

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

JULY 31, 2014

The Administrative Review Team made the following determinations at this meeting:

4. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project
Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road
14-070BPR/PP Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat

Proposal: A request for preliminary review for seven new blocks for future development on approximately 30.9 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development located on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D) for a Basic Development Plan. This is also a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat Review under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Applicant: Nelson Yoder, Principal, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.

Planning Contact: Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4656; rray@dublin.oh.us

DETERMINATION #1: Recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission of the following Development Plan Waivers:

- 1) Maximum Block Size (Block 'D') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a): To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block 'D' (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±594 feet on the west and 607 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,886 feet.
- 2) Maximum Block Size (Block 'H') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a): To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block 'H' (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±630 feet on the west and 686 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,945).

DETERMINATION #2: Recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this request for Basic Development Plan Review with 10 conditions:

- 1) City Council approval of the area rezoning to the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District;
- 2) That the applicant select building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
- 3) That the applicant work with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;
- 4) That the applicant dedicate the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;

- 5) That the applicant address any remaining Engineering details as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant coordinate with the City and Washington Township Fire Department to ensure fire accessibility throughout the site as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 7) That the applicant work with the City to plan for future transit stop locations for appropriate areas of this development;
- 8) That the applicant provide the remaining one-foot (for a total of 12 feet) clear sidewalk area as part of the public streetscape along appropriate portions of the Shopping Corridor;
- 9) That the applicant describe the intent for the required BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review; and
- 10) That the applicant provide an outline of the details for each open space type, including the intended users, exact acreages required and provided, and general program, at the Development Plan Review, with determinations as part of the Site Plan Review.

DETERMINATION #3: Recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Preliminary Plat with five conditions:

- 1) The modifications to the street sections described in this report are incorporated in the plan as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 2) That the proposed utility easements be provided on the preliminary plat prior to review by City Council;
- 3) That the applicant dedicate the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
- 4) City Council approval of the Plat modification of the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent;
- 5) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to City Council submittal.

RESULT: This application was forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the recommendations noted.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Steve Langworthy, Director of Planning

DETERMINATION

4. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road 14-070BPR/PP Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat

Rachel Ray said this is a request for preliminary review for seven new blocks for future development on approximately 30.9 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive (relocated), south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Development Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). She said this is also a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat Review under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the site and then provided an overview of where this application for Basic Development Review is in the context of the current applications on file, and the upcoming applications that will be filed. She explained that the purpose of the Basic Development Plan Review is to make sure the framework that will enable the future mixed-use development at this site is cohesive and will ensure that a strong public realm is established. She explained that this application is not intended to serve as a determination for all project details associated with the public or private realm. She stated that further details will be determined at the Development Plan Review, Basic Site Plan/Site Plan and Final Plat stages. She said there are some questions still to be worked through, and pointed out that the applicant is meeting with the City on a weekly and almost daily basis to coordinate these items.

Ms. Ray said the applicant has also filed an application for Development Plan Review for Phase One of this project, although the applicant has requested a time extension to allow time to address the issues and obtain feedback from the Commission on the Basic Development Plan. She said that by the time the Development Plan Review for Phase One is ready to move forward, all of the detailed items that have not been determined at this stage will need to be for that review. She said following the Development Plan Review, the next step is the Basic Site Plan Review, which is a review of the conceptual buildings, uses, and site details, and finally, the last step is the Site Plan Review, which is likely to proceed in phases by block and will serve as the most detailed review out of all of the applications since all of the architectural details, open space details, parking, landscaping, signs, and other site details will be reviewed at that time.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the proposed Basic Development Plan. She said that the proposed plan includes a grid street network forming seven blocks for development. She stated that the Basic Development Plan involves the public realm elements, including seven development blocks (Blocks A, B, C, D, F, G, H) subdivided by private access drives and mid-block pedestrianways (Block 'E' is the designation currently applied to land north of John Shields Parkway, east of Riverside Drive, and is not included with this application), three new public streets (Broadstone Avenue, Tuller Ridge Drive, Mooney Street), and a future mixed-use shopping corridor designated along portions of Broadstone Avenue and Riverside Drive. She said this application also includes a Preliminary Plat for the project site that includes the reconfiguration of rights-of-way for John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive and the necessary vacation and reconfiguration of the right-of-way for the east/west portion of Dale Drive.

Ms. Ray said the Code analysis for the project includes the Lots and Blocks requirements. She explained that Waivers are required for Blocks 'D' and 'H' because the east and west faces of both blocks each exceed the 500-foot maximum block length, and when combined with the other block lengths, the total block perimeter also exceeds the maximum of 1,750 feet. She said approval is recommended for the Waivers. She explained that the intent of the maximum block length provisions is to prohibit "superblocks" from being established, which limit pedestrian connectivity and do not appropriately

distribute traffic. She stated that the plan meets the intent of this requirement by providing mid-block pedestrianways through private drives, which serves to break up the blocks and allow for connectivity through the site. She added that the greenway along the south side of John Shields Parkway adds an additional 80 feet to the block length measurement, which is a condition unique to these two blocks.

Ms. Ray said the Street Types section of the Code addresses the designation of street families and street elements such as bicycle facilities. She explained that five-foot one-way cycletracks are proposed along both sides of "Broadstone Avenue," which is the main shopping corridor that is part of the regional cycletrack system through the Bridge Street District. She said that the cycletrack transitions into an eight-foot, two-way cycletrack along Riverside Drive. She said that a condition was recommended to begin to identify accommodations for transit stops, as well as on-street parking details. She said at Mr. Hahn's suggestion at a previous meeting, the applicant should consider providing on-street parking spaces for motorcycles and scooters where full-length vehicular parking spaces will not fit. She said they will also need to continue to work through fire access throughout the site as the details come together. She said one of the recommendations is a condition that, in addition to Mooney Street being public south of "Broadstone Avenue," Banker Drive (shown as Reserve I) will also need to be a public street between Dale Drive and Mooney Street to allow for fire access. She said no on-street parking would be required on this portion of Banker Drive.

Steve Langworthy asked if that was because of the steepness of the road grade.

Ms. Ray said yes, the slope is about 10 percent in that area, which makes on-street parking challenging.

Ms. Ray said the Neighborhood Standards are also part of the Basic Development Plan Review. She explained that the consideration include placemaking elements such as the designation of the shopping corridor, providing a pedestrian-oriented streetscape, identifying street terminations, locations for gateways and open spaces, and later in the process, sign plans. She explained that along the shopping corridor, which is shown along portions of "Broadstone Avenue" and Riverside Drive, the Neighborhood Standards require a minimum 12 feet of clear sidewalk area. She said within the right-of-way, between the six-foot sidewalk and five-foot cycletrack area, a minimum of 11 feet is provided; the applicant will be required to provide a minimum of one additional foot to be provided within the Required Building Zone along the shopping corridor.

Ms. Ray stated that in terms of open spaces, staff met with the applicant yesterday to work through the placement of open spaces to meet the intent of the Code requirements for the provision of a high quality open space network. She said the applicant was also thinking through the private spaces, including restaurant patios, and how they will interact with the streetscape. She said those details would be finalized through the next phases of Development Plan and Site Plan Review.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the proposed Preliminary Plat. She said the Preliminary Plat can be viewed as the "technical" side of the Basic Development Plan Review. She referenced the plat content including the site conditions, lots, right-of-way dedication/vacation, lot line adjustments, street sections, reserves for private drives, grading and utilities, open space, and a tree survey.

Ms. Ray explained that the applicant had provided street sections for all of the roadways throughout the project area. She presented graphics depicting the sections for "Broadstone Avenue" and Riverside Drive. She stated that although the applicant is not constructing Riverside Drive, it is included on the plans given its integral relationship to the project. She provided overviews of the sections for Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge Drive, as well as section views on how the private drives will be installed over parking structures in some areas of the site.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing a summary of the comments received from the ART on this application to date. She reiterated that this is the first of a multi-step process in the review of this project, with details increasing with each review. She commented that the applicant is in the process of working to establish a development agreement with the City Administration, although the agreement has not been finalized at this time. She noted the comments and conditions related to the shopping corridor and provision of a highly pedestrian-oriented streetscape, in addition to the attention that will be paid to ensuring that the applicant appropriately integrates open space into the development, including distribution, suitability, and design. She noted that stormwater information should be advancing, and the applicant should be prepared to make any corrections on the Preliminary Plat before it advances to City Council.

Ms. Ray referenced the comments from Fire, which at this time relate mainly to fire hydrant locations, the need for public streets in certain areas of the site to provide fire access, and private drive construction above garages. She noted that Mr. Perkins' comments indicated that surfaces must be capable of supporting a 75,000-lb. fire apparatus. She said Building Standards commented that the applicant should start thinking about a loading/trash/building services plan and utility services.

Ms. Ray said there are three ART actions required: 1) Development Plan Waiver Review for two waivers; 2) Basic Development Plan Review, based on the review criteria of Section 153.066(E)(3) for Development Plan Review; and 3) Preliminary Plat Review. She said the Planning and Zoning Commission will also make a determination on the required reviewing body for the Development Plan reviews.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the two waivers, which are for:

1. Maximum Block Size (Block D) – to increase the maximum permitted block dimensions from 500 feet to +594 feet on the west and 607 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 to +1,868 feet; and
2. Maximum Block Size (Block H) – to increase the maximum permitted block dimensions from 500 feet to 630 feet on the west and 686 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 to +1,945 feet.

She said the Waiver review criteria have been met for both blocks.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the Basic Development Plan, with 10 conditions:

- 1) City Council approval of the area rezoning to the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District;
- 2) That the applicant select building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
- 3) That the applicant work with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;
- 4) That the applicant dedicate the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
- 5) That the applicant address any remaining Engineering details as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant coordinate with the City and Washington Township Fire Department to ensure fire accessibility throughout the site as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 7) That the applicant work with the City to plan for future transit stop locations for appropriate areas of this development;
- 8) That the applicant provide the remaining one-foot (for a total of 12 feet) clear sidewalk area as part of the public streetscape along appropriate portions of the Shopping Corridor;
- 9) That the applicant describe the intent for the required BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review; and

- 10) That the applicant provide an outline of the details for each open space type, including the intended users, exact acreages required and provided, and general program, at the Development Plan Review, with determinations as part of the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Langworthy said nearly all of the conditions are administrative in nature.

Ms. Ray said a lot of the conditions refer to the types of elements that are expected to be addressed with the Development Plan Reviews, and are noted here to make sure the applicant is aware.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the Preliminary Plat with 5 conditions:

- 1) The modifications to the street sections described in this report are incorporated in the plan as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 2) That the proposed utility easements be provided on the preliminary plat prior to review by City Council;
- 3) That the applicant dedicate the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
- 4) City Council approval of the Plat modification of the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent;
- 5) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to City Council submittal.

Mr. Langworthy asked for clarification if the reconfiguration of the John Shields Parkway right-of-way was covered under condition five.

Ms. Ray said the reconfiguration is shown on the plat, and will be addressed in that manner.

Aaron Stanford said the applicant has already shown the necessary changes on the plat.

Mr. Langworthy asked for any additional comments.

Police Sergeant Rodney Barnes said Police is supportive of the proposal. He said they appreciate the amount of access provided through the area. He said Police has talked about increasing the officers in this area, and making greater use of the substation within the Hard Road Fire Station, with a possible use for bike patrol.

Mr. Stanford noted that the applicant indicated that the street names may be changed further, and asked at what point will they be finalized.

Claudia Husak said the street names should be determined with the Preliminary Plat.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said they are more concerned with the timing of the Final Plat than the Preliminary Plat and have focused on the end of the process. He said the Preliminary Plat could be delayed from advancing to City Council if needed to have time to work out the final street names.

Joanne Shelly said Barb Cox has been working with the applicant to coordinate the naming of the streets, and they could be finished as soon as next week.

Mr. Yoder said addresses will be assigned to the blocks and buildings after the street names have been determined.

Alan Perkins, Washington Township Fire Marshal, said based on the changes to Mooney Street to make it a public street, and the condition requiring Banker Drive to be public between Mooney Street and Dale Drive, Fire is comfortable with the streets. He said for the private drives, the Fire Department will need to make sure they have comfortable truck access, and if there are areas that will not accommodate a fire apparatus, they will need to make sure there are posted weight limits. He said he is waiting on locations for fire hydrant and set-up zones, and said he would have more comments as those elements are known in the next steps. He said the building types for the most part will be okay at six story buildings since they are likely to have sprinklers.

Ray Harpham commented that Building Standards' only comments at this time relate to waste management, and making sure that attention is paid to how this will function throughout the site.

Mr. Yoder said there is a meeting to discuss this very topic occurring right now, with other team members.

Fred Hahn said he had no further comments at this time beyond what had been included in the report.

Mr. Langworthy stated that this is a determination this week, with the recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission provided in the ART Report and presented at this meeting. He asked the applicant if he agreed to the conditions of each recommendation.

Mr. Yoder agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Langworthy said recognizing the applicant agrees to all the conditions as discussed the recommendation of approval stands and will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for two Waivers, Basic Development Plan, and Preliminary Plat Review. He said the application was scheduled for the Commission's meeting agenda for August 7, 2014.

CASE REVIEWS

2. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road 14-070BPR/PP Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat

Rachel Ray said this is a request for preliminary review for six new blocks for future development on approximately 27.3 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Development Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). She said this is also a review and recommendation of approval to the Commission and City Council for a Preliminary Plat Review under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray said she and other staff members had met with the applicant yesterday afternoon to review the streetscapes and referenced an Exhibit the applicant had supplied showing the proposed right-of-way configuration for "Park Avenue."

James Peltier, EMH&T, explained how they have realigned the right-of-way for Park Avenue to follow the roadway curvature and noted the difference at the intersection with Mooney Street.

Ms. Ray confirmed that relocating the cycletrack to the sidewalk side of the planter would allow for additional walkway area.

Barb Cox said she understood and thought the right-of-way was shown appropriately.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked if the cycletrack should be the same material as the sidewalk, or a different material.

Fred Hahn suggested that the cycletrack on Park Avenue should have the same materials as the sidewalk but maybe a six-inch band could differentiate the space between the cycletrack and sidewalk. Ms. Cox agreed.

Steve Langworthy asked how many parallel parking spaces were shown.

Ms. Cox said they may have to reduce the number of parallel parking spaces to accommodate an appropriate number of ADA-accessible spaces. She assumed the two blocks along Park Avenue would need at least one.

Mr. Langworthy asked what the requirement was for the number of accessible spaces. Ms. Cox indicated that it was based on the total number of parking spaces provided. Mr. Langworthy asked if the spaces needed to be differentiated between public parking and garages. Ms. Cox said handicap spaces need to ramp onto a sidewalk, be slightly longer than regular eight-foot parallel spaces and an appropriate number of spaces will be needed for public streets. She said once the buildings are designed, the number of ADA spaces within the garage can be determined. Mr. Langworthy asked at which point that was dealt with. Ms. Cox answered sooner rather than later.

Joanne Shelly asked if the curb could be pushed down rather than providing a ramp. Ms. Cox answered that was not possible as they would have to do a whole section of curbing in that manner, and that would not work in this instance. Mr. Hunter asked if additional parking spaces could be provided on Park Avenue closer to the intersections. Ms. Cox said maybe one more could be added, but they would need to look at it based on intersection spacing. Mr. Langworthy suggested that maybe that is where the handicap spaces are provided.

Ms. Cox said the intent is to make this area highly active in terms of pedestrian activity so she suggested placing one or two accessible spaces on Riverside Drive and one or two accessible spaces on Mooney Street.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the ratio of parking for office space and residential development. Mr. Hunter replied it all factored into the parking numbers. He said they could put in extra office square footage in Building C1 and B1 while still meeting and exceeding the parking requirements.

Ms. Ray questioned why the cycletracks were shown on the plans only next to the planters. Ms. Cox said it was a carry-over from concept previous project that the material would be different, and the line delineates material changes. She explained there was likely going to be a band between the sidewalk area and the cycletrack area, but staff had not yet determined the details for where it starts and stops.

Mr. Hahn confirmed that at this conceptual level, it is appropriate to just show the dimensions. Ms. Cox and Ms. Ray agreed.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant if they were comfortable with the dimensions for the right-of-way, what was on the plat, the conceptual development plan, and Park Avenue. The response was yes.

Ms. Ray asked about the provision of a minimum 12 feet of clear area in front of Building G1, as required for the shopping corridor. Mr. Peltier indicated that the shopping corridor was not expected to extend east to that block.

Mr. Hahn suggested that the applicant consider providing parking spaces designated for motorcycles, particularly if there were areas that were too small for vehicular parking spaces.

Ms. Ray reported she received an email from Brian Quackenbush earlier that day regarding Riverside Drive and switching the location of the cycletrack adjacent to the sidewalk. She said she had discussed the street section with staff, and staff had agreed that the same approach for Park Avenue could be applied to Riverside Drive for consistency.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant what they planned to present to the Commission. Mr. Peltier answered they would show the building footprints on the Basic Development Plan. Ms. Ray said the applicant needs sections as part of the Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Ray said she had not had a chance to meet with staff to discuss Mooney Street and whether it would be public or private at this time, but she planned to meet with staff after today's ART meeting to have a recommendation for the applicant before the end of day Friday.

Ms. Ray asked if there were any other higher level topics requiring discussion. She said she had forwarded Ms. Cox's memo on the Basic Development Plan/Preliminary Plat to the applicant and asked the applicant if they had any questions about Ms. Cox's comments at this time.

Ms. Ray offered Time Extension forms to the applicant as the ART is obligated to make a recommendation next week on all of the open applications. She asked that the forms be returned tomorrow or Monday. Ms. Ray requested electronic filings as soon as possible so she would have enough time to properly review and draft her Planning Reports. She asked if there were any further questions. Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant when we might start to see actual building plans. Mr. Hunter replied "soon." He said they were trying to get through the Basic Development Plan first.

Claudia Husak inquired about the signatures on the application form from the medical office property. Mr. Hunter said it was in progress.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or comments regarding this application at this time. [There were none.] He stated that the ART's recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Basic Plan Review and to City Council for Preliminary Plat Review were scheduled for July, 31, 2014, unless the applicant decides to file a Time Extension.

3. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project, Phase 1
14-071DP-BSC **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive**
Development Plan Review

Rachel Ray said this is a request for review and approval for four new blocks for development on approximately 17.28 acres, including new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Bridge Street District Development Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Ray stated that pending the issues surrounding the Basic Development Plan/Preliminary Plat, a Time Extension for the Development Plan (Phase 1) was recommended.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 pm.

- Sidewalk extension to allow for access from short-term parking;
- Standard directional signs; and
- Crosswalk markings

She said approval with one condition is recommended:

- 1) That the revised stormwater calculations be submitted with the building permit.

Mr. Gunderman asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this request for Minor Project Review with one condition.

CASE REVIEWS

3. Verizon Wireless Co-Location – Avery Park Water Tower 14-067ARTW

**7697 Avery Road
Administrative Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for Verizon to replace six panel antennas and install three remote radio heads and one OVP distribution box on the Avery Park water tower. She said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless communications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Ray reported there have been no updates on this application since the previous ART meeting. She reported that she was waiting to hear back from the Law Director's office on the lease terms for this site since it is on a City-owned facility, although the lease should not have any impact on the application requirements. She said ART's determination is anticipated within the next two weeks, which still meets the required time frame for decision making.

Mr. Gunderman confirmed there were no additional comments or questions on this application and concluded a determination is scheduled for next Thursday, July 24, 2014 unless otherwise specified.

4. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project

14-070BPR/PP

**Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road
Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for preliminary review for six new blocks for future development on approximately 27.3 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Development Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). She said this is also a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat Review under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray reported that a general staff meeting to review this application was held July 16th, and she had prepared a list of comments, questions, and a preliminary zoning analysis both for the Development Plan/Preliminary Plat as well as the Development Plan to serve as a starting point for the discussion with the ART at today's meeting. She provided three sets of comments on each of the applications to the applicants and the ART members, and noted that revisions would be necessary on the plans before a recommendation can be made to the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said she planned to meet with the applicant again immediately following this ART meeting to walk through more of the detailed items to be addressed on the plans, but she would like to discuss some of the higher level issues at today's meeting.

Ms. Ray began by laying out the concerns and issues with the following as part of the Preliminary Plat:

Right-of-Way

- Private streets should be provided in reserves on the plat, and reserve lines should mirror the sections for public streets.
- Banker Drive (currently noted on the plans as Bond Avenue) should be public between Mooney Street and Dale Drive, and interim and future conditions should be provided given the existing car dealership on the south side of that future roadway. Ms. Ray stated that additional information about how the project would address development on the south side of this roadway, until future development was proposed, would be needed.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, clarified that the public portion would end when Banker Drive extends over the proposed parking structure for the segment between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Mooney Street south of Park Avenue should be public, since it is no longer proposed over a parking structure, and the street section should be consistent as the segments north of Park Avenue, with on-street parking on both sides of the street.
- The applicant should provide an exhibit showing all of the lot lines to be reconfigured or adjusted, including Dale Drive/Park Avenue (and the Dale Drive vacation); John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive; and the greenway parcels south of John Shields Parkway.
- The applicant should provide detailed sections for all streets and street segments, including all of the variations (such as where turn lanes are added).

Barb Cox inquired about Block F where Lot 1 and Lot 2 were noted but the lot lines were not shown. Mr. Langworthy stated that better defined blocks were needed and setbacks should be noted.

Mr. Quackenbush asked if, for the private streets, the lot lines should be drawn at the curb or walkway and not at the edge of the building as there is no tree lawn. Ms. Ray responded staff prefers a sidewalk in the area and suggested mirroring the sections for the public streets.

Ms. Cox pointed out several areas where the proposed lot lines did not join that would need to be corrected.

Ms. Ray continued:

Parcels/Lots

- Lot sizes are dependent on the proposed building types, and the applicant should indicate the conceptually proposed building types and uses anticipated for each block and lot. She suggested a table reference.
- She asked the applicant if they ever planned to subdivide the blocks into smaller parcels for future financing purposes, and suggested that they consider a game plan for how the parcels could be configured, and if there would be an impact on the plat.
- She stated that known open spaces should be shown in public access easements.

Other Improvements

- She stated the applicant still needed to provide a master utility plan with the Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Cox said utility provisions were needed or there could be issues with the utility easements and future building placement.

Mr. Quackenbush said the private streets were over the parking garages, and he did not anticipate the need for utility easements to run through the private streets.

Ms. Cox pointed out a few areas where the reserve areas meet the rights-of-way and where the transformers sit. Mr. Quackenbush agreed with Ms. Cox's assessment. She said there may just be three or four instances.

Ms. Cox asked the applicant to make sure the plans included "environmental" aspects of the site, including existing wetlands, buried structures, etc.

Jeff Tyler said there may be more issues and comments to come on the electrical plans, and he is continuing to meet with the applicant to discuss and coordinate Building Code related issues.

Ms. Ray stated that to conclude the discussion on the Preliminary Plat, a few additional design details were noted on the comment sheet she had provided the applicant, including the need for updated proposed street names, fixing the plan scale, providing a table showing all block dimensions, and providing a tree survey for the portion of the site north of Tuller Ridge Drive.

Ms. Ray referred everyone to the comments she had prepared on the Basic Development Plan which included the following key issues:

Required Waivers

- Blocks "D" and "H" exceed block length and perimeter, and other block waivers may be identified once the applicant provides the correct block measurements. Ms. Ray said the Waiver could be reviewed either as part of the Basic Plan or Development Plan applications.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said he preferred to submit the Waiver request with the Basic Development Plan. Ms. Ray agreed that since the Preliminary Plat would be affected the Waivers should be discussed as early as possible.

Street Sections

- Ms. Ray stated that the ART and the Planning and Zoning Commission will require a much clearer understanding of the vision for each street, including detailed sections at a minimum 20-scale. She agreed that final details will be determined with the Development Plan Review (refer to comments on case 14-071DP-BSC, below).

Neighborhood District Standards

- Ms. Ray reiterated the applicant's need to think through the vision for the shopping corridor(s) along Park Avenue and Riverside Drive (since the required shopping corridors had not yet been identified), the gateways, and other urban design elements of the streetscape.

Ms. Ray noted technical issues:

1. Block Measurements - Blocks need to be measured along rights-of-way where they exist, and along the section edges of the private streets, and/or property lines. Provide a table showing calculations (total length of each side and total perimeter).
2. Vehicular Access Configuration – Engineering is still reviewing.
3. Mid-block Pedestrianway - Required for Block G on shopping corridor
4. Plans/Additional Information Needed
 - a. Scale should be no larger than one inch = 100 feet
 - b. Gray out the building footprints (the property/right-of-way lines should be more prominent)
 - c. Identify existing/future Principal Frontage Streets
 - d. Identify front/corner side/side property lines (based on building orientation)
 - e. Show lot configuration (refer to Preliminary Plat comments)
 - f. Show all typical sections (refer to Preliminary Plat comments)
 - g. Show location and dimensions of planned shopping corridor

Ms. Ray summarized the main issues with the Basic Development Plan and that a clearer vision was needed for the character of the streets throughout this project before the application moves forward. She said this, to some extent, also applies to the open space plans because while all the final details do not need to be solidified at this stage, the applicant needs to demonstrate how they are starting to think through the details of their placement, dimensions, character, purpose, function, etc. for open space.

Mr. Langworthy suggested that the applicant show the required build zones (RBZ) on the plans and not the building footprints, since the purpose of the Development Plan application is to focus on the street network and block framework. He said the applicant should understand that the buildings will then have to be sited within the RBZ range.

Ms. Ray suggested that the applicant show the building footprints on the plans for the Development Plan. Mr. Quackenbush said that taking buildings off of the Development Plan would be quite a challenge because then there would not be much left.

Joanne Shelly suggested just providing the building envelope. Ms. Ray agreed, because the building footprint outlines would help illustrate the locations of parking structures and vehicular access.

Ms. Cox referred back to the Preliminary Plat and noted that there were a few requirements such as rights-of-way with chamfered corners that would require variances by City Council since they are technically required by the Subdivision Regulations, but are not necessarily appropriate for urban streets. Mr. Langworthy said those items would be noted in the report.

Mr. Langworthy asked about the process for vacating right-of-way for existing Dale Drive. Ms. Cox said it can be done with the Final Plat. Ms. Ray asked for an exhibit to clarify each of the lot line adjustments, right-of-way vacations, etc.

Ms. Ray reiterated that the plans for the street sections needed to be at a larger scale with a much greater level of detail. She indicated that when this goes to the Commission, they will want an understanding of the vision for Park Avenue that will include the look/feel, where the private patio spaces will be accommodated, how the open spaces will be integrated into the streetscape, and how the other less prominent streets will feel as well. She stated that Park Avenue will terminate at the pedestrian

bridge landing point, and the ART, Commission, and City Council will all want wide sidewalks and an exceptional public realm along Park Avenue leading up to the park and the bridge. She indicated that at this stage, the Commission will be looking for "vision" and not necessarily all of the details – just an understanding that the project's public improvements and public realm are headed down the right path.

Mr. Yoder asked what would be considered enough walkway area. Mr. Langworthy asked if each street will have a section drawing.

Ms. Ray stated each street needed to have its own section, including where street segments had different sections. She recommended that the applicant carefully review the preliminary analysis she had provided, and provide the information highlighted in yellow that is still missing since that information would be needed before the project moves forward.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked about the mid-block pedestrianway requirements along the shopping corridor. Ms. Ray noted the blocks exceeding 400 feet on a shopping corridor would require a mid-block pedestrianway. She also referred to item #4 of the Development Plan.

Mr. Yoder inquired if they could stop the shopping corridor to avoid the need for a mid-block pedestrianway. He suggested that portions of the Riverside Drive frontage and the first two blocks of Park Avenue could serve as the shopping corridor.

Ms. Ray said the Code had a minimum required length for the shopping corridor, and the applicant would need to show how the minimum length was provided on the plans since that information had not been provided.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or comments regarding this application at this time. [There were none.] He stated that the ART's recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Basic Plan Review and to City Council for Preliminary Plat Review were scheduled for July, 31, 2014.

5. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project, Phase 1
14-071DP-BSC **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive**
Development Plan Review

Rachel Ray said this is a request for review and approval for four new blocks for development on approximately 17.28 acres, including new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Bridge Street District Development Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Ray said after conducting a preliminary review of the plans since they had been submitted last week, she had identified a significant amount of detail on the public improvements that have not yet been provided. She said she had met with the Director of Strategic Initiatives/Special Projects to discuss the level of information that the City is comfortable making a recommendation on at this stage of the project, and he agreed that a comfort level on the details for project elements including the disposition of each of the public/private streets, the cycle track configuration on Park Avenue, and the streetscape character of Park Avenue and Riverside Drive needed to be reached before the Development Plan moves forward.

Ms. Ray stated that with a bit more information, the Basic Development Plan application could move forward, since it is more conceptual in nature, but she strongly recommended that the applicant consider



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

JULY 10, 2014

AGENDA

- 1. Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District
14-039ADMC
(Approved 5 – 0)** Scioto River Neighborhood District
Zoning Code Amendment
- 2. Zoning Map Amendment/Area Rezoning-Bridge Street District
14-040Z
(Approved 5 – 0)** Scioto River Neighborhood District
Zoning Map Amendment
- 3. Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District
13-095ADMC
(WORKSESSION)** Zoning Code Amendment

Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Amy Kramb, Richard Taylor, Victoria Newell, John Hardt, and Todd Zimmerman. Amy Salay was absent. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Readler, Dana McDaniel, Logan Stang, Nicki Martin, Rachel Ray, Andrew Crozier, Jeff Tyler, Devayani Puranik, Terry Foegler, Joanne Shelly, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. John Hardt seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6– 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there is a presentation that will be first and following the cases will be heard in order of the published agenda and briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Presentation Bridge Park East Project

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, provided a project overview on the planned Bridge Park East mixed-use development. He said his intent was to inform the Commission of changes that have been incorporated into the plan since the Commission's informal review in November 2013.

Mr. Yoder said the changes are related to the comments related to blocks sizes being too big and the recommendation that the blocks needed to be broken up. He said they improved the building design with enhancing the character, they provided more open space, extended the shopping corridor to the east, and provided more office square footage and meeting places to address the need for more space for Dublin's corporate citizens. He said they have increased the square footage to 60,000 square feet of office space spread throughout five different buildings and are taking advantage of the best views available within the project. He stated that they had reduced the number of residential units from 741 to 596.

Mr. Yoder said the target audience includes current and future Dublin corporate citizens, capturing the companies that are here now and attracting new Class A offices, while having the residential units

capable of attracting a nice spectrum of empty nesters and young professionals. He said this is an approximately 24-acre project in a great area of the city while still being a walkable district that is highly engaged with the river and adjacent parks. He said the project will include a 500 seat theater, gathering spaces with pocket parks, restaurants, convention center space, and a hotel that would likely be a Marriott product. He said economically, they are expecting to create 500 full time jobs for two full years for the project construction, as well as 1,000 full time equivalent jobs.

John Hardt asked Mr. Yoder to clarify the limits of Phase One of the project.

Mr. Yoder said phase "1A" is basically the existing Bridge Point Shopping Center, for which they plan to ask for demolition permits as soon as tenant relocations are complete, and areas slightly north of existing Dale Drive.

Mr. Hardt asked for the height of each of the new buildings.

Mr. Yoder said the corner building will be 85,000 square feet and will be a four or five story building. He said the hotel is four stories of guest rooms with a ground floor amenity space for a total of five stories, the next building has two stories of office/fitness with fitness/retail on the ground floor with four stories of apartments above for a total of six stories. He said the potential condominiums will be six stories with 12-foot ceiling height.

Richard Taylor said the changes are great and the project is headed in the right direction. He said he appreciates the applicant's response to the Commission's comments that they provided last November.

Todd Zimmerman said he likes the concepts and indicated that the progress on the implementation of the Bridge Street District is eye opening.

Victoria Newell said she appreciates the applicant's efforts made to address the Commission's comments and asked for some details on proposed materials that will be used for this project.

Mr. Yoder said they are working with Moody Nolan to complete the next level of documentation to bring sections and detailed elevation views to the Commission to highlight the materials. He said they are looking at the combination of brick and stone with a variety of colors and types of brick that would be most appropriate while having the ability to bring in Hardiplank or masonry products to have a variety of materials focused on the upper levels of the buildings.

Chris Amorose Groomes said she appreciated the presentation and the opportunity to ask questions. She said it appears that great strides have been made, although she said she still had concerns with the breakdown of uses and the amount of residential uses and apartments along Riverside Drive. She said she is concerned that only 18,000 square feet of retail in the entire first phase would be too small an amount compared with 1.1 million square feet of residential square footage. She thought that a more appropriate balance would be critical to balancing the traffic generated by this development.

Mr. Yoder agreed, but said that they would need to closely monitor the balance of parking. He said that residential development generates less parking at the equivalent of about 1.5 spaces per thousand square feet, while office uses generate about three to five spaces per thousand, but both hit the tax rolls at the same rate. He said changing the mix of uses could put the parking out of balance where they would not be able to afford to build the parking needed to support the office uses.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if they have started to identify interior spaces that will be used for structured parking.

Mr. Yoder said a location might be available further up the hill as the project expands, but would not be something that would be considered within the first phase.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Yoder for the presentation.

1. **Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood District
14-039ADMC Zoning Code Amendment**
and
2. **Zoning Map Amendment/Area Rezoning-Bridge Street District
14-040Z Scioto River Neighborhood District
Zoning Map Amendment**

Chris Amorose Groomes said the following two cases were previously tabled and will be heard together but will require separate actions. She said the following applications are requests for review and recommendation to City Council for modifications to the Zoning Code to establish a new Bridge Street District zoning district and related Code amendments for the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District and for an area rezoning of 23 parcels for the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood and BSC Public Districts in the Bridge Street District.

Rachel Ray said this case was tabled at the June 5th Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She said Planning has modified the name of the district from "BSD Riverside Neighborhood District" to the "BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District" in response to the Commission's comments from the last review.

Ms. Ray said the majority of the Zoning Code amendments involve the Neighborhood Standards, which includes the new standards for the Scioto River Neighborhood, in addition to related Code amendments to some of the other main sections of the Bridge Street District zoning regulations.

Ms. Ray said the text follows the same general format and outline as the other neighborhood districts. She explained the history for the creation of the neighborhood districts, and noted that the components had been drafted in coordination with the developers and land owners who were working on plans for the Indian Run and Sawmill Center neighborhood districts at the time. She said the general locations for the shopping corridors, street network framework, open space network, and other elements that the developers were contemplating had been incorporated into the draft regulations and the associated graphics.

Ms. Ray referred to the updated Riverside Neighborhood District graphic and noted the updates, including an arrow at the east end of the shopping corridor for a mixed use activity node, a designation on the graphic indicating limited vehicular access adjacent to the roundabout at the intersection of Riverside Drive and State Route 161, and modifications to the boundaries of this district consistent with the modifications to the zoning map.

Ms. Ray said the modification to the proposed zoning text included the District Scope and Intent to emphasize the importance of a balance of land uses, in addition to a modification to the use table to require conditional use review for transit stations and conference centers. She said the Law Director's office requested that the reference of the "Group Residences" be eliminated from the use table entirely. She said the most significant modification is related to the Building Types. She stated that at the June 5th meeting, the Commission requested the elimination of wood and fiber cement siding as a permitted primary material and also to reduce the maximum permitted height for corridor buildings from 7.5 down to 5.5 stories in all Bridge Street District zoning districts. She said they have received three letters from potential developers in the Bridge Street District with some concerns about those two provisions, along



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

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 10, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Jeremiah Gracia, Economic Development Administrator; Alan Perkins, Washington Township Fire Marshal; and Sgt. Rodney Barnes, Police.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; Jonathan Staker, Planning Assistant; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; Logan Stang, Planning Assistant; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Flora Rogers, Administrative Assistant.

Applicants: Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; Jay Boone, Moody Nolan; James Peltier, EMH&T; and Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 2 & 3).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the July 3, 2014, meeting minutes. He confirmed that ART members had sent their modifications to Ms. Rogers prior to the meeting. The minutes were accepted into the record as amended.

INTRODUCTIONS

**1. Verizon Wireless Co-Location – Avery Park Water Tower
14-067ARTW**

**7697 Avery Road
Administrative Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for Verizon to replace six panel antennas and install three remote radio heads and one OVP distribution box on the Avery Park water tower. She said the applicant had originally requested to punch in a new port entry hole for the cables; however, after discussions with Engineering, who had expressed concerns with adding a new hole in the water tower, the applicant is now proposing to reconfigure the existing wires and use one of the existing entry ports instead. She said since this is City-owned land, the City's legal counsel for wireless issues is looking at how this request relates to the existing lease in effect for this site. She said this will require more time for review, and therefore a determination on this request is anticipated for the July 24th ART meeting (barring any issues raised).

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any initial questions or concerns with respect to this application.

Aaron Stanford confirmed that Engineering had preliminarily reviewed the request and found the port entry detail to be acceptable.

**2. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project – Basic Development Plan
14-070BPR/PP
Riverside Drive & West Dublin-Granville Road
Basic Development Plan Review/Preliminary Plat**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for a Basic Development Plan and Preliminary Plat for preliminary review for six new blocks for future development on approximately 27.3 acres, in addition to new public rights-

of-way, for a future mixed-use development located on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road.

[ART discussion summarized below.]

3. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project – Phase 1

14-071DP-BSC

**Riverside Drive & Dale Drive
Development Plan Review**

Rachel Ray stated this is a request for Development Plan Review for four new blocks for development on approximately 17.28 acres, including new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive at approximately the intersection of Dale Drive, north of West Dublin-Granville Road.

Ms. Ray said there was a Pre-Application Review at last week's ART meeting for both applications. She explained that staff had also met with the applicant yesterday to review the updated plans and to discuss the approach to obtaining the property owners' signatures for the COTA Park and Ride site and the medical office building on Dale Drive. She stated that staff had agreed to process the application and begin the reviews, provided the property owner signatures are obtained prior to a determination on each application. She reiterated that the ART recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission are targeted for Thursday, July 31st for both applications.

Ms. Ray said the first application is for the Basic Development Plan and Preliminary Plat, which covers the larger area south of John Shields Parkway but does not include the land west of the Vrable site, north of John Shields Parkway. She described the Mooney Street extension south through the site, which would become private south of the new "Park Avenue" roadway in the southern portion of the site. She said the Basic Development Plan application is intended to review the street network and block framework for the site on a larger scale. She said the applicant has also filed a Preliminary Plat for the lots and future rights-of-way.

Steve Langworthy confirmed blocks A and B will be divided by a private street.

Ms. Ray explained that the proposed Zoning Code language for the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, which the Planning and Zoning Commission will review later this evening, includes special provisions for the measurement of block size given the unique block access circumstances near the future roundabout.

Ms. Ray said there are separate case numbers for the Basic Development Plan/Preliminary Plat and the Development Plan for Phase 1 of Bridge Park East. She stated that Phase 1 includes four blocks with the future "Park Avenue." She explained that the purpose of the Development Plan is to take a step further than the Basic Development Plan, looking at general building footprints and locations of streets, blocks, and lots, in addition to evaluating the proposal against the Neighborhood District standards that are currently being drafted.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they would like to comment further on the two applications.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the streets that will be installed above parking structures will be private. He provided an overview of the proposed public and private streets shown throughout the site.

Ms. Ray said the plans also include block dimensions, utility plans and open spaces. She reiterated that although the open space plan shows amenity decks as part of the "open space" provided on site, these spaces will not count toward the open space requirement.

Mr. Yoder described the intent of the open space distribution across the site, including larger pocket parks and pocket plazas intended to serve as larger gathering spaces, such as BriHi Square in Historic Dublin, in addition to smaller spaces along the sidewalk.

Ms. Ray said in terms of timing, she is looking at scheduling a General Staff meeting within the next week, and we will continue to meet with the applicant at the ART meetings until the recommendation scheduled for July 31st.

Mr. Langworthy instructed staff to prepare for the General Staff meeting and to review the applications from a broader perspective.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 pm.



**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

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 3, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; Jonathan Staker, Planning Assistant; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; Brad Conway, Residential Plans Examiner; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; Jay Boone, Moody Nolan; Mike Bermeister, OHM Advisors (Case 1); Linda Meneray, EMH&T (Cases 4 & 6); Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross LLC (Case 4); David Blair, Ford and Associates Architects; Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests (Case 5); and Jim Muckle, Vrable Healthcare (Case 6).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the June 26, 2014, meeting minutes. He confirmed that ART members had sent their modifications to Ms. Wright prior to the meeting. The minutes were accepted into the record as amended.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

1. Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development

**Riverside Drive and State Route 161
Pre-Application Review**

Bridge Park East

Rachel Ray said this is a request for non-binding review of a potential application for a mixed-use development with residential, commercial, office, restaurant, hotel and conference center uses on approximately 25 acres located on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of State Route 161. She said this is a request for pre-application review prior to submission of an application for Basic Plan Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(C).

Ms. Ray provided an overview of the applications that the applicant plans to file within the next week. She explained that the applicant would submit Basic Development Plan, Development Plan, and Preliminary Plat applications for the entire area shown as part of the Bridge Park East development. This area includes the land between Tuller Road to the north, east of the relocated Riverside Drive, north of West Dublin-Granville Road, and west of the new Dale/Tuller connector roadway but not including the Acura car dealership. She explained the proposed Development Plan application for Phase One that includes the new street currently identified as Park Avenue leading up to the future pedestrian bridge landing point, and adjacent development blocks. She explained that the applicant had met with City staff yesterday at their weekly project coordination meeting to review the application materials in preparation for the Pre-Application Review and the upcoming application submittals.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, provided the ART with an overview of each of the plans submitted as part of the three separate applications that would be filed.

Colleen Gilger asked if Block 'F' was slated for a medical office building.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, agreed that was presently the intent for that building.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, explained that building was not shown on the perspective rendering included in the Basic Development Plan.

Ms. Ray explained the Preliminary Plat includes the public streets of Park Avenue, Mooney Street, and John Shields Parkway. She said the Final Plat, when submitted by the applicant, will be sectioned off into smaller areas likely corresponding with the Site Plan applications.

Ms. Ray reiterated the timeline for reviewing these applications, assuming the applicant is prepared to file next week. She explained that these cases would be introduced to the ART next week, July 10, and staff would continue meeting with the applicant on a weekly basis to coordinate. She stated that an ART determination is expected for July 31st to be ready to move forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 7, 2014.

Steve Langworthy prefaced this agenda item by stating it is a pre-application review, and general comments are preferred as the applicant prepares their formal submission. He said the purpose at this stage is to raise the larger issues or concerns and note anything that may be missing for the submittal.

Fred Hahn asked if the building terraces have anything to do with open space.

Ms. Ray confirmed that the applicant is showing their roof decks and courtyards on the open space plans, but they will not count toward meeting the Code required open space. Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant to be sure to identify the open spaces that will meet the requirements, versus the other open areas shown on the plans.

Mr. Quackenbush said they are currently in the process of identifying any Waivers that may be necessary, in addition to the potential for fees-in-lieu of open space dedication.

Jeff Tyler pointed out that they are showing Block 'A' as part of the Preliminary Plat, but it is not depicted on the Development Plan. Mr. Quackenbush said Block 'A' was represented on some of the plans for the Basic Development Plan but they will rethink what they are showing.

Jennifer Rauch referred to the perspective rendering of the site and suggested the applicant label or color code the buildings/blocks included in this phase to make it less confusing. Mr. Quackenbush agreed that would help make the development area clearer and easier to understand.

Aaron Stanford confirmed that the applicant had begun coordinating with Engineering on the proposed street names for this project. He said more information will be necessary to determine how the applicant plans to address stormwater management, and the applicant will not be able to count improvements in the public rights-of-way, including the pervious pavers in the parking lanes, for managing stormwater from private sites. He said the applicant will also need to begin thinking about the provision of water service throughout the site and the water taps needed. He said the City is dealing with the same water line issue with the developer for the Tuller Flats project. He asked the applicant if they have engaged in conversations with the City of Columbus yet in terms of the provision of water service.

Mr. Quackenbush said their proposal was more straightforward than Tuller Flats with different development entities and buildings. He said Tuller Flats is an apartment complex whereas the Bridge Park project will have different building owners and developers. He said the blocks were not all separated but they were starting to think through those issues. He said one of the issues is private utilities, and they are speaking with AEP about electric as there limited areas to put transformers. He explained they are shown on the utility plan but it is hard to understand at this scale. He stated they have planned for below-grade transformers like downtown Columbus, with grates providing access to vaults. He said they could also go through the garage for access.

Mr. Stanford asked if the garages will be built on the right-of-way. Mr. Quackenbush answered the garages would be adjacent to the public streets.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any special fire issues with underground transformers. Mr. Quackenbush said these will be normal pad transformers but garages are above the floodplain and gravity drains the water. He said the submersible is explosion proof and designed for this type of location.

Mr. Stanford asked if they were incorporating street lighting on the plans. Mr. Quackenbush said he did not think so, but he would check.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant to detail each block on the Development Plan so staff can verify block dimensions and the relationships between the buildings and the rights-of-way and property lines. Mr. Quackenbush said some of those dimensions were called out on the plans.

Mr. Langworthy concluded that a more thorough review would be conducted at a general staff meeting following submission of complete applications, and that the applicant could expect comments in writing that they could respond to prior to moving forward.

Bridge Park West (94 & 100 North High Street)

Jennifer Rauch explained that the applicant had requested late the previous day to include the Bridge Park West project in the Historic District as part of the Pre-Application Review, as they are nearing completion of the application materials for the west side of the river.

Mike Bermeister, OHM Advisors, presented the Basic Development Plan application materials. He explained that as part of the submittal, they had provided a narrative that outlines how the proposal meets each element of the Bridge Street District zoning regulations, and where Waivers would be necessary. He said the project exceeds the block size requirement, street frontage, and building height.

Mr. Bermeister said with respect to the lots and blocks requirements, he pointed out the proposed parcel reconfiguration and that they end up with a block size of approximately 498 feet, where a maximum of 300 feet is required. He said the Waiver ties into the block configuration for a pedestrian pathway and the building is separated to the back of the condominiums so while it is an open view they do not have an actual pedestrianway. He said vehicular access to the parking garage below on High Street requires a Waiver as well.

Mr. Bermeister commented that in terms of the Street Type requirements of the Code, they meet all the requirements with the exception of High Street access. He noted the parking count, which currently exceeds all requirements.

Mr. Bermeister stated that the applicant had also begun to review the Building Type requirements. He said there were elements of the Historic Mixed-Use building type, with a Podium Apartment Building on the back and a parking structure as part of that, which exceeds the requirements. He presented various perspective renderings and at the request of ART members, agreed to clarify some of the views to ensure that the actual scale, massing, and appearance of the building viewed from different angles and viewpoints would be easier to understand.

Mr. Bermeister said the future location of Rock Cress Parkway is shown at the south end of the project site, north of North Street. He said the buildings in this area, adjacent to the Oscar's restaurant, were not part of the project but the renderings serve as a placeholder for a future building. He presented section views of the project to demonstrate the back of the building's limited visibility from High Street due to the change in grade.

Colleen Gilger said there are elevations for the front sides and the back views for the buildings but asked about the back side view. Mr. Bermeister said it was not included in the package and is being developed. He said they are also developing the landscape plan along High Street to incorporate benches and other streetscape details, as well as internal vistas and gateways.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked if the concept plan should be included in the Development Plan submittal. Ms. Rauch said to include that in the Basic Site Plan application submittal.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the scale of the drawings. Mr. Bermeister said it should be 1 inch equals 100 feet, but he would make sure to provide a scale on the plans.

Rachel Ray commented on the property lines and other details that should be shown on the plans, and that the aerial photo should be eliminated, since it makes the proposal difficult to read.

Mr. Bermeister said he would provide black and white graphics instead of aerial views.

Ms. Rauch commented that the Architectural Review Board would be very interested in seeing the details of how the "historic" and traditional portion of the building transitions to the more contemporary portion, as this was a significant topic of their discussion when reviewed informally in May.

Steve Langworthy said he was concerned with the proposal, overall. He said the plans show the historical aspect on High Street but when you turn the corner, the architectural character changes abruptly. He emphasized the need to see a transition. Mr. Bermeister said they were continuing to work on the revised renderings.

Jeff Tyler said he agreed with Ms. Gilger for needing to see the perspective of views from other buildings. He emphasized the need to sell this project and suggested more drawings are needed to convince the ART and the ARB that this is the right architecture for this area.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the garage doors with access off the High Street entrance. Mr. Bermeister said the idea was to downplay the visibility of that access point.

Mr. Hunter said he had trouble with how the parking would work. He said they have more parking than they need and want to use it, making it easier to get the public in.

Mr. Tyler pointed out that there appears to be multiple perspectives and two to three different rendering styles using several different programs, which did not result in a flattering appearance of the building. He indicated the main perspective did not show detail like the others, and articulation along this side of the street is important.

Ms. Rauch said there is no curb cut shown where Mr. Bermeister had referenced the intersection with the future Rock Cress Parkway.

Mr. Langworthy stated he was concerned about the pocket park shown on the slope toward the back of the building.

Fred Hahn said it could be nice and a very interesting space, or worthless given the slopes. He said as the project comes forward, staff will need to see a great deal of detail about this space.

Aaron Stanford asked if there was any potential to include a valet area along North High Street. Mr. Bermeister answered that valet service through the carriage doors was being considered. Mr. Stanford asked who would use the garage doors on High Street. Mr. Bermeister said from retail, public areas, restaurants, and apartments. He said the applicant wants to make excess parking available to the visitors to the Historic District.

Mr. Hahn asked about parking counts, loading zones, and restricted or designated parking. Mr. Bermeister said they need three primary loading zone spaces and restricted parking for deliveries and fire trucks on High Street.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there was any strong desire to provide metered spaces on High Street. Mr. Hunter said he did not know. Mr. Langworthy said metered parking would not just be for this section but could be needed District-wide for both the east and west sides of the river. Mr. Hunter said the garages will likely have some fee associated with them and on-street parking available for up to 20 spaces.

Mr. Stanford asked how they propose to handle trash for two restaurants at opposite ends of the building, as he was looking for a corridor with a trash compactor. He said he was accustomed to seeing trash rooms on each floor for condominium complexes.

Ms. Rauch said the change requests discussed today were not expected by Monday following the holiday weekend but the changes will be required for the full submission. Mr. Bermeister promised to get the changes and comments in the revised plans to be submitted.

Joanne Shelly said she appreciated the effort the applicant made by reading the Code. She said the graphic read pretty well but she was not seeing section lines anywhere and said the sections appear very overwhelming and massive.

Ms. Rauch said she would appreciate a scale comparison of the new compared to the existing as viewed from High Street.

Mr. Langworthy expressed he was not sure this was the whole issue; he has concerns about the river side as well.

Mr. Bermeister promised to create additional views that include pedestrian views from the street to better tell the story.

Ms. Shelly illustrated that the view from the east side of the river to the west side at the pedestrian level will show primarily trees and not the building.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments or questions. [There were none.] He thanked the applicant for their presentation.

DETERMINATIONS

2. Verizon Wireless – AEP Transmission Tower Co-Location 14-060ARTW

**8421 Glenree Place
Administrative Review**

Devayani Puranik said this is a request for Verizon to replace six panel antennas and install three remote radio heads on an existing pole within an AEP transmission tower on the east side of Glenree Place, north of the intersection with Summit View Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless communications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Puranik said this application was introduced last week and there have been no changes. She said an Administrative Departure to Code Section 99.05(C)(3)(f) is requested for maximum height, allowing antenna panels on an existing tower to be installed approximately 110 feet from grade, which falls within the existing tower height.

Ms. Puranik explained that replacing the panel antennas and installing the remote radio heads requires no other changes or ground modifications. She said **approval** with three conditions is recommended:

- 1) That any future installation and/or replacement of the antennas should not exceed 110 feet measured from the grade;
- 2) That the new equipment should be unobtrusive and maintain similar color; and
- 3) That any associated cables are trimmed to fit closely to the panels.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this application with three conditions.

3. BSC Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – FC Bank – Sign 14-061MPR

**4545 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Minor Project Review**

Devayani Puranik said this is a request to construct a new 20-square-foot wall sign for a new tenant in the Shoppes at River Ridge shopping center on the south side of West Dublin-Granville Road at the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066(G).

Ms. Puranik said the proposed wall sign, which includes internally illuminated channel letters, meets the height and square footage requirements. She said the letters would be individually flush-mounted to the brick façade. She said the applicant is also proposing vinyl window graphics that show the store hours. She explained that the proposed window sign would be adhered to the right glass panel of the door and that she is working with the applicant to modify the store hour details so that it meets the Code requirements for size and not requiring a sign permit.

Ms. Puranik said **approval** with one condition is recommended:

- 1) That the existing exterior light fixtures above the proposed wall sign should be covered and resurfaced to camouflage with the background wall prior to sign permitting.



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

NOVEMBER 14, 2013

AGENDA

Informal Case

- 1. Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development** **Riverside Drive and State Route 161**
13-111INF **Informal Review**

New Case

- 2. Village at Coffman Park PUD – Ganzhorn Suites**
13-058Z/PDP/PP **Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan/
Preliminary Plat**

Administrative Case

- 3. Bridge Street District – Code Modification**
13-095ADMC **Administrative Request -Zoning Code Amendment**

[Please note: due to technical difficulties there is no recording available for this meeting. These minutes were created using staff notes.]

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, John Hardt, Warren Fishman, and Victoria Newell (arrived 8 pm). City representatives were Dan Phillabaum, Terry Foegler, Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Gary Gunderman, Justin Goodwin, Rachel Ray, Marie Downie, Jennifer Readler, Jeff Tyler, Alan Perkins, Barb Cox, Dana McDaniel, Laurie Wright, and Libby Farley.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved, John Hardt seconded to accept the documents into the record as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

- 1. Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development** **Riverside Drive and State Route 161**
13-111INF **Informal Review**

Dan Phillabaum presented this case and began by providing some background information that preceded this Informal application. He said that one of City Council's Goals for 2013 is to embrace the vision of true mixed-use, walkable neighborhoods in the Bridge Street District by

working with public and private partners to create a sustainable, safe, vibrant and dynamic mix of land uses, creative open spaces, residential options and signature architecture to attract a diverse population of residents and visitor.

Mr. Phillabaum said that to begin implementing this vision, Council made a strategic decision to focus development efforts on the Scioto River Corridor area based on the transformative opportunities this area presents to build off of the walkable environment of Historic Dublin by creating a complementary, pedestrian-friendly development pattern on the east side of the river, to engage the Scioto River by expanding parkland on both sides of this natural amenity and facilitating pedestrian movement across the River, and to create a gateway experience at this prominent location. He said that staff has been directed to advance the preliminary planning and design of several Capital Improvement Projects in this area of the city, including the realignment of Riverside Drive, creation and expansion of parkland on both sides of the Scioto River, a roundabout at Riverside Drive and State Route 161, and a pedestrian bridge linking Historic Dublin, the parks and future development on the east side of the Scioto. He said the purpose of this Informal is to provide an opportunity for Crawford Hoying Development Partners to introduce the Commission to their master plan concept for the east side of the Scioto River and for the Commission to review and provide initial feedback to City Council, Staff and the Developer on this mixed-use development concept within the context of this public infrastructure framework.

Mr. Phillabaum described the project site as being approximately 25 acres at northeast corner of State Route 161 and relocated Riverside Drive. He said it includes majority of the former Bash Driving Range, Bridge Point Shopping Center, the Spa at River Ridge, Touch of Class Car Wash and COTA Park and Ride Facility. He added that coordination between the City and several of these entities is ongoing in order to facilitate the public infrastructure currently under preliminary design. He informed the Commission that Crawford Hoying has also been in close coordination with City staff and our consultant team to as they develop their mixed-use concept to ensure that the private development and public infrastructure are aligned so that the vision for the Scioto River Corridor can be realized.

Chris Amorose Groomes said that first they would view the presentation from the applicant, then they would take public comment on the proposal, then open it up to Commission for discussion and questions for the applicant and staff.

Nelson Yoder with Crawford Hoying Development Partners thanked the Commission for taking the time this evening to review their ideas for the Bridge Park mixed-use development. He thanked the Commissioners that were able to attend the Community Input Forum where these plans and images were first presented to the public and welcomed the opportunity to have a broader discussion and obtain more in-depth feedback from the Commission. He said Crawford Hoying firmly believes this project is walkable, sustainable and aligned with the City's vision for the Bridge Street District.

John Martin, with Elkus Manfredi Architects provided a description of the overall plan beginning with the blocks south of Park Avenue. He said that at the southernmost block of the development are a five story, 140,000 s.f. office building and a 195 key hotel room and a 30,000 s.f. conference center with a plaza space between. He said these buildings are located above two levels of parking below ground. He said the next block to the north would contain a

32,000 s.f. fitness center at the ground floor with 82 dwelling units on the floors above, a three story parking structure lined by townhomes on two sides, and about 23,400 s.f. of retail/food & beverage uses at street level on the south side of Park Avenue with 90 dwelling units on the floors above. He said all of the development in this block is located above two levels of parking below ground, and to the east across Mooney Street is a 5,000 s.f. retail/food & beverage use anchoring the intersection with townhomes to east at the ground floor and 88 dwelling units above. He added that a two level parking deck would be located behind this building.

Mr. Martin then outlined the proposed development north of Park Avenue. He said there would be about 33,000 s.f. of retail/food & beverage uses lining the north side of Park Avenue west of Mooney Street and turning the corner along Riverside Drive. He said there would also be a 19,000 s.f. neighborhood grocery along Riverside Drive. He said the four upper floors of these buildings would be comprised of a total of about 220 dwelling units over the three building footprints below. He added that on the interior of this block is a three level parking structure capped with a roof-top amenity deck for residents. He said on the block to the east across Mooney Street is a 10,000 s.f. retail/food & beverage use anchoring the intersection with townhomes to east at the ground floor. He said the remainder of this block was comprised with approximately 78 residential units both at the street level and on the floors above and parking would be located on the interior of this block.

He said the six blocks to the north between Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge/Dale Drive would be comprised of about 100 3-story townhomes and that these would likely be built by other developers in a range of architectural styles. He said the remaining block to the west along Riverside Drive would also be entirely residential, with about 285 dwelling units distributed among four five-story buildings that surround a parking structure capped with a roof-top amenity deck for residents.

Mr. Martin described a few perspective images to illustrate what this district could be in the future. He noted that these were conceptual sketches of an architectural character that will certainly undergo changes as the development is refined.

The first view is from the vantage point of the center of the roundabout looking to the north. He said a portion of the exposed parking beneath the buildings would be concealed by a bermed embankment. He said the office building would be clad in stone or cast stone with the same coloration and texture of Dublin limestone. He said a plaza in the center opens views to the hotel and conference use. He said there would be a ballroom in the center of the space with pre-function areas featuring extensive use of glass in order to provide views to the river. He said small meeting rooms would be oriented closer to the courtyard. He said the hotel would have an amenity deck with a swimming pool at the top floor.

He said the next view was of Park Avenue from the pedestrian bridge landing across Riverside Drive. He said this would be a 'double loaded' street with active ground floor uses such as retail and food & beverage on both sides. He was supportive of the design for this street that proposes a different pavement material through the intersection at Riverside Drive, and makes a strong connection to the cycletrack along Park Avenue to bring pedestrian and bicycle traffic from their development to Historic Dublin and back. He said the buildings depicted would be four stories of residential in wood construction on top of either a concrete or wood podium and clad with brick or masonry.

He described the next image as a view to the south down Riverside Drive with the neighborhood grocery in the foreground. He said this grocery would serve the needs of the over 1,000 future residents in the area. He noted that parallel parking has been depicted along the east side of Riverside Drive and they were hopeful that this could be achieved. He said from the grocery to the south would be more of the retail and restaurant uses as one approaches the pedestrian bridge.

He said the next view was of Park Avenue at the east end of the development area to the west toward the river. He described the street as having two travel lanes flanked by parallel parking, cycletracks on each side of the street, a planting and site furniture zone, followed by sidewalks adjacent to the proposed development. He anticipated that sidewalks would be a minimum of 12 feet wide in addition to space dedicated to create outdoor café seating. He believed this streetscape would be very inviting to residents and visitors alike.

He presented the final image of the proposed townhomes as the most conceptual of all that they had presented. He said the townhomes would be developed by a variety of developers and architects, but that they would generally be three-stories with parking in the rear of the unit. He said these units may be very different than depicted here and could be constructed of masonry, brick, stone, siding and could feature sloped or flat roofs and that the objective would be to encourage a diversity of contemporary architectural styles as each block is built out.

Mr. Yoder concluded their presentation and said the plan and the images presented are the end result of a lot of minds working together to develop a plan that they feel will meet the test of time. He believed that this development would appeal to both empty nesters looking for a step down housing option, as well as young professionals that might work nearby at Cardinal Health of Wendy's Headquarters. He stated that a housing market analysis was currently being conducted by Ken Danter, with the Danter Company, specialists in real estate market feasibility.

He provided additional information related to the parking distributed throughout the project, and the benefit to residents with covered parking that may be above or below ground level. He said the retailers and restaurants on the other hand want readily accessible parking at ground level. He added that the amount of parking provided meets, or exceeds in some areas, the amount of parking required by Code. He said his architects made a conscious decision to draw upon the strength and character of the historic limestone of Old Dublin without being too literal but creating a neighborhood on these banks that would appeal to a great number of people. He stated that as a lifelong resident of Dublin he wanted to see the City continue to be successful into the future. He said that Crawford Hoying recognizes that users in and out of Dublin want a walkable, Historic Dublin type of environment. He welcomed the Commission's feedback and questions and wanted to gauge if they were supportive of the images presented as being the right look for the project.

Chris Amorose Groomes invited public comment.

Mike Bradley, Interim VP COTA for Planning and Service Development said that they like and are supportive of the project, but are anxious to know how COTA fits in. He said that they are receiving questions from passengers that use the Park & Ride at Dale Drive on the future of this facility. He reiterated that COTA is very supportive of the density of this project and that

discussions and coordination between COTA and Dublin about this and other Park & Ride facilities in Dublin.

Bill Jacob, 8326 Autumnwood Way said that this was an exciting opportunity for the City of Dublin and was looking forward to seeing something happen. He said he represents some of the residents and business people in Historic Dublin and Dublin in general, and wanted to make sure that the development wouldn't have a negative impact on existing businesses.

Phil Weisenbach, 5505 Villas Drive said that as a runner, he likes the idea of being able to cross the river over the pedestrian bridge, but had concerns about traffic at the intersection of Riverside Drive. He was supportive of the project but wanted to ensure that the pedestrian crossings are safe.

Ms. Groomes said that there was obviously a lot to talk about with this project and asked for the patience of everyone present.

Amy Krumb said her biggest concerns were with traffic back-ups in the roundabout at State Route 161 and Riverside Drive created by the signal at the intersection of Park Avenue (Dale Drive) and Riverside Drive to the north. She wanted to see the capacity numbers that were projected for Bridge Street and the traffic studies. Her second concern was with the convention center and hotel uses and was skeptical if these were appropriate uses in this location. She said the memo referenced some uses or building types would not be permitted with the underlying zoning and that a rezoning would be necessary. She asked if the hotel and convention uses were currently permitted.

Mr. Phillabaum replied that those specific uses are being proposed on property currently zoned Bridge Street Commercial District, and they are not permitted in that district.

Ms. Krumb asked what the zoning to the north of Dale Drive was currently.

Mr. Phillabaum replied that the rest of the site is zoned Bridge Street Office Residential District.

Ms. Krumb said she was hesitant to carve out another piece to a different zoning to accommodate the applicant, and thought that they should work within the existing zoning. She said she would want to be provided with some analysis of the conflicts with the current zoning districts, such as uses and building types. She said it seemed like there was a considerable greater amount of density and taller buildings than the current zoning. She was generally in favor of the contemporary architecture and the concept of structured parking. She was not convinced that there will be views to the river from the ground floor of the conference center and that the residential building shown on the Wendy's restaurant site would be feasible due to access limitations.

Mr. Phillabaum reminded the Commission that during the area rezoning process the previous owner of Bridge Point Shopping Center requested to be rezoned to Bridge Street Commercial District, as they envisioned maintaining the property in its existing state as a suburban strip retail center with outparcels. He said that particular zoning district was generally applied only to existing retail centers and other low-rise single use buildings.

John Hardt was excited to see this and other things happening in this area since staff and the commission spent nearly three years thinking and dreaming about what they wanted to see happen in Bridge Street. He said this part of the city really needed a different flavor of development than shopping centers surrounded by parking. He thanked everyone for the work that has been done to date. He respectfully disagreed with Ms. Kramb on the use discussion at the Bridge Point location. He appreciated the staff comments that what is being proposed does not fit the zoning, and this was an opportunity to get uses functionally in the right places rather than fitting in a zoning district planned several years ago. He said he would be open to considering a rezoning process to achieve a rich mix of uses with residential spread out across the entire area. He agreed with Ms. Kramb that the residential building depicted on the Wendy's restaurant site to the south of State Route 161 did not seem feasible and was the least pedestrian-friendly site in the area.

Mr. Hardt expressed conceptual support for the contemporary architecture, but noted that there was a lack of variety overall. He was not in favor of the monolithic scale and appearance of the buildings north of Park Avenue, and said that the space on the interior of the building immediately north of Park Avenue along Riverside appears to be impenetrable by the public. He recommended more accessible internal public open spaces on the interior of these buildings, and suggested making the internal courtyard accessible from the east side of the block. He acknowledged the staircase depicted connecting down to the sidewalk along Riverside, but didn't think it was substantial enough to serve as effective public access.

Mr. Hardt said that more variety is needed in the townhome area. He did not have a problem with the building that was shown, but not with three blocks of the same building. He said the Riverside facing buildings have the same problem of being too uniform in character. He referenced Woodlands, Texas and the Arena District as examples of places that successfully achieve architectural variety but with coordinated character.

Mr. Hardt said that the Park Avenue area was on the right track, but was concerned that it did not go far enough. He would like to see the integration of non-residential uses at the ground floor continue able to be continued as Park Avenue extends to the east and had concerns that without this the overall walkable intentions for the District would not be fulfilled. He suggested that these spaces be constructed as loft spaces with higher ceilings to accommodate future commercial uses in this space as markets change. He had concerns with the right turn from Park Avenue to Oxford Street as being very automobile-oriented and wanted to see a more pedestrian friendly approach to this access point.

Mr. Hardt referenced the view of the office building, hotel and conference center and had concerns with the conference appearing as being built on raised plinth and the disconnection this created for pedestrians from the sidewalk along Riverside Drive. He said the office building had the same issue although not as severe. He said there were several other instances in the plans and images presented along Riverside Drive where sidewalks do not interface with the proposed buildings very well. He said this detail has to be correct to encourage interaction and activation of the Riverside frontage.

Richard Taylor said that he was also excited that we are beginning to implement the Vision Plan, and he thanked everyone for their time and effort and primarily the current members of the Commission who went to Greenville, South Carolina. He said his first concerns

were more directed toward the City than Crawford Hoying, because he disagrees with the roundabout and proposed location for Riverside Drive.

Mr. Taylor said he is frustrated that we created a problem by placing buildings on the opposite side of the street from the park. He said pedestrians should be able to cross Riverside at all the intersections to the east to have frequent and easy access to the park, and if residents have to cross a street to get to the park we are making a big mistake. He noted that a tunnel under Riverside had been suggested at the Community Forum and acknowledges that many people feel this is necessary as they are concerned about interrupting traffic flow with pedestrian crossings, but he disagrees. He said that we are trying to create a different type of place along this section of Riverside Drive and that in this area pedestrians should be prioritized above traffic flow.

Mr. Taylor referenced the Vision Principles that stressed the need for transit accommodations in the plan beyond buses—he said we need to allow for more modes in the future. Is concerned that we don't create enough right-of-way for future transit and have the same problem we have at Bridge and High, where the street can't be widened for on street parking because of where buildings were located. He said the Principles also discussed embracing nature, but he has always been confused with the need for a greenway running along John Shields Parkway and how it was supposed to function.

Mr. Taylor said he was concerned that several access points were in the development were too auto-centric and stated that one-way street were anti-urban. He said a major landmark tree was lost with the Vrable skilled nursing facility and wanted to be certain that a detailed survey of the existing trees be conducted and that the pedestrian bridge be moved if necessary to preserve trees along the river.

He said the development needed to expand the range of residential choices offered. He stated that the buildings have too much of the active common space located on the interior of the building where residents will never be forced to walk out to the public street, and was concerned that the apartment buildings will function as high-end dormitories. He said that if the city is going to spend millions of dollars to create great views to the river, the corporate residents should have priority over college kids or recent graduates looking for small apartments. He understood Office Residential District as being primarily office uses with some residential use, and believed in general there needed to be more jobs within the development.

Mr. Taylor was concerned with single-use apartment buildings. Buildings should be adaptable and constructed of masonry versus wood frame. He said wood frame construction was not easily adaptable to other uses. He indicated that a modern architecture was desirable, but that this can be taken too far. He didn't think replicating Historic Dublin was appropriate, either. He referred to the image presented of the office and hotel buildings, and stated that the hotel architecture direction is good, but he feels that the office is too suburban. He characterized it as a 70 mile per hour freeway building. He said that the buildings in this portion of the plan should engage the street at the roundabout with retail uses. He noted that a conference center is limited to upper floors in the Code and that the proposed ground floor location is not permeable for the public. He said it would be fine if pushed back to interior of block in favor of more active use in this location. He suggested more be office use be incorporated in the plan overall. He

said the proposed heights of buildings in the plan may be appropriate, but said 4 to 5 stories would be the maximum he was comfortable with.

Mr. Taylor questioned what happened to future bridge connection depicted in Transportation Network graphic from the Code from Dale to Historic Dublin. He said the only vehicular bridge depicted now was at John Shields Parkway and felt this was a major mistake to lose this bridge. He said that residents here should be able to meet all of their daily needs within the quarter-mile pedestrian shed, and doubted that pedestrian use of bridge would happen without a strong connection to both sides of the river both in terms of use and design. Noted that there is a strong pedestrian node in the proposed plan, but the pedestrian shed does not overlap with the Historic Dublin pedestrian shed based at the Bridge and High intersection. He wondered what effect this proposal would have to the Historic Dublin businesses, and was concerned that the customer base could leave for this side of the river. He said the only way to avoid this was to make a stronger connection between the Historic District and the new development. He noted that the west landing of the pedestrian bridge will be below High Street and said that the bridge won't be visible at all from Historic Dublin.

Mr. Taylor was not supportive of the monolithic apartments. He said he would like to see office and residential vertically mixed versus horizontally, and a wider range of housing types. He wanted to see buildings where it could all happen together at once, and agreed that retail should extend to the east along Park Avenue. He said that we need to think about development beyond this development, and extend planning further to the east and west to understand how everything will fit together.

He wanted more detail on the street types, and was concerned that 12 feet of sidewalk is not enough to accommodate through foot traffic and outdoor dining spaces. He also wanted detail on street tree height and spacing, including if they are proposed as wells or lawns.

Mr. Taylor said that in all of the blocks of the plan buildings have been pushed from edge to edge within the block, with no room for small open spaces within the block. He said the development should include smaller scale parks and public green spaces that are walkable to all residential units. He asked if the block dimensions met the length and perimeter requirements for this zoning district.

Mr. Phillabaum replied that some of the block sizes depicted may exceed the maximum length permitted but more analysis is needed.

Mr. Taylor clarified that if the block lengths are exceeded, a mid-block access would be required and wanted to see how this was worked out.

He said that parking was a difficult issue to tackle in terms of predicting what the necessary number of parking spaces is and taking into consideration the overlap between businesses during the day and residents at night. He said at some point a parking authority may be needed to manage parking meters and garages, shared parking arrangements, etc. He was concerned with having so much of the parking underground and that this will kill street activity if direct access is provided from the below grade parking to the uses above with an elevator or other

internal access way. He said he would rather see separate parking garages that require people to walk out along the street to their destination in a nearby building, especially for office employees. He was unclear how the parking for the proposed townhouses was proposed to function, and requested additional information to clarify the relationship between this parking and how the residents access their units as these are refined.

Warren Fishman said he was also excited about things happening in Bridge Street after five years of working on the Code and attending meetings. He asked how much square footage of housing and how many housing units were proposed.

Ms. Groomes answered that it was 1.26 million square feet of development with 1,162 housing units.

Mr. Fishman thought that this density of dwelling units was out of kilter from Code. He appreciated the comments from the architects on the Commission and said that hearing their input was very valuable to him. He said he wants to see beautiful architecture with durable materials that will last for the next 100 years, because that is what makes a lasting community. He said the buildings had to be adaptable and this can only be accomplished with masonry construction.

Mr. Fishman agreed that priority should be given to executive level professionals, as they bring income to the city through income tax, not young professionals. He said that most people he has talked to at Bridge Street events say that they want to own their residence, and it is only because of the current economy that they are renting. He believed that young executives want to own a condominium with at least 1,500 square feet, 2 bedrooms and an office. He said that there shouldn't be any one car garage units, that two should be the minimum.

Mr. Fishman suggested that bicycle parking facilities should be included on the interior of buildings. He said that at APA and other training venues he has attended he constantly hears that the cities that have implemented form based codes were disappointed because developers built too many apartments. He said these communities were left with empty storefronts that zoning made them put in, but that they have no incentive to lease because the rents for residential are paying for building.

Mr. Fishman wanted to stick to the uses and other requirements that are in the Code as they spent countless hours working on that language with staff and City Council. He said he had a lot of respect for the work of Ken Danter and would be interested to see the results of his analysis mentioned by the applicant.

Victoria Newell apologized for missing the presentation by the applicant, and said she could sum up her concerns as being in three areas. She thought the plan was too heavily weighted toward only residential uses at the north end and was concerned with this separation of uses. She said a stronger connection needs to be made to Historic Dublin, as both sides of the river should be able to benefit from this development. She said she was very familiar with this type of commercial residential construction and sees a trend occurring with this type of development. She asked what is it that will make this area unique, as these types of townhomes and the other architectural character is being seen everywhere. She had concerns with what the rear of the townhomes would look like.

Chris Amorose Grooms said she was in agreement with almost everything the other Commissioners said. She said she had reviewed some of the previous impact and capacity studies for Bridge Street produced by a number of talented consultants. She was concerned with the numbers proposed in this development plan and how they compare with what was projected for this area in the Vision Plan and the Planning Foundations document.

Ms. Grooms noted that the Vision Plan included a target housing unit mix for the next 5 to 7 to 10 years, with 807 rentals, 425 multi-family condos, 175 single-family attached and 93 single family attached, and that was for the entire Bridge Street Corridor. She said she was concerned this proposal exceed what was projected in the impact studies for the Riverside District. She said we need to achieve the right balance of commercial and residential uses. She believed that the real financial assets to the community are our corporate office employers, as opposed to residential uses which generally cost the city. She said the great frontage being created along Riverside should be devoted to the these corporate employers, not residents.

Ms. Grooms said the Riverside frontage should be more engaging and had concerns with the size of the buildings at Riverside, as this scale gets out of hand very quickly. She remembered the Lane Avenue project they had toured as being just under 100 dwelling units, and that the building felt really big, and was concerned that these buildings will be even bigger. She said she was not comfortable with the size of the apartment buildings along Riverside.

Ms. Grooms agreed with Mr. Taylor that Park Avenue is not wide enough to accommodate the amount of pedestrian activity desired. She said she hoped that this area would be an authentic, complete neighborhood. She said some areas of the plan seem disjointed and recommended that it be more diverse in the distribution of uses. She challenged the applicant to make this an authentic place and a complete neighborhood with more of the daily service needs of residents and businesses more buildings of a smaller scale.

She was concerned about auto courts behind the townhomes, and thought this arrangement really defeats the urban environment. She expressed a preference that the units use an underground garage as opposed to the auto courts. She said she shared the concern of Ms. Newell that this architecture looks very similar to what is being done everywhere and fears that the buildings will become dated. She said people should not be able to look at a building and immediately tell when it was built.

Ms. Kramb spoke again and said she wanted to see the development numbers and how they match what has been modeled. She also wants more information about how the buildings match what is permitted by Code. She wants to see smaller, more unique buildings

Ms. Grooms invited the applicants to ask questions of the Commission and hoped that a clear image was provided and that they can come together on solutions.

Mr. Martin agreed with the notion of extending the non-residential uses along Park Avenue to the east. He said that they too hold the conviction that as this area becomes successful development will want to move in that direction.

Mr. Yoder was not certain that a true vertical mix of uses with residential above office above retail at the ground level was plausible economically and from a Code perspective, but they were confident that a very active street can still be created.

Mr. Martin clarified the width of the sidewalk along Park Avenue as being typically a minimum of 12 feet which would be clear walking dimension. He said this is wide enough for three people to walk abreast. He said this 12 feet would be in excess of any space dedicated in front of the buildings for seating/dining. He added that he had participated in many public meetings and the Commissions comments were some of the most astute he has heard, and that the Commissioners were very consistent in their comments. He said it was a very valuable discussion.

Mr. Yoder thanked the members of the Commission for visiting The Lane in Upper Arlington. He said that it was a 108 unit building and many of the buildings proposed here would be smaller than that.

Ms. Groomes said that the other Commissioners may be a lot more comfortable with this building size than she was.

Mr. Hardt said the one building in particular that he was concerned about from a scale perspective was the building just north of Park Avenue.

Brent Crawford of Crawford Hoying Development Partners said that they are experiencing a trend in demographics at their projects that is skewed toward empty nesters, but also to slightly older young professionals in the late 20s to mid to late 30s, and not as much those young people just out of college. He said the average age of their residents was over 40 with an income over \$100,000. He said the desire for large homes among this demographic has changed.

Ms. Groomes said that she thinks that our office residents are also important to accommodate. She said she wants to give the apartment renters good space within the plan, but maybe not the best spaces. She added that there should be 'almost enough' apartments available in Bridge Street to meet the market demand.

Mr. Crawford said that there was a conscious decision to locate the core of the non-residential use along Park Avenue, and that businesses want to be located in these walkable environments just as residents do. He said he could see potential to push the office more to the north because the interest has been very strong.

Ms. Groomes thanked the applicants.

Terry Foegler informed the Commission that the financial analysis from the applicant of the structured parking, the streets and other infrastructure would be advancing soon and may inform how much parking will need to be provided for additional office use in the development plan. He added that another significant regional study on demographics over the next 30 to 40 years was coming soon and was reflecting a significant trend toward single person households.

Justin Goodwin clarified for the Commission that a more robust capacity analysis was conducted more recently than the Vision Report that was reference by Ms. Groomes, and that this could be provided to the Commission along with the fiscal analysis that was also completed in the time since the Vision Report analysis.

Ms. Groomes called a short recess until 9:05 pm.

**2. Village at Coffman Park PUD – Ganzhorn Suites
13-058Z/PDP/PP
(POSTPONED) Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan/
Preliminary Plat**

This case was postponed prior to the meeting as requested by the applicant.

**3. Bridge Street District – Code Modification
13-095ADMC Administrative Request -Zoning Code Amendment**

Ms. Groomes said she is unsure how to tackle the rest of the Code and asked what remains to be reviewed.

Mr. Goodwin noted that at the last meeting, the Commission had discussed working through each remaining section of Code with Planning providing initial observations of what items need to be addressed prior to the Commission's discussion on each topic. He said Planning is open to another approach if the Commission has a preference.

Ms. Groomes said that it is nice to have materials from Planning during the discussion. She said there are some topics like parking in an urban district that it is difficult to discuss because we have not had experience with this type of development.

Mr. Hardt recalled that an earlier Commission discussion at which the Commission came up with a list of Code items and set priorities for discussion. He said he thought it was okay if an individual Commissioner had specific concerns, such as parking, that everyone would have the opportunity to have that discussion and that some would be more interested in other topics. He asked if Planning had completed its full technical review of the Code.

Mr. Goodwin said that Planning has prepared a list of issues and potential revisions for all Code sections over the past year and has been reviewing each section again prior to sending the annotated copies to the Commission for Review.

Mr. Hardt said he believed Council would grow weary of receiving Code revisions in pieces.

Mr. Goodwin noted that the Commission had decided to review the rest of the Code prior to sending it to Council.

Mr. Hardt said it was easier for him to focus when the Code was the only item on the agenda.

Mr. Taylor agreed and asked how many more pieces of the Code there are to review.