



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.Dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

MAY 15, 2014

AGENDA

- 1. Bates Property Management** **5560 Shier Rings Road**
14-019CU **Conditional Use (Approved 7 – 0)**
- 2. NE Quad, Subarea 3 - Wyandotte Woods Multi-Family** **Wyandotte Woods Blvd.**
14-032INF **Informal (Discussion)**
- 3. Tuttle Crossing/I-270, Subarea 5A** **5515 Parkcenter Circle**
14-033FDP **Final Development Plan (Approved 4 – 3)**

Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Joe Budde, Victoria Newell, Amy Kramb, Richard Taylor, John Hardt and Amy Salay. City representatives present were Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Yazan Ashrawi, Alan Perkins, Tammy Noble-Flading, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Rauch, Aaron Stanford and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt moved, to adjourn the meeting into Executive Session regarding personnel matters. Ms. Kramb seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Kramb moved to reconvene the meeting. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt moved to appoint Victoria Newell as the 2014 – 2015 Vice Chair. Ms. Salay seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved to appoint Chris Amorose Groomes as the 2014 – 2015 Chair. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Ms. Newell seconded, to accept the April 17, 2014, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, abstain; Ms. Salay, abstain; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 0 – 2)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there were three cases on the agenda and two were eligible for consent. She stated Ms. Newell had requested the Parkcenter Circle application be pulled and stated the agenda order would be as follows: 1) Wyandotte Woods - Informal Request; 2) Bates Property Truck Rental – Conditional Use; and 3) Parkcenter Circle – Final Development Plan. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.]

1. Bates Property Management 14-019CU

5560 Shier Rings Road Conditional Use

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for Truck and Automotive Rentals and Leasing for a 9,022-square-foot building on a property zoned TF, Technology Flex District. She said the site is on the east side of Dublin Industrial Lane, north of the intersection with Emerald Parkway.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in witnesses that intended to address the Commission on this case.

Tammy Noble-Flading reported the Planning and Zoning Commission had approved the Code modification for this type of business in November 2013 and it proceeded to City Council in January 2014.

Ms. Noble-Flading presented the site that is approximately 1.3 acres just north of Shier Rings Road. She said the site is fully developed; the properties surrounding this site are zoned similarly and contain industrial and office type uses. She said the building is situated on the central portion of the property with parking surrounding it. She said the applicant is a single tenant of this building and there will be no other tenants associated with the building. She explained their general operations occur Monday through Friday with additional Saturday hours from 9 am – 12:00 pm. She stated the business is closed on Sunday. She said there are five employees. She said there will be 16 vehicles available for rental. She said the parking area for the rental vehicles is going to be predominantly on the east and south sides of the parking area, with two spaces left to the north for parking. She explained the remaining portions of the site will either be used by employee or patron parking.

Ms. Noble-Flading said the application meets the criteria for the conditional use request as well as the standards associated with the Tech Flex District, with the exception of landscaping requirements for screening of vehicular use areas. She said the applicant had proposed deciduous plant material along the western edge of the parking area that would not provide year-round screening that is required by the landscape Code. Planning is requesting that this plant material be modified to meet the requirement and the applicant has agreed to the condition listed in the Planning Report.

Ms. Noble-Flading stated that Planning is recommending approval with one condition that the landscape plan be modified to substitute the Burning Bush with Upright Yew on the western edge of the parking area and Chinese Junipers in the northwest corner of the parking area.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the applicant to step forward and state his name and address for the record.

Jack Reynolds, attorney for Smith and Hale, 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43215, said they have worked with Planning to draft the Code modification that was presented to the Planning Commission in November 2013. He said they requested that this case be tabled on April 3, 2014, so they could ensure

that all of the landscaping concerns were adequately addressed. He said they agreed to the screening material recommended by staff and is available to answer any questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited anyone from the public to speak on behalf of this case. [Hearing none.] She closed the public portion of the meeting to allow discussion amongst the Commissioners.

Amy Krumb questioned the primary entrance off of Dublin Industrial Lane as all the patron parking is off of Shier Rings Road. She asked if they were changing the entrances in any way or putting up new signs.

Mr. Reynolds said they will add a sign to direct the patrons to park in the appropriate location. He explained that the majority of users to that parking area will primarily be staff. He said there are not a lot of patrons who drive to the site, park their cars, and get into a truck and leave. He said they rent for longer periods of time so people are usually dropped off to pick up the trucks because people do not want their cars to sit on a parking lot for a couple of days.

Ms. Krumb said the Planning Report stated that this plan was modified based on comments from Planning and Zoning but they tabled the application in April.

Ms. Noble-Flading stated that is correct, the applicant did table the case in April. She said before this request had been made, one of the Commission members had recommendations about the landscaping material proposed by the applicant. She said in response to that comment, the applicant modified their landscaping plan.

Ms. Newell said she appreciated that the applicant tabled the case in April and have since rectified many of the issues she had at that time. She said she was still concerned with the long row of screening that essentially becomes a fence. She also recognizes there are several portions of the site where there is not room to do anything else but asked if they could provide more staggering on the north portion of the site where they have wider lawn width.

John Hardt said the driveway is right justified along the edge of the building and asked why the parking spaces are not on the other side.

Eric Morton, 7071 Hill Road, Plain City, Ohio, said when the architect did the Site Plan, he said the spaces were necessary for the truck to back out.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was going to be any additional mounding.

Mr. Reynolds responded that none was planned.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see some mounding along Shier Rings Road based on the proximity to Emerald Parkway. She said a four-foot mound with trees planted on the backside of the mound would be far more attractive. She explained that as the Serbian Spruce age, they become very transparent. She is concerned that in the next five or ten years, the line of site would be straight into the underside of these trucks.

Mr. Reynolds stated that some of those are existing trees and suggested bushes may address the concerns of the Chair.

Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed to two-tiered planting with a hedgerow that would provide more of a lower buffer.

Mr. Reynolds said it could be conditioned with staff.

Ms. Salay clarified it would be a mixed planting with something lower than the evergreens and agreed it would be very attractive.

Ms. Newell said that the applicant said they did not need as many visitor parking spaces as they have. She asked if it would be better for the circulation of the site that fewer parking spots be allowed if they can have the backup room. She asked what the distance was.

Mr. Morton said they were comfortable with the parking.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thought restriping would help.

Mr. Taylor asked for confirmation that those spaces do not get much use.

Mr. Reynolds said 16 customer spaces would not be used at one time, however he would prefer to leave the parking as is.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any other comments or issues. [Hearing none.] She asked Jack Reynolds if he agreed to the two conditions and he answered yes, the applicant agrees.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt moved, Ms. Kramb seconded, to recommend approval of the Conditional Use request with two conditions:

- 1) That the landscape plan be modified to substitute the Burning Bush with Upright Yew on the western edge of the parking area and Chinese Junipers in the northwest corner of the parking area; and
- 2) That the applicant supplement their proposal with planting materials to block the site line beneath the evergreens along Shier Rings Road, as approved by Planning.

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

2. NE Quad, Subarea 3 - Wyandotte Woods Multi-Family 14-032INF

Wyandotte Woods Blvd. Informal

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for a 120-unit, multiple-family development located west of Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, 1,000 feet north of the intersection with Emerald Parkway within Subarea 3 of the Northeast Quadrant Planned Unit Development District.

Jennifer Rauch said this is an Informal Review and the next step would be a Final Development Plan as the zoning is already in place for this development. She presented the site that is located on the southwest side of the Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, just recently connected through the entire Wyandotte Woods subdivision. She said there are existing single-family homes within the Wyandotte Woods Subdivision and the new sections under construction within Sections 6-8. She said the applicant has met with the neighbors, prior to submitting an application.

Ms. Rauch stated the proposal includes three, four-story buildings, each with 40 units and 210 parking spaces with the buildings situated in the center of the site. She said there is one main public entry from Wyandotte Woods Boulevard at the northeast corner of the site. She said there is a private interior street connecting the site from east to west and includes on-street parking. She said a secondary emergency access point is in the northwest portion of the site between two single-family lots in Section 8, currently under construction. She said parking is proposed to the rear of each building in smaller pods, separated by landscaping. She said the five northern pods closest to the building will incorporate a covered parking area. She said a clubhouse with a pool is located within a large open space north of the proposed

buildings, across from the drive serving this site. She said the intent is to provide a buffer between Section 8 and the proposed site. She reported new trees or tree replacement would take place in the southwestern corner and preservation of existing trees in the opposite corner.

Ms. Rauch said preliminary elevations were provided in the packets for review designed to look similar front to back, with the main access from the rear, adjacent to the parking areas. She said the proposal includes porches and balconies on all four floors. She said the predominant materials are brick and siding with a stone base, generally earth-tone with a more vibrant color of red brick. She noted they are screening their mechanicals and AC units so there are no ground units.

Ms. Rauch said the development text limits the height of buildings to 35 feet, and the proposed buildings are 47 feet, 6 inches tall. She stated the proposal brought forth with the taller buildings, as an option to have a smaller area of building footprints allowing more useable open space on the site. She noted the increased height would require a text modification, should this move forward.

Ms. Rauch said the 210 parking spaces to the rear are based on the applicant's user needs and history. She stated Code would require 300 parking spaces based on 2.5 parking spaces for each dwelling unit. She said they are showing a future parking area in case more parking is needed. She noted the Commission had previously mentioned the importance of visitor parking within these types of developments and the applicant should more clearly indicate where visitor spaces are anticipated for use. As mentioned earlier, she said the applicant is proposing covered parking.

Ms. Rauch read the discussion questions and invited feedback from the Commission:

- 1) Are the proposed four-story, 40-unit buildings, parking, and opens space sited appropriately given the existing site conditions?
- 2) Could the Commission support a text modification to the building height?
- 3) Is the proposed architectural concept appropriate to the surrounding area?
- 4) Could the Commission support a lower parking ratio for this development than required by Code?
- 5) Should additional open space amenities be considered?
- 6) Other considerations by the Commission?

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the applicant to step forward and state their name and address for the record.

Jason Kambitsis, Director of Land Development for AR Building Company, 310 Seven Fields Blvd., Suite 360, Seven Fields, PA 16046. He said Dan Mancosh, President of AR Building Company, Geoff Campbell, architect from Rothschild Doyno Collaborative, and Kevin Kershner, civil engineer from Stantec were also present.

Mr. Kambitsis thanked the Planning Staff, serving as a great resource. He said the community members have been extremely helpful and responsive and thanked them for attending tonight.

Mr. Kambitsis said AR Building is a residential real estate development firm, established in 1968, with 5,000 units over six states. He said they are distinguished from other real estate development firms as they are the owner, developer, and managers. He said they build with longevity in mind, committed to the community, and doing the project right.

Mr. Kambitsis provided a background of the process to date. He said they have met with staff twice, and on April 15 they met with the East Dublin Civic Association, the Wyandotte Woods HOA, and the Wyandotte Woods Civic Association. He said they listened and incorporated their feedback. He said his intent tonight is to gain feedback from the Commission. He introduced Jeff Campbell to provide an overview.

Geoff Campbell, Rothschild Doyno Collaborative, located at 2847 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15222, presented an elevation slide showing the last building they designed for AR Building. He said his firm has been working with AR Building for more than 15 years. He said they design based on the context and what fits best on a site. He requested feedback on that last building. He has heard from the community that they want it to blend in with the rest of the neighborhood. He said they are trying to use similar materials as much as possible.

Mr. Campbell clarified they currently plan on having 40 condensers and have room for 24 of those to be located up on the roof leaving 16 units on the ground. He said they are conscientious of the views from above. He referred to the Site Plan as he responded to some of the feedback received from the neighborhood to break up the parking. He said the amount of water and ponds are based on the last submission they had seen. He said the existing pond would remain to use for stormwater management but it would not be this extensive. He said a tree survey is being done and their goal is to preserve as many trees as possible. He said in all the years they have been working with AR Building, they have built garages and parking underground but never built a freestanding parking unit. He said they have not clearly envisioned how the covered parking area could work, and requested feedback. He said their goal is to have it look as nice as possible and visually pleasing from the upper floor units.

Ms. Amorose Groomes opened up the floor to public comment and invited the first person listed on the sign-up sheet.

Jerry Kosicky, 313 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, said the neighbors had a very productive meeting with the developers a few weeks ago; it was constructive and collaborative. He reported they had many meetings with the previous developer about the same property and they greatly appreciated the City's support at that time in upholding high quality building standards, great design and materials, and preserving the character of the neighborhood. He said they understand this is zoned for multi-family use, done many years ago, to which they do not oppose.

Mr. Kosicky said he is concerned with the significant piece of wooded property being developed in such a way as to be an asset to the neighborhood. He wants to see it developed to high standards with enduring value and great aesthetics. He confirmed the stormwater retention ponds are counted towards the 7.7 acres of open space.

Mr. Kosicky said he understands the tradeoffs for height and land consumption while achieving 120 units on this property. He said the buildings proposed are very tall and the site is going to be consumed by retention ponds, driveways, buildings, parking structures, and a parking lot.

Mr. Kosicky suggested the parking be accommodated underground as it seems inadequate and can affect the surrounding neighborhood. He said the covered parking as it is proposed is not very aesthetically pleasing. He said the plans are supposed to preserve views from second and third floors but the first floor apartments will only have views of the parking areas.

Mr. Kosicky noted the grassy area north of the buildings is unattractive, no park-like amenities and the space could be made more useful and attractive, something to draw people outside and enjoy that space. Mr. Kosicky commented the elevators and picture windows are nice features but he said the buildings are massive and somewhat intimidating. He said he would like to see some variation in the footprint and the design of the structures, creating more articulated details, more interest, and livable. He suggested four buildings with 30 units and three stories high. He stated if the Commission considers a variance for the height, he thinks it should be minor and perhaps for higher ceilings in each unit or to accommodate underground parking. He noted their neighborhood is not within the Bridge Street Corridor where tall buildings will someday become the norm. He said the closest four-story buildings he is aware of are the East Bank condominiums and they are in Columbus. He expressed his appreciation for the care AR

Building has put into the plans and the collaborative and open, friendly approach they have displayed. He said the plans as they exist now are not quite right for their neighborhood.

Brett Page, 7638 Kelly Drive, said he read through the past decisions and petitions that contained over 150 signatures from the previous proposals. He said the neighbors were simply focusing on connectivity and safety as they would want the incoming residents to be fully integrated into their community. He emphasized architecture and parking. He said he has a hard time envisioning 120 units, pretty and connected to this neighborhood. He applauds their effort because they are listening. He appreciates the applicant is trying to maximize green space but these are very tall, massive buildings. He said the neighbors are looking for a healthy balance. He asked if four buildings could be an option and staggering the building footprints. He indicated this is very nice land with natural features he hoped could be respected and softened while maintaining connectivity to Wyandotte Woods. He said he liked the walkway shown to the current path through Emerald Fields Park and down to the high school. He remarked the roundabout has really helped.

Kathy Harter, 7825 Holiston Court, a trustee at Wyandotte Woods, said the process is moving very nicely as they are all communicating and the developers are listening to the different ideas the neighbors have. She said she thought the developers have a good understanding of what the neighbors want within the community.

Ms. Harter said the neighbors are concerned about the four stories. She said she has driven by three-story buildings in the area and tried to envision another story on top for this project. She reported the neighbors thought the units may be too low in price. She said they are concerned with how this development flows and connects. She said they appreciated the green spaces with more walking and bike paths. She said they are interested in what the name would be. Ms. Harter said they are going through a lot with the new roundabout and inquired about the new sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if anyone else would like to speak with respect to this application. [Hearing none.] She closed the public portion off for Commission discussion and questions.

Richard Taylor thanked the applicants for their presentation and the public in attendance. He said he was pleased to see the cooperation going on, especially for a proposal such as this. He said they have heard many cases over the past few years that are inserting a different use or a slightly different use in an existing area. He said Dublin is doing a lot of infill and there is resistance to that and is happy to know the residents understand what is going to happen in terms of the use. Mr. Taylor said he was on the Commission for the early stages of the proposal in 2008. He noted what has changed from the last proposal is a lot of good improvements and recalls that useable open space was a big issue.

Mr. Taylor said he likes that the parking is more or less hidden behind the buildings, the buildings are pushed back from the houses, and there are fewer curb cuts and buildings. He said there is some work to be done and is concerned about the pond in the upper right and the grade change from the backyards of the buildings to the water level in the ponds with respect to safety. He said there is going to be increased traffic per all the units comprised of working people and he envisions a lot of bottleneck traffic at the entrance to the development on the east side at peak times. He thought this might prompt traffic to take a shorter route than Riverside Drive by going through Wyandotte Woods Boulevard but hoped the completion of Emerald Parkway would alleviate that. He said he would encourage a right-out traffic pattern. He said the Commission has been consistent with not allowing the HVAC units to be visible as much as possible. He said he cannot even begin to accept covered parking. He said he appreciated the comments from the neighbors to blend with the surrounding structures and appreciated the applicants' efforts to try and use some of those same elements and materials but if these are going to be large massive tall buildings, using single-family homes for architectural inspiration is the wrong direction. He asked they consider how to make large buildings work and look good and think about these buildings as

one entire building, top to bottom. He recommends they look at the Craughwell Village on Perimeter Center for inspiration for high quality architecture and design materials on large buildings.

Mr. Taylor said photos from other projects showing exposed lumber and the inside of the balconies would not be acceptable.

Mr. Taylor said he could probably come to accept four-story buildings, but there needs to be a really big step up in the overall design of the building exteriors.

John Hardt said he echoes some of the comments Mr. Taylor made and is thankful for the residents who came tonight and the progress that has been made. He began by addressing the questions posed by staff:

- 1) Siting of the Property – He appreciates the reduction in the number of buildings to help preserve the green space and sensitivity to the homes to the north and the woods on the site. He said he is not ready to comment if three or four buildings was the right direction. He appreciates the connections to the surrounding area and the extent of the pathways, as this is critical to be an integral part of the community. He warned the applicant to be cautious about reducing the ponds to the minimum size needed for engineering; they need to sustain themselves.
- 2) Building Height – He said height relates closely to the siting of the buildings. He is not opposed or entirely sold on the four-stories but the architecture has to be something special, due to the significant mass of the buildings. He understands the request for height to reduce the footprint to preserve more open space. He asked what the intended ceiling height is. Dan Mancosh replied 8 feet for ceiling height.
- 3) Architecture – He agreed with everything Mr. Taylor said. He said he can only respond to the renderings and photos from other projects AR Building has completed and said they look ordinary and very high quality architecture is expected. He said he was also going to mention Craughwell Village as an example to follow. He said the proposal does not have to look like Craughwell, but the quality of architecture, detailing, and materials are a benchmark. He said vinyl windows without trim are not acceptable. He said he wants to see an honest use of materials, using traditional materials in a traditional way.
- 4) Parking – He confirmed 300 spaces were required by Code and 210 spaces were proposed, which makes him uneasy. He said he could support a reduction in parking provided below Code with a couple of caveats: 1) He would want to see a plan that accommodates the missing parking spaces to be put back in as a relief valve; and 2) He would want to see quantitative analysis for the reduction from 300 to 210 as that seems severe. He said he has never seen a nice looking car port and will be critical of the design, materials, and architecture if brought forward. He said parking under the buildings might be considered, making the first level parking with three levels of units, above.
- 5) Entryway into the Development – He said when you pull off of Emerald onto Sawmill Parkway and head into Wyandotte Woods, this site is the first area approached. He suggested making the entry look like a residential subdivision and not an apartment complex with quality signage and landscaping.

Amy Salay thanked everyone for coming and appreciates the neighbors working with the developers, which is significant, and a better project will be the result. She asked the developer who the target market is. Mr. Kambitis answered young working professionals, empty nesters, and one to two people per unit were the target.

Ms. Salay asked what the rent might be. Mr. Kambitis said anywhere from \$1,000 - \$1,400 a month, based on the local market that is around Columbus, average numbers for the past two years.

Ms. Salay encouraged quality and for the applicant to think big. She said Dublin is an extremely high quality community and Wyandotte Woods is one of the most beautiful neighborhoods due to the

topography, homes, and trees. She said parkland is adjacent to this site and big dreams for our bike path system on the east side of the river and someday it will match what is on the west side and have connections between the two. She thought the applicants were underestimating how nice they could make this.

Ms. Salay hopes there would not be any vinyl on these buildings and encouraged the applicant to look at Craughwell Village as well. She said the details are going to be really important here and something is not right in terms of the size and massing. She suggested creativity with the building shapes or providing a different relief in the front instead of three boxes. She said she was not convinced about the four stories. She said she realizes the tradeoff but has a hard time imagining the fit within this neighborhood. She said the big boxes lend themselves to an apartment complex feel. She said she liked the amount of windows.

Ms. Salay said she was comfortable with the 210 parking spaces, because their group is the one that has to make it work for the residents and if there are issues their group will need to solve them. She said she agreed with her colleagues, she does not see how you do car ports well.

Ms. Salay restated that connectivity to the neighborhood is important. She said 120 units were permitted but if they would consider reducing the number of units, higher quality, and perhaps charging more would accomplish a better job of promoting Dublin.

Ms. Salay said she likes the idea of open space amenities including a swimming pool and a clubhouse but requesting a shape other than a square and integrated into the site, taking advantage of the natural features of the site. She said this could be a visual amenity as well as a place to hang out by including gardens. She said the entry feature is going to be important and while cut through traffic is not desirable for Wyandotte Woods, we are going to have traffic down to Riverside Drive as a public street. She reported she met with the traffic engineer that said that it is inevitable that Wyandotte Woods Boulevard will become the next Tara Hill Drive as it is wide, it is going to carry traffic, and connects two big streets.

Joe Budde commended both the applicant and the neighbors for achieving collaborative meetings. He said he did not want to reiterate all the great comments. He said the car ports are not attractive. He agreed with the architects on the Commission that if the four stories were combined with a better parking plan, better architecture with the high quality standards he could support the proposal. He said the parking issue of 120 units, comprised of a lot of single tenants mixed with couples; the one car, two car scenarios he believes works with additional space that could be turned into parking if there is a problem. He said he sees the large green space between the two ponds and the pool and clubhouse as a great amenity. He noted there is a park nearby but if they were talking young professionals, exercise stations might be considered. Mr. Budde said most importantly, he wanted to ensure the Wyandotte Woods residents' representatives continue to collaborate with the applicant and are in agreement with the developer's plans as it moves forward.

Victoria Newell said she agreed the developer started in the right place by approaching the residents in the community and she hopes the neighbors understand this site is going to get developed. She said it is incredibly beautiful with the tree canopy that is full of dogwoods that will be lost when developed, which is painful for all of us.

Ms. Newell said this was an improvement over what she has seen since her term on the Commission and appreciates the preservation of the open space and does not think there needs to be other amenities other than people being able to enjoy that space. She sees good merit to the plan using the large green space as a buffer to the residential property taking the least desirable element, the car ports and placing them closest to the school site. She did not mean any disrespect to the Dublin Schools but there is a stadium there associated with a noise issue.

Ms. Newell said she would normally have a great deal of difficulty with so much residential property violating that 30-foot height requirement. She said there are unique issues to this site and reducing the footprint is a real plus. She said she will however, have difficulty approving four stories as the building architecture is presented now with three very large tall box-like structures. She said there is no change in the mass elevation of the height of the building, no frame detail, and following the designs of the single-family homes might not be the best way to resolve the height issue. She said the suggestion of locating additional parking under the structure may help reduce the amount of parking and coverage on the site. She noted there is a 12-foot fall across a wooded site and when they try to grade the site, they will not be able to preserve the number of trees they are presenting. She indicated a building that is 47-feet tall in elevation, the tree canopy at 50 – 60 feet, she suggested varying the height of the structures or adding another building. She emphasized the architectural character of the buildings needs to be improved. She said she liked the brick screen wall for the car ports. She suggested they consider vegetative growth within that structure to improve the view from above, which is a lot more affordable than five years ago. She said she liked the active wet pond features at least the ones closest to the residents. She said one is bordering along the school property that could be better integrated or made a storm water retention basin. She said she was ok with reducing the parking count as long as there is guest parking provided and clearly designated. She said they have been consistent with asking applicants to use permeable pavers along those areas.

Amy Krumb said she likes the proposal a lot; she has been on the Commission since 2008. She understands this is zoned for 120 units but that does not mean that many units can fit. She recommended lowering the number of units and providing a better quality product and charge more and make just as much revenue. She suggested three stories of a much more attractive unit and would be willing to give a few extra feet for underground parking and take the elevator straight up. She indicated that 12 feet is a minor text modification and when the Code was written, it was probably assumed that there would be three-story buildings.

Ms. Krumb thought the comments on architecture had been covered well; she emphasized she does not support the use of vinyl. She said the clubhouse definitely needs to be more unique.

Ms. Krumb said she would approve the lower parking ratio if additional justification was provided by the applicant.

Ms. Krumb highly recommended a tree survey be completed as soon as possible and would be very upset if a landmark tree was cut down. She said she walks the north/south trail on the east side every day and there are wonderful trees inside that property but there is also a lot of water, especially on the southeast corner where it is constantly wet. She said she is concerned the pond on the south border may not work well and might need to be bigger. She said they are on the right track with the smaller footprint to preserve more trees.

Ms. Krumb wants to see useable open space. She answered a question posed earlier stating that normally ponds are included in open space but nobody is going to use them in any way. She would like to see what is left after removing the ponds from the 7.7 acres. She does not see the need for amenities with a wonderful park with a playground, baseball diamonds and soccer fields located next to this site within walking distance.

Ms. Krumb said it was important to connect with the school property, hopefully along the southern boundary if it was acceptable to the school. She agreed with her fellow Commissioners regarding the entrance. She asked that the cross walk where the path crosses the street, be striped or a sign added because the traffic is increasing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not hear much that she did not agree with from her fellow Commissioners. She thanked the residents for their attendance and being passionate about their

community; that is what makes Dublin great. She thanked the developers for being willing to listen and to file an Informal Review application so it can be properly discussed.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she understands this area is zoned for a maximum of 120 units but when the maximum is proposed, they expect the best architecture and site plan. She said because they are blowing the height restrictions out of the water and still only proposing units with 8-foot interior ceilings; she said that will be a difficult bar for her to hurdle without having exceptional interiors. She may not be supportive of the four-story buildings and hopes she has not seen their best architecture yet.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said there is nearly a 14-foot drop in the property. She said there would be a whole lot of cost associated with individual garages and asked that they “think outside the box” and consider bank barn parking to achieve covered parking while not using a whole lot of space on the site. She explained this would be two decks notched naturally into the grade change; the top deck would be accessible from one side and the lower would be accessed from the other with assigned parking spots so the two do not mingle, therefore a much more efficient way to build structured parking without losing valuable space for ramps and drive lanes. She said in Dublin, people will expect covered parking to avoid the horrific amount of snow we had this past winter. She said snow removal was quite costly and there needs to be somewhere for the snow to go and removal will not be needed for the lower deck.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she is looking forward to the new traffic study and what all will happen in light of the new roundabout and connectivity, and also very interested in a tree study. She said several years ago, the Kiwanis did a landmark tree survey, which might still be available on the City's website. Ms. Rauch said it was not on Dublin's website but it does exist.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she is concerned with the ponds on the south and its ability to be a living, breathing, eco system; we do not want puddles.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she has grave concern for the treatment of the windows, essentially, a window that has siding coming up to it. She said the statement had been made that you took cues from the surrounding residential buildings to provide inspiration for these buildings. She said the proposal is not for a single-family residential building and the mass, size and use of the materials is not appropriate. She encouraged them to look at Craughwell Village, one of the few four-story apartment buildings in Dublin. She said the Commission does not approve many of them so the ones they do approve are fantastic.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the parking ratio needs to be proven; a market study may be in order. She thought there would be a lot of families in these apartments because of the proximity to their fabulous schools. She thought that young professionals would be attracted to another part of Dublin, more removed from the school system. Ms. Amorose Grooms said she would like to see the open space left natural.

Ms. Amorose Grooms invited the applicant to come forward with any questions for the Commission or to request points of clarification. She asked he state his name and address for the record.

Dan Mancosh, President of AR Building Company. He said he appreciated all of the Commission's comments and they could put a strong effort to restudy the building in terms of overall architectural design. He said the buildings they have constructed show a lot more brick than what was presented; they know vinyl is not acceptable to Dublin standards and never intended on using it. He said the four-story building differentiates and allows them to affordably build an elevator into the building opening it up to all age groups as being residents. He said they can make a good effort by reviewing the overall architecture of the building.

Mr. Mancosh said parking under the building is not doable from an economic perspective, but he understands what everyone has said about car port structures. He said he would be the last person to build that structure if it did not fit in or work well aesthetically. He said the four-story building with an elevator handles half of the need that most people in a three-story walk up really complain about or settle for when they lease a three-story unit as getting up to the second and third floors with all of your packages and furniture, etc. is a challenge. He said trash can also be dealt with easier with a four-story building. He said that takes up 50 percent of the improvement that comes from a four-story structure.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant for his time and asked if he had any additional comments or direct questions for the Commission. She explained that with an informal review, a vote will not be taken, and looks forward to his possible return with some fantastic plans.

Mr. Mancosh asked if the Commission would consider a four-story building with a flat roof and asked if it was out of character. Richard Taylor said that was a tough question because they “know it when they see it” but his initial response is no but that is not to say that the building could not have some parts that were flat.

Mr. Mancosh asked the Commission if they could provide any further direction relative to the overall feel or look of the building. Mr. Taylor said the Commission does not want to design it but in terms of a reference point, they suggest Craughwell Village as an example of a high quality, tall, large building. Ms. Kramb agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes assured the applicant that staff would work with them on the architecture. She said staff will take the Commission’s comments and lead them in the right direction.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant.

**3. Tuttle Crossing/I-270, Subarea 5A
14-033FDP**

**5515 Parkcenter Circle
Final Development Plan**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced the application for a request for modifications to parking, landscaping and signs for an existing office building at the northwest corner of the intersection of Parkcenter Circle and Paul Blazer Parkway.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in witnesses that intended to address the Commission on this case.

Jennifer Rauch said the site is located on the south side of Rings Road between Atrium Parkway and Paul Blazer Parkway and contains an existing multi-story building with parking to the west and north and a regional stormwater pond in the northwest corner of the site.

Ms. Rauch said the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed the rezoning/preliminary development plan back in late summer of 2013, forwarded it onto City Council, which was approved Spring 2014 for modifications to the parking, signs and landscaping.

Ms. Rauch said the application includes two different phases but Phase Two is contingent on the leasing of this building.

Ms. Rauch said Phase One includes a sign plan and minor landscape modifications. She stated within the development text the site is permitted a series of signs. She said the applicant is proposing two monument signs; one on the north side of the Blazer Parkway entrance (Sign 7) and one at the northwest corner of Blazer Parkway and Parkcenter Circle (Sign 6). She said both signs are 50-square-foot and 9 feet high, meeting the text. She stated the Parkcenter Circle/Blazer Parkway sign is single-

sided, oriented toward the intersection; while the Blazer Parkway entrance sign is perpendicular to the street and double-sided. She said both signs are externally illuminated and mounted on a concrete base.

Ms. Rauch said Code requires signs be set back 8 feet from the right-of-way and Sign 6 is 10 feet from the right-of-way. She said Sign 7 is in the required setback and must be moved to the west to meet the setback requirement.

Ms. Rauch said the overall ground sign design is a black aluminum cabinet with white individual raised tenant panels. She said the top of the sign has a blue accent panel with the building address/owner in white raised lettering.

Ms. Rauch said landscape modifications are proposed with both of these monument signs.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is proposing two canopy signs for the two main building entrances along Atrium Parkway to identify the appropriate building tenant entrances for each tenant space (Signs 1 and 3). She said the proposed signs have address number and street name with a maximum letter height of 24 inches. She explained the address numbers are individual aluminum, white channel letters mounted to the top of the canopies and the street name will be white vinyl letters applied to the surface of the metal canopy. She stated the maximum letter heights are met and no illumination is proposed.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is proposing three internal signs for the three building entrances. She said (Sign 5) will be for the north entrance and (Signs 2 and 4) will each be at the Atrium Parkway entrances. She said text permits each sign at 6-square-feet and 6-feet high with individual tenant names, suite, and floor number, which meets the requirements. She explained the internal signs incorporate the same black, blue and white color scheme of the monument signs and each is single-faced with blue sign posts and a white background with black lettering for the individual tenant panels with no illumination proposed.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is proposing an external directional sign to be placed along Parkcenter Circle, approximately 70-feet east of the Atrium Parkway intersection (Sign 8). She said this sign is 4-square-feet and 3 feet high and only contains the building address, which meets the text. She said this sign is double-sided with a black background and white copy with the similar blue arched detail as the monument sign and will be externally illuminated with the same type of fixture as the monument signs.

Ms. Rauch said the Phase One landscape improvements include three planting areas associated with the new sign locations that will contain a variety of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs, as well as perennials.

Ms. Rauch said Phase Two includes the reconfiguration of the existing parking lot, removal of a large landscape island, installation of additional parking and the majority of the required tree replacement. She stated Phase Two is contingent upon a future tenant requiring additional parking and the tenant is required to provide written documentation to the City showing need by the Owner. She said Code requires 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet, or 466 spaces and the existing 571 parking spaces equal a ratio of 4.9 spaces per 1,000, each space being 9 feet by 20 feet in size.

Ms. Rauch said the proposed modifications to the site could result in an additional 106 parking spaces for a total of 677 parking spaces at a ratio of 5.8 spaces per 1,000 and include:

- 1) A decrease in parking space width;
- 2) The removal of interior landscape islands; and
- 3) A reconfiguration of the north parking area to remove an existing open space.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is proposing to relocate 16 trees caused by the removal and modification of the landscape islands and includes removal of 18 trees, or 271 inches. She stated text requires a total inch replacement for the site regardless of tree condition.

Ms. Rauch said Planning is recommending approval of this application with two conditions:

- 1) That Sign 7 be moved to the west to meet the required 8-foot setback from the right-of-way along Paul Blazer Parkway and the address number be removed; and
- 2) That Phase Two improvements will not occur until the City is provided written documentation of need by the Owner, as outlined in the development text.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the applicant to come forward.

Jack Reynolds, attorney with Smith and Hale, 37 W. Broad Street, Columbus, OH. He said they have shown the removal of the trees and reoriented and increased the size of the landscape islands to better hide vehicles. He said they are aware of the tree replacement requirement. He said they are before the Commission tonight for approval of the signs and approval of Phase Two that will only be put into place if they do get a tenant. Mr. Reynolds said Linda Menerey of EMH&T was in attendance to answer any questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone present that would like to speak on behalf of this case. [Hearing none.] She closed the public portion off for Commission discussion.

Victoria Newell inquired about the canopy sign elevation comment in the Planning Report.

Ms. Rauch said the existing element has a space in the middle with a canopy on each side. She explained the applicant will need to come forward with a design that makes it appear as one whole piece that will need to be approved administratively.

Ms. Newell inquired about the ground sign along Paul Blazer Parkway (Sign 7) that has a street number that is not applicable to Paul Blazer Parkway. She said she cannot support it with the street number on it as it creates confusion for other residents. She said the other aspect she cannot support on that sign is the inclusion of the real estate information. She said very large address numbers are put on each of the buildings, above the canopy. She did not like the channel letters as presented and would prefer clear anodized aluminum letters. She suggested Sign 6 be located at the entrance of Atrium Parkway and additional signs would not be needed for such a short distance. She understands it was approved in the text but they were lacking a sign package at that time.

Ms. Rauch asked for clarification that Sign 6 be moved. Ms. Newell suggested either moving it or eliminating the additional signs. Ms. Rauch said they are limited per their property line and cannot get it right on the corner. Ms. Newell said something has got to give as this is overly redundant.

Amy Salay was in agreement about the address stating she knew of a similar situation where it makes it confusing to the visitor. She said she also had an issue about the real estate information on the sign. She asked if it was possible to get four future tenants with four names to which Ms. Rauch confirmed. Ms. Salay recommended naming the building and making that the corporate address. She said it is going to become a very busy sign with four names there.

John Hardt said he also had concerns with the address and the leasing information. He inquired about the design of the sign. He said the base was noted in the packet as concrete to match the building. He said the building is indeed concrete but it is an architectural precast material which is very high quality colored concrete and asked if the base of the sign will be produced with the same material.

Mr. Reynolds said they will try to replicate the building so the concrete will have a finer finish. Mr. Hardt said there is a significant difference between architectural precast and structural concrete that is normally used for signs.

Mr. Hardt asked staff about the new sign approach and if they are envisioning that the four panels could have four different logos on them. Ms. Rauch said they will need to meet the three-color sign requirement. Mr. Hardt asked if the logos will be presented in their entirety. Ms. Rauch said the intent is to use black letters so the color would be the same for all four panels. She said 20 percent of the maximum area of the sign would be permitted for secondary image.

Mr. Reynolds said he could agree to just black letters and no logos.

Mr. Hardt said Ms. Salay had referred to other signs in the city where there are multiple panels, which he does not love but what he dislikes the most is how they look five years later, when panels have been changed out several times and no longer match each other. He asked that a condition be added to state the panels have to be acquired from the same source and identically colored. He stated that if he was going to support a multi-name sign, he would need some comfort that we would address the evolution of the sign over time.

Ms. Salay suggested that each tenant name looks identical and if not, change them all out. Ms. Kramb said it was not practical to state they all have to come from the same place but should be identical in appearance to which Mr. Hardt agreed.

Mr. Hardt said he could reluctantly support this application because it applies with the text that both the PZC and City Council approved but he cannot stand the fact that these are being determined on a site by site basis. He said if the parking code no longer addresses market conditions anymore, then this should be dealt with on a city-wide basis. Claudia Husak said Economic Development was in process of reviewing studies. Mr. Langworthy said the report was sent to him. Mr. Hardt said he did not want to derail this case but this reinforces his point that the report deals with two office parks but what happens to everyone else in the city; it puts them at a competitive disadvantage. He suggested we subscribe to new standards for parking or we don't. Mr. Langworthy said that was part of what the study was doing; how to creatively maintain standards for parking, parking screening, reduction of pavement, and small water management, etc. where a text change may become necessary.

Ms. Salay said the other part of that is a counter point to what Mr. Hardt is saying is this particular site and she did vote no and is going to vote no tonight because she does not want beautiful mature trees cut down for a parking lot as that is such a departure from Dublin. She said she read three articles in the past two weeks that they are finding that open office concepts where people are crammed together are not conducive to worker happiness, productivity, or collaboration; they stress people out because they are constantly distracted by everything else happening in the room so the pendulum may be swinging back the other way. She said she hates the idea of redoing the whole city's parking code for what could be a passing fad. She said she has issues with the signs but more issues with these trees because she rides her bike past them every day in the summertime. She said she cannot proudly stand up to her neighbors and say she cut down those trees to make a parking lot.

Mr. Hardt agreed with her and thought that conversation is a policy decision. He said we need to figure out what side of the fence we are on.

Ms. Salay reported that the other item discussed extensively at Council was asking PZC to make a policy decision was not supported at Council as their role is very different.

Ms. Newell said we all struggle with the discussion of the trees coming down. She said she reviewed the Arborist's report and looked at the Silver Maples on the site and she thinks they are at the end of their

life. She said portions of the trees that are leafed out, there is clearly dead lumber and sections of the branches that are falling down, trees are split at the bottom, and hollowing out is typical of Silver Maples when they reach the end of their life and topple in storms. She said that was the only reason she was willing to support the removal of those because she does not think they are removing healthy strong vibrant trees.

Ms. Newell said she wanted to revisit a condition about park-like amenities like park benches to be reused elsewhere on the site and have relocated them but really in a plop fashion. She said these were envisioned as an amenity and placed in a patio format with additional landscaping or making a spot where someone really wanted to sit and use the space for the canopy. She said in particular, the picnic table was relocated to an area that is usually wet and is sitting in a large puddle, currently.

Ms. Newell noted the sign at the corner intersection and questioned the height of the sign because it is up on a mound and wanted to verify it was being measured from the bottom of the sign to reach 10 feet and should be measured from the curb elevation for maximum height of the sign which appears to violate the regulation.

Ms. Rauch said she did not know the answer to that but it would have to meet the 10-foot requirement.

Ms. Newell asked about the dimensions of the current parking spaces. Ms. Rauch answered the plans states the spaces are 9 feet by 18 feet. Ms. Newell confirmed that in the text, they were allowed to reduce the width to 8.5 feet but nothing about reducing the length of the space. She said she pulled up the original text presented to them and it stated surface parking spaces may be reduced from 9 foot in width to 8.6 inches as approved in a development plan and all other parking ratios and running facilities shall be regulated by Dublin Code Provisions. She questioned how they got to 18 feet. Ms. Rauch said that was not discussed and believed the existing length of 20 feet would be retained. Ms. Kramb said she did not think there will be an issue with parking length and if it exceeded Code, it would be in violation of the approved text. She said when the parking lot is restriped, it should adhere to text and Code. Ms. Newell said she wanted to be sure that all were consistent. Ms. Rauch said she would verify.

Ms. Kramb said Phase Two occurs if they prove to staff they need the additional spaces. She inquired about the number. Ms. Rauch said, given the magnitude of what has to occur to increase this number of parking spaces, they are not going to undertake doing part of it. Ms. Kramb said she was going to vote no like she did before as she does not want to see trees cut down. She said even though it is consistent with what was approved, she does not believe we need to take the park out. She said she understands old trees but they can be replaced with nicer trees.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she shares Mr. Hardt's frustration and a city-wide solution is needed. She said this site screams structured parking and that requires difficult partnerships be made and difficult decisions happen. She understands this is a difficult position for this particular owner of this property but once they start making these decisions, they will come fast and furious and do not have good answers at this point in time.

Ms. Kramb said she wanted to make clear that she is ok with the signs but not the parking. She understands this is two parts but one vote. She said her no vote is on the Phase Two portion.

Ms. Rauch said she drafted conditions but it sounds like more needed to be added.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant how they wished to proceed as some sign issues need to be worked out.

Ms. Rauch read the conditions and stated she had not yet addressed the parking concern and asked for guidance from the Commission.

Ms. Kramb said if the applicant is restriping the parking lot, they need to meet the text.

Ms. Newell said she was concerned about the parking spaces to be potentially added. She said if they are cramming more in by reducing the width to get more in those clearances, then it should have been approved that way within the text. She said if it is an anomaly on the site that things have gotten installed in the field that do not meet Code that happens all the time. She said her answer depends on what the issue is.

Mr. Hardt asked if there was a mechanism available to the Commission where they could vote on this application with the seven conditions. He suggested voting an eighth condition that the parking revisions need to come back for another hearing.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see something like that because the 18-foot parking space caught him by surprise and asked how it got there. Ms. Husak said the table in the plans appears to be incorrect and staff needs to verify.

Linda Menerey said the spaces were all dimensioned on the Phase Two engineering plans with the 22-foot drive aisle and is sure it is a typo and the spaces are 9 feet by 19 feet. She would prefer if it was a condition so if it is correct, they will come back.

Ms. Menerey referred to the name on the sign and stated Arden is the owner and part of the GE, and not a real estate company. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if they occupy the building. Ms. Menerey answered they do not occupy the building. Ms. Kramb said only the tenants names can be placed on the signs, otherwise just an address is allowed. Ms. Newell said the same information could be displayed inside the building. Ms. Amorose Groomes said Blackstone buildings have their sticker on the window next to the door into the building.

Ms. Menerey referred to the sign on Blazer Parkway at the intersection of Parkcenter. She said the entrance that is mid-block has a lot of landscaping and it is really hard to find the building. She explained the front of it faces internal to the drive on Atrium and on Parkcenter. She feels very strongly about keeping it angled at the intersection. She said the sign further down again at Blazer Parkway, she understands how that causes confusion. She said when you come over top of the freeway, on Rings Road, you do not see that building until you are almost passed it. She said the evergreens are mature behind that pond. She said they are willing to give up the directional sign even before you get to Parkcenter; that directional sign was pulled back because we do not own the corner there. She stated what they really want is to keep the sign address on Blazer, keep the main monument sign, keep 6 & 7, and remove the directional sign. She stated they do not need to move forward with the Phase Two parking at this point.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said another option available is to name the building. Ms. Newell said they were using Parkcenter Place. Ms. Newell provided an example of a medical facility that asked for the same request that had greater need to have a street number that did not apply to their building and we asked them to remove that. She does not think it is fair to police and fire, to anyone coming in for emergency, or to any other surrounding tenant. Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed with Mr. Hardt that it is not detrimental to people finding your building, it is detrimental to the people trying to find any other building. Ms. Newell said she was fine with the sign location; it is the issue with the street number that does not apply to the street it is located.

Mr. Reynolds said the street address or even the number becomes the identifier for the building and not necessarily 5515 Parkcenter. He said it almost becomes an identifier for the building itself. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the numerical nature over there is very confusing. She said there are a number of buildings with the same street number on different streets. She said she has tried to navigate that area and it is

extremely difficult. She said they would be far better to name the building the “Dublin Blazer Fantastic Place to do Business” than to call it the “5515 Building”.

Ms. Menerey asked for Commission to approve the request and let them work with staff to come up with a different name and removing the 5515 on the Blazer/Atrium intersection, take off the Arden name, and do the same thing for the sign located on Blazer. She said possibly leaving the directional sign with the address at the corner. Ms. Amorose Groomes said it is appropriate to have the address. Ms. Menerey said the property line is 40 feet back from the intersection.

Ms. Husak noted the many outstanding issues that suggested they regroup and come back. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission needs to determine where they are. She said basically there are two issues: 1) Signs; and 2) Parking. She asked if the applicant wanted to move forward with votes that marry those two or if they want them peeled apart and move forward in that direction, or they could table it entirely and could come back in short order.

Mr. Langworthy said he thought more time was needed to work this out. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is hearing staff would like to table it and work through some of these issues, and asked if that was the pleasure of the applicant. Ms. Menerey said if they could work through the signs and get that approved, they would be willing to let the parking go but if we took a quick straw poll and the signs were thumbs down, they would come back. She explained they have a tenant in there right now and they really need signs up on the corner and on Blazer Parkway. Ms. Amorose Groomes said they can apply for a temporary sign permit. Mr. Langworthy stated he did not think it would do the applicant much good.

Mr. Hardt asked what element of the signs they have not addressed with the conditions. He asked if there was something in particular that needs time to resolve.

Ms. Husak said it did not seem like the applicant was okay with eliminating the number off the sign. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the applicant just said that they would, and name the building. Ms. Menerey said they are not happy about it or taking the Arden name off but in order to get the sign done they could come up with a name “Parkcenter” and that goes on and the address comes off. She said she would like to leave the address on the directional sign on the corner. Ms. Amorose Groomes said if it is on the street and the right address that it is acceptable. Ms. Newell said she could support that as a compromise. Ms. Menerey said they are doing all the same color on the fonts, taking off the logo, removing Arden, and will get a name on there without an address.

Mr. Taylor asked the sign numbers be specified in the conditions. He confirmed sign #8 would remain the same.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there was confusion with the parking issues. He asked if it was an issue of verification of the space size. Mr. Hardt said generally yes but there are some Commissioners not comfortable with the proposal at all.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they had to determine the size of the parking spaces. He said Ms. Menerey said she was comfortable with the length of 19 feet so if the plan is accurate, he did not think that verifying the dimensions would sway Ms. Salay or Ms. Krumb.

Mr. Hardt asked the applicant if he was asking for a vote on the parking with the condition the spaces are indeed 19 feet in length. Ms. Newell said if the Commission is going to vote on the whole application, in terms of parking, she would like amenities with picnic tables. She said they had made a concession with the landscaping and taking it out and she feels it is appropriate to give something back associated with that. Ms. Menerey asked if her concern was with the picnic tables by the pond. Ms. Newell said she was concerned with what they had done with the picnic tables, and she realizes they are not overly attractive

as a picnic table on a concrete pad with a cigarette waste container. She asked that those amenities be reincorporated in an aesthetic way.

Ms. Menerey said they could agree to so some enhancement with landscaping and willing to relocate others that are not properly placed.

Mr. Taylor asked Ms. Menerey if she was ok with the conditions now and she responded yes. Ms. Newell asked the conditions stipulate working with staff to resolve issues. If so, she said she would be comfortable.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see something about placards on the sign can only be reflective of tenants occupying space but she does not want three tenants to move in the building and Arden decide to stick their name as the fourth on the sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked everyone if they had an opportunity to read through the proposed conditions. She asked if anyone had any further comments with regards to this case. Ms. Salay asked if the applicant was happy with condition #8. Mr. Reynolds said they were happy with that condition. Ms. Amorose Groomes said if there were no other comments, she asked the applicant if they agree to the 10 conditions as modified.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Budde seconded, to recommend approval of the Final Development Plan with ten conditions:

- 1) Sign 7 be moved to the west to meet the required 8-foot setback from the right-of-way along Paul Blazer Parkway and the address number be removed;
- 2) Phase Two improvements will not occur until the City is provided written documentation of need by the Owner, as outlined in the development text;
- 3) Only building occupant signs shall be permitted on the proposed monument signs;
- 4) The proposed concrete base incorporate the same architectural precast concrete material used on the building;
- 5) Logos are not permitted on the individual tenant panels;
- 6) All tenant panels shall be uniform in appearance and be maintained to look consistent;
- 7) The canopy letters utilize clear anodized aluminum in lieu of the individual channel letters to coordinate with the design of the canopies;
- 8) The ground signs (6&7) eliminate the street address and provide a building name in lieu;
- 9) The applicant verify the parking spaces are 19 feet in length to meet the text; and
- 10) The applicant provide a more comprehensive and integrated design for the outdoor amenities, subject to Planning approval.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, no; Mr. Hardt, no; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, no; Mr. Taylor, yes; and Mr. Budde, yes. (Approved 4 – 3)

Ms. Newell thanked the applicant for accommodating the Commission's requests this evening and being patient with them.

Communications

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any communications to be relayed and discussed. Claudia Husak reminded them of the next City Council Work Session scheduled for June 2, 2014, at 6:30 pm. She said these are being live-streamed to be viewed online.

Ms. Husak asked Ms. Salay about potential meeting dates available for the Chair, Vice Mayor, and Council Member Liaison meeting. Ms. Salay said the 9:00 start time does not work and said she could be

available at 9:45 for one to two hours. Ms. Salay and Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed Fridays work well for them. Ms. Salay wants to confer with Mr. Gerber to sort out who should be in attendance. Ms. Husak said she would get this scheduled for June. Ms. Salay said the upcoming City Council Work Session would be a very interesting meeting and encouraged the Commission to attend or find materials online. She said for that development, the real challenge is going to be to make it look like it did not happen overnight. Ms. Salay asked what would be discussed in June 2. Ms. Husak responded Darren Meyer with MKSK will continue to narrow down the street streetscapes and materials. Ms. Salay asked if specifics such as lights and benches, etc. would be discussed. Ms. Husak answered yes. Mr. Hardt asked if the location of cycle tracks would be part of the discussion. Ms. Salay said it was part of the streetscape.

Steve Langworthy said storm water grates would be discussed and Victoria Newell requested crisscross grates to prevent bicycle tires going in.

Commission Roundtable Discussion

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any roundtable issues to be discussed.

Ms. Krumb said it was mentioned earlier but before the development occurs within Subarea 3, the cross walks on Wyandotte Woods Blvd. by the trail should be striped as traffic has increased.

Mr. Hardt asked if there was an update on the neon signs/neon-like signs that he inquired about a couple of meetings ago. Ms. Husak said Code Enforcement was already dealing with one case he had mentioned. Ms. Salay said the Code is not well-written and when this went to the Mayor's Court, and the presiding magistrate threw it out and said it could not be enforced written as "neon or neon-like". She said she will bring up at City Council on Monday night. She recommended Planning and Legal work together to get the Code written properly. She said these signs can be found everywhere, which is a problem. Yazan Ashrawi, Assistant Legal Director, said he was working on it.

Mr. Hardt asked about Monday's presentation. Ms. Husak said they are in the pre-application stage. Mr. Hardt said he was happy with all the information from the developer. He said there have been challenges on the west side of the river, primarily surrounding parking, for many years, that have stressed our businesses. He said business on the west side of the river do not have a chance with a bright shiny new development proposed on the east side of the river with 800,000 square feet of structured parking. He asked that a message be relayed to City Council ~ with all the investment that the City is making in Bridge Park Development and other surrounding districts, it would be appropriate to put some attention and funding toward solving the parking problem on the west side of the river, that will not keep them at a disadvantage with the coming of east side new business. Ms. Salay said she would pass it on.

Mr. Hardt asked if it was possible to have an informal conversation on what is causing us to rezone Crawford Hoying's land in order to accommodate their proposal versus working within the current structure. He said even the consternation over the timeline is wrapped up in that step.

Steve Langworthy said Planning will have more detailed explanation of that when the case is actually brought forward. He said the basic idea behind it is as it was described by Terry Foeller at the work session. He said the creation of the neighborhood is something we would have done in the beginning had we had a unified development area at the time. He said they had to assume at the time that development would come in as four or five different parts with four or five different developers without an overall plan. He explained the zoning is now split between at least two different zoning districts, and there is the issue of what building types are permitted in each district, where zoning heights vary, etc.

Mr. Hardt said it would be helpful if they could receive a memo explaining that before we see the case. He said the other night, several council members asked why we are not looking at PUDs, which may not be viable. He does not want to have this conversation or debate on the fly in front of Crawford Hoying. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she has been beating this drum for a long time and has yet to receive a very

good explanation as to why a PUD would not be an option. She then assumes that it would be an abandonment of the Bridge Street Code. She would argue that it is not abandonment any more than any other PUD; it is still going to be the basis for that development and would certainly allow a tremendous amount of flexibility that Crawford Hoying is going to need unless we want to write a lot of waivers. Mr. Langworthy said the Code permits them to ask for a PUD if they wish. He said there is nothing to prevent them from asking. Ms. Amorose Groomes thought we have not encouraged them to go in that direction. She said Planning has plenty to do without trying to write a neighborhood district Code that will meet the needs of Crawford-Hoying and they do not even know what they are going to do yet. Mr. Langworthy said he appreciated her concern but it takes a lot less time to write the neighborhood district than it would a PUD. He said a PUD would also require a rezoning action like the neighborhood district Code.

Ms. Salay suggested Planning could look at their questions and put thoughts and answers in a memo form so all can digest it. She said Mr. Langworthy knows what he is doing, why it needs to be done, and what the end result would be but we need to understand that methodology so we can have clarity that might make the discussion easier. Ms. Groomes suggested a list of Pros and Cons, so they would have an opportunity to review, as a basis for discussion. Mr. Langworthy said that narrative needs to be prepared for the Planning Report anyway. Ms. Kramb said to Mr. Hardt's point, it would be helpful to see before it comes to us.

Ms. Kramb said when they finally start bringing applications, they would probably bring a building or a couple of buildings at one time, per what Nelson Yoder said during the presentation and she said they need to see a bigger picture of how they all fit in, as well as the blocks. Ms. Husak said the Commission will get a Development Plan that is the middle step. Ms. Kramb wants to see the entire street network and each individual proposal. Ms. Husak explained they would then bring forward a Site Plan for each block.

Ms. Kramb noted the piece on the west side of the river and asked if it would come to the Planning and Zoning Commission as part of the development plan. Ms. Husak said it would not be part of the development plan and would go to the Architectural Review Board (ARB). Mr. Langworthy said the west side is a separate project. Ms. Groomes asked for clarification for decision-making bodies. Ms. Kramb said she was concerned about the ability of the east and west side being able to interact. Ms. Husak said Planning cannot determine the track of the process; Code requires projects in the Historic District be reviewed and approved by the ARB. Jennifer Rauch explained the Architectural Review District is a separate section of the Code that dictates the boundaries and the review process for the properties within those boundaries. She explained the Bridge Street Code reinforces the existing ARB district.

Ms. Kramb said the concern is about the pedestrian bridge that will connect the two sides together. She said issues may arise when the different reviewing bodies are unaware of the other's actions. Mr. Hardt said the bridge is a City project and not a Crawford-Hoying project. Ms. Kramb said the issue is where the bridge lands in the respective districts which are totally different. Mr. Langworthy thought those elements would go to City Council as a CIP item. Ms. Kramb asked for clarification of what the PZC might be asked to review. Mr. Langworthy said the east side plaza area off Park Avenue might come to the Commission. Ms. Kramb reiterated that communication is important between all the different parties so that it does not look out of place.

Mr. Taylor said the ARB is primarily concerned with small scale review and how it relates to buildings that already exist in the Historic District and wonders if they have the capacity to review major projects like this as they may not be as steeped in this entire process in the whole Bridge Street Corridor from a participation perspective.

Ms. Salay said it was good this was brought up now rather than when Crawford-Hoying is before us and would bring this to her colleagues on City Council Monday night. She agreed, ARB is not accustomed to reviewing large development plans. Ms. Groomes said the ARB has not participated in the Bridge Street

Code process to date, at least not extensively. Mr. Taylor said he did not want to take anything away from the ARB. Ms. Salay agreed. Ms. Kramb said ARB still plays a large role in determining things they normally review.

Mr. Hardt said everything being discussed is relevant to Crawford-Hoying's west side; large scale new development that may be outside ARB's normal wheelhouse. He said a broader discussion would include Gerry Bird's project and the library. He said the only way to address this issue is as Mr. Langworthy said through rezoning. He said an option could be to come to PZC as an informal on to ARB for formal. Ms. Kramb is interested in ARB's thoughts on this.

Mr. Taylor said the way the Commission is assembled right now, they are custom built to deal with these projects. He said he attended the presentation on Monday night and was impressed with the changes. He said it showed they listened to the comments from this Commission. His main concern is a timeline and asked that group if they could have two weeks to review instead of the normal six days, due to the complex issues and the projects are all going to be reviewed in a much larger context of other buildings and other streets.

Mr. Langworthy said they had some rather amazing spreadsheets to show how all these pieces fit together and where they go in the timeline. He reported that engineering hired a consultant/coordinator to help block the schedule together to run from beginning of approval all the way through the building permit. They are considering October 1 to be on the optimistic side and Mr. Taylor agreed. Mr. Taylor restated that they need more than six days to review. Mr. Hardt requested that they receive even the very preliminary information to give them a running start. Mr. Langworthy said he understood what the Commissioners were asking and said he has to wait to see what Crawford-Hoying, submits. He said they have the Development Plan with the street network in it and the plat that goes along with it, which is pretty well set but still not sure what they plan to submit for Basic Plan or Site Plan.

Ms. Salay asked what they are required to do. Mr. Langworthy said they can take it in as small of chunks as they want to but our preference is that the entire street network located on it. He said they also have some street improvements that Council approved that needs to get under construction like the Dale Drive connector to Tuller Ridge and part of John Shields has to get in. He stated this is critical and likely the first step.

Mr. Hardt asked for clarity on the process. Mr. Hardt referred back to when the hospital project came forward. He would encourage as many informal reviews as possible. Mr. Langworthy said he would have a discussion with them and see how they are progressing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any further issues.

Ms. Salay said Tuller Flats is coming back to Council with new ideas this Monday and wanted everyone to be aware. Mr. Langworthy said this is more of a quick overview and not a full-blown work session, at the end of the agenda. He reported Planning had a meeting with them on Monday to see what they wanted to present to Council and gave them a few comments. Ms. Husak said this is public information as soon as the packet is public. Ms. Kramb requested any paperwork distributed to go in the Dropbox before meetings. Mr. Hardt restated getting a running start instead of trying to absorb in a weekend, would be helpful.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anything further. [Hearing none.] The meeting was adjourned at 10:09 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on June 19, 2014.