direct pedestrian activity, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
- 2) That driveway access points along the neighborhood streets (Street Segments 2 and 3) be coordinated and aligned, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
- 3) That heightened architectural detailing and an open space node be provided at the intersection of Street Segments 1 (John Shields Parkway) and 2 at the southwest corner of Block B;
- 4) That the applicant work with the property owner to reconfigure the proposed open space to provide the required open space “node” at the intersection of Street Segments 1 and 2, with open spaces (pocket plazas or pocket parks) at a minimum of three, if not all four corners of the intersection and provide the minimum required 1.49 acres of open space on-site and/or within 660 ft. of the development site;
- 5) That the applicant submit a demolition plan in addition to a plan for the interim site conditions, including grading, seeding, parking lot reconfiguration, etc. as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant coordinate the timing of the improvements to Tuller Road with the City Engineer;
- 7) That the applicant provide a phasing plan as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 8) That the applicant provides all necessary public and private infrastructure plans as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 9) That the applicant provide a designated bicycle way and enhanced pedestrian pathways on John Shields Parkway;
- 10) That the applicant provide additional sidewalk width on the eastern north-south street;
- 11) That the applicant work with staff to address concerns regarding theater exits and safe roadway crossings for pedestrians; and
- 12) That the applicant provide greater architectural detailing at the terminal vista of a potential road connection east of the proposed apartment building.

Mr. Hale agreed to the conditions.

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

Motion #3 and Vote – Site Plan Waiver for Façade Materials

Mr. Taylor moved, and Ms. Newell seconded, to disapprove the Site Plan Waiver for Façade Materials.

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

Motion #4 and Vote – Basic Plan Review for the Site Plan

Mr. Taylor moved, and Mr. Hardt seconded, to approve the Basic Plan Review for the Site Plan with 9 conditions:

- 1) That the ridge lines parallel to the streets be interrupted to meet Code Section 153.062(D)(2)(c);
- 2) That the applicant provide a pedestrian circulation plan demonstrating safe access to the building for residents and visitors;
- 3) That the building’s architecture be modified to provide the appropriate vertical façade divisions (no spans greater than 40 feet), horizontal façade divisions (detailing required within 3 feet of the top of the ground story), and required change in roof plane (changes required every 80 feet) to meet the Podium Apartment Building Type requirement

- 4) That Pocket Park D be redesigned to eliminate the proposed bioretention facility and reconfigure the stormwater management facilities (if needed) to maintain usable, accessible open space area;
- 5) That the applicant provide publicly available bicycle parking facilities within the streetscape and within the pocket parks and plazas for visitors and residents;
- 6) That the applicant provide additional details regarding the parking structure operation and circulation at the Site Plan Review;
- 7) That the surface parking lot plans be modified to provide a street wall consistent with Section 153.065(E) with the landscape treatment required by Sections 153.065(D)(5)(a) and (c);
- 8) That the applicant work with Planning and Engineering to reevaluate the proposed dumpster location in relation to the proposed right-of-way, prior to Site Plan Review; and
- 9) That the applicant work with the City to execute a suitable agreement that provides the full amount of required open space as required by Code as part of a future phase development of the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District.

Mr. Hale agreed to the conditions.

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

Motion #5 and Vote – Open Space Fee-in-Lieu

Mr. Hardt moved, and Ms. Newell seconded, to disapprove the request for payment of a Fee-in-Lieu of open space land dedication.

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

Pete Edwards, Edwards Communities Development Company, thanked the Commission for the Waiver to the maximum block size, because it was much more important than they realize. He said he understood what was being said about the materials. He said he had been working with Brian Jones for 10 to 15 years and relies a lot on his guidance on architectural design. He added that they would like to build much better building even than the Commission does, but he was concerned that some of the material choices would drive up the development costs so much to the point that the units could not be rented at a marketable rate. He said that one bedroom units are becoming increasingly popular as people want to live alone, and the size of the apartments has also gotten much smaller. He said that his units are upscale, and at the same time, he has found that vinyl is a much better product with using light colors that do not fade or need painted. He said they are learning and they have hired the best people and they will give them all a good product.

2. Community Plan Update 12-046ADM

Administrative Request

Mr. Goodwin said he wanted to give a quick summary of what has changed from the last Commission meeting. He said they had a thorough review at that time and Planning has summarized the changes made since then in the Planning Report. He said that Planning has gone through and done a comprehensive effort at formatting the site and taken the track changes off, so the Commission can see what the Plan is going to look like.

Mr. Goodwin said there are still some tweaks to the formatting that will be done. He said the bulk of the plan is what will be adopted as seen now. He said you can click on different chapters and see the previous track changes in a PDF format. Mr. Goodwin said Planning has placed a lot of images throughout the Plan to help illustrate the points.

Mr. Goodwin said the Commission had addressed doing a better job at addressing public transportation and they have tried to graphically expand how they are discussing future bus enhancements and potential rail options to Dublin in the future in the transportation chapter. He said they are making sure they have a complete bikeways plan depicted and they are showing all of the future bikeway connections that they would see in the various area plans as well as in the CIP.

Mr. Goodwin said on the front page they have added the “What is the Community Plan” section with a lot of text and also added some images to address the Commission's concern of the lay person not understanding the difference between a Community Plan, the Zoning Code or the Capital Improvements Program.

Mr. Goodwin said it was suggested that they better address sustainability in the Plan and they have added that as one of the Foundation Elements of the Community Plan because Planning agrees that the concept of sustainability is inherent to all of the Community Plan's objectives but wanted to do a better job of explaining this.

Mr. Goodwin said Ms. Readler can address the process for adopting the new digital format of the plan if needed.

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

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any further discussion from the Commission. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt moved, and Mr. Budde seconded, to approve this Administrative Request and forward a recommendation of approval to City Council of the proposed amendments to the 2007 Community Plan.

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

Communications

Ms. Husak said she wanted to make sure all the Commissioners received an invitation to the recognition ceremony Monday, May 20, 2013.

Ms. Kramb said she did not get an invite to either the recognition ceremony or the Memorial Tournament. Ms. Husak said the recognition was a regular email from the Clerk's office.

Mr. Fishman said he did not get an email either, but did receive a card and when he called they were out of passes.

Ms. Husak said she could not rectify the invitation to the tent and apologized and staff has agreed that any kind invitations to events will continue to be sent to personal emails and City related business will go to their City email addresses.

Mr. Hardt and Ms. Amorose Groomes said they received both emails to his Dublin address.

Mr. Taylor said regarding administrative approvals on signs he was concerned with the approvals included. He showed a picture of a sign and asked if the white part will be lit at night. Ms. Husak said the letters will be lit at night. Ms. Amorose Groomes said it is an internally illuminated sign.

Mr. Hardt said they can do an acrylic sign face that is white that the light does not come through. Ms. Husak said they are required to have the background opaque.

Mr. Taylor said the two logos and names on the signs looks like someone just cut them out and taped them to the sign, the composition to that is un-interesting and they need to press people to do better jobs on the design because these signs are visible.

Mr. Hardt said buried in the staff report for the Edwards case was a comment that said the detailed Code Analysis was provided for the applicants benefit and he wanted to make sure the Commission will continue to see them, because the document was extremely helpful.

Ms. Husak agreed and thought it was not included in the materials provided online for ART materials. Mr. Hardt said it was implied it would not always be included.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the report talked about that this is more detail than they will typically see and if that is the case, she does not know how they are suppose to make any comments on it, because if there are less detail than what was presented, why bother and the detail that was provided tonight was a minimum standard to make any educated comments on what was being reviewed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 9:58 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on June 6, 2013.