



**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

JANUARY 8, 2015

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; and Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Tammy Noble-Flading, Senior Planner; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Nelson Yoder and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; John Woods, MKSK; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan.

Others Present: Dan Phillabaum, dp planning & design, LLC; consultant to the ART.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 30, 2014, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATION

**1. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development
Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road
15-002BPR/PP Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan/Preliminary Plat Reviews**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for a review for a new mixed-use development on a 30.9-acre site at the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road. She said the proposal includes new public streets and nine blocks for development for the overall site, with eight mixed-use buildings containing 372 housing units and 260,000 square feet of commercial uses (office, retail, and restaurant) in this first phase. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan Review applications under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). She said this is also a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray presented an overview of the application, summarizing the contents of the Administrative Review Team Report. She began with the Basic Development Plan and presented a graphic of the site area that includes:

- A grid street network;
- Nine development blocks (Lots 1 through 9) subdivided by public streets;
- Five new public streets (Bridge Park Avenue, Tuller Ridge Drive, Banker Drive, Mooney Street, and Longshore Street);
- A future mixed-use shopping corridor designated along portions of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive; and

- 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 shared a graphic of the site area that encompasses the Basic Site Plan Review, including:

- Lots/Blocks 2, 3, 4, and 5;
- Eight buildings; and
- Associated open spaces proposed on the four blocks.

Ms. Ray explained the ART had identified two Development Plan Waivers and three Site Plan Waivers to be recommended for approval/disapproval separately.

Ms. Ray stated the ART is required to make recommendations to City Council on this application including the requested Waivers, the Basic Development Plan Review, the Basic Site Plan Review and Preliminary Plat. She said a major caveat relates to the ART analysis of the building type requirements. She said Staff has reviewed the information with the assistance of Dan Phillabaum, who completed the building type calculations and Code analysis. She explained the following Administrative Departures were identified:

- 1) Front Property Line Coverage (minimum 75% required)
 - a. Building C2 – 73.46% along Bridge Park Avenue
- 2) Upper Story Height
 - a. Building B4 (Garage) – 12.5 feet (maximum 12 feet)
 - b. C2 – 15 feet (max. 14 feet)
 - c. C4 (Garage) – 12.67 ft. (maximum 12 feet)
- 3) Upper Story Street Façade Transparency Requirement (minimum 30% required)
 - a. Building B1 – 27.70% at 4th floor (Riverside Drive elevation);
 - b. C3 – 29.19% at 5th floor (Bridge Park Avenue);
 - c. C4 (Residential) – 29.31% at 2nd floor and 29.88% at 5th floor (Mooney Street).
- 4) Minimum Primary Façade Materials Requirement (minimum 80% required)
 - a. Building B1 – 74.45% (Longshore Street elevation); 74.71% (open space); 73.85% (Banker Drive)
 - b. B2 – 76.15% (open space)
 - c. B3 – 73.06% (Longshore Street); 78.70% (Mooney Street)
 - d. B4 (Residential) – 73.08% (Longshore Street); 78.73% (open space)
 - e. C3 – 74.13% (Mooney Street)
 - f. C4 (Residential) – 74.58% (Mooney Street)

She noted that for these buildings listed, the specific Code requirement is within 10 percent of the numerical requirement of being met. She said this is within the range of an Administrative Departure. She reiterated that the numbers and percentages are based on two-dimensional calculations completed on the renderings submitted with this application. She explained that at this project advances to the next level of detail, some additional Administrative Departures may be identified, some of the items listed may be modified to no longer be eligible for Administrative Departures (requiring Waivers instead), and some may ultimately meet the Code requirement.

Ms. Ray said for the rest of the building type analysis, Mr. Phillabaum had reviewed each of the buildings against applicable building types (Corridor, Mixed-Use, and Parking Structures). She noted that there are a number of Code requirements noted on the tables that are “not met” and would require a “future Waiver.” She said the reason why they are noted as “future Waivers” and not being evaluated at this time is because at this level of detail, there is not enough information to determine the merits of each potential Waiver. She said the applicant would need to verify the numbers and provide justification based

on the Waiver criteria for the items that do not meet Code. She suggested that some Waivers may be appropriate, but the applicant would need to be prepared to make the case that *not* meeting the requirement will result in a better building, or other justification why the requirement cannot be met.

Ms. Ray said the Basic Development Plan includes the proposed street network, block framework, and street types in accordance with BSD Zoning Code. She said the proposed Preliminary Plat for 30.9 acres establishes nine blocks coinciding with nine developable lots with new public rights-of-way to establish the street network, block layout and dimensions for a portion of the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District. She said the plat includes the vacation of the east/west segment of Dale Drive and realignments of portions of existing rights-of-way.

Ms. Ray stated that Bridge Park Avenue is the east-west District Connector Street providing an eventual future road connection from Sawmill Road to Riverside Drive. She said the proposed roadway has three sections:

Between Riverside Drive and Longshore Street: 80-foot typical street section includes:

- Two 11-foot travel lanes, plus an 11-foot left turn lane;
- 3-foot carriage walk;
- 8-foot planter/sidewalk area;
- 5-foot cycle track; and
- 7.5-foot sidewalk.

Between Longshore Street and Mooney Street: 80-foot typical street section includes:

- Two 11-foot travel lanes, plus an 11-foot left turn lane;
- 8-foot parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street;
- 5.5-foot planter/sidewalk area;
- 5-foot cycle track; and
- 5-foot sidewalk.

Between Mooney Street and Dale Drive: 69-foot typical street section includes:

- Two 11-foot travel lanes (no turn lane);
- 8-foot parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street;
- 5.5-foot planter/sidewalk area;
- 5-foot cycle track; and
- 5-foot sidewalk.

Ms. Ray explained that Tuller Ridge Drive is a Neighborhood Street that runs east/west and connects the existing, realigned Tuller Ridge Drive (realigned as part of the Dale/Tuller Connector road project) with Riverside Drive. She said the 65-foot right-of-way accommodates all required streetscape elements, including:

- Two 11-foot travel lanes;
- 8-foot parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street;
- 2.5-foot carriage walk;
- 5-foot planter/sidewalk area; and
- 6-foot sidewalk

Ms. Ray stated that Mooney Street is a Neighborhood Street that runs north/south and connects the dedicated Mooney Street north of John Shields Parkway, south through the Bridge Park development to future Banker Drive. She said Longshore Street is a Neighborhood Street that runs north/south parallel to and between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street, and Banker Drive is an east/west street that is an extension of the same road located farther to the east of the site. She stated that Banker Drive connects Riverside Drive east to Dale Drive. Ms. Ray explained that the 60-foot right-of-way for all three streets accommodates all required streetscape elements, including:

- Two 11-foot travel lanes;
- 8-foot parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street;
- 5-foot planter/sidewalk area; and
- 6-foot sidewalk.

Ms. Ray pointed out that not all portions of Banker Drive show parking on the plans. She said the plans should be revised to include parking on the south side of the section between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street. She noted that the section of Banker between Mooney Street and Dale Drive will not have parking due to the grade change but all other elements will remain the same.

Ms. Ray said the Basic Site Plan includes site details including building types/architecture, open spaces, parking, landscaping, stormwater, and signs in accordance with the BSD Zoning Code. She presented a diagram showing buildings B 1–4 and C 1–4 identifying the eight building types proposed as part of Phase 1 of the Bridge Park development project:

- B1** Faces Riverside Drive at the northeast corner of the intersection with new Banker Drive.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; and Retail
Floor 2: Office
Floors 3 – 6: Residential
- B2** Is at the highly prominent intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, visible from the future pedestrian bridge landing.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; and Retail
Floor 2: Office
Floors 3 – 6: Residential
- B3** Faces Bridge Park Avenue.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; Retail; and Office
Floors 2 - 5: Residential
- B4** Functions as two buildings in one: the north and west sides of the building (facing an open space and Longshore Street respectively) are entirely residential. The east and south sides of the building (facing Mooney Street and Banker Drive respectively) are parking structures from the ground floor up.
East and South Elevations: 6 levels of garage parking
North and West Elevations: 5 floors of residential
- C1** Faces Riverside Drive at the southeast corner of the intersection with the Tuller Ridge Drive extension.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; and Retail
Floors 2 - 5: Residential
- C2** Is at the highly prominent intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, visible from the future pedestrian bridge landing.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; and Retail
Floors 2 - 5: Office
- C3** Faces Bridge Park Avenue.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; and Retail
Floor 2: Office
Floors 3 – 6: Residential

C4 Functions as two buildings in one: the south and east sides of the building (facing an open space and Mooney Street respectively) are entirely residential. The west and north sides of the building (facing Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive respectively) are parking structures from the ground floor up.

North and West Elevations: 6 levels of garage parking

East and South Elevations: 5 floors of residential

Ms. Ray asked the applicant to provide an overall view of all four Riverside Drive buildings in their presentation to City Council. She presented elevations of one side of all four buildings to show how the architectural elements reflect some consistency, but demonstrate unique architectural character across the overall site.

Ms. Ray said the resident/pedestrian bridge detail presented on the screen was submitted after last week's ART meeting, which contained the following elements:

- Stainless steel cable guardrail;
- Exposed rivets;
- Composite metal panels; and
- A design with unenclosed sides.

Ms. Ray stated that the ART raised concerns previously about the design of the proposed resident/pedestrian bridges, and that they be designed to deter people from climbing out of them or from throwing or dropping objects over the edge into the public right-of-way. She said greater detail would be expected at the Site Plan Review.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the distribution of proposed open spaces throughout the site to meet the open space requirement. She suggested the applicant think of the open spaces in a three-dimensional sense, rather than just in plan view. She presented a few concepts that had been submitted for the spaces between buildings. She added the drawings need to show how the open spaces will capture the eyes of the passers-by and draw pedestrians in and through the open spaces, which will require more than just landscaping and seating areas. She said she understood that these are all four-sided buildings with streets on three sides, and they needed to find some place to put the mechanical elements. She said however, showing how the mechanicals will be screened in the open space is critically important for the next review.

Fred Hahn asked if design intent and square footage should be included in the presentation to City Council, as well as the conceptual open space plans, given all of the feedback on the spaces. It was decided that only the open space distribution diagram should be presented given the work that needed to be done on the open spaces.

Ms. Ray summarized the ART's overall comments on the project, beyond the more Code-specific elements:

- **General**
Ms. Ray reiterated that the street network, block framework, site, building, and open space designs for the Bridge Park mixed-use development must serve as examples of desirable Bridge Street District development, and this can only be accomplished through exacting attention to detail, thorough and well-coordinated planning, and adherence to applicable Code requirements. She stated that as this is the Basic Plan Review; there are many details still to be identified and coordinated, in later more detailed approvals.
- **Development Agreement**
Ms. Ray stated that at this time, City Council has not approved a development agreement, although the City Administration is actively working with the developer to establish terms. She

said a project of this size, scale, and impact requires significant partnership between the City, the developer, property owners, and many other interested parties. In addition to project financing, she said the development agreement is expected to address the following:

- A series of land acquisition and/or land swap issues;
 - Public improvement design and construction responsibilities;
 - Park and open space issues;
 - Parking facility and policy issues;
 - Other public and private development investment responsibilities; and
 - Project phasing.
- Principles of Walkable Urbanism
Ms. Ray said this was a newer section of the Zoning Code. She said Staff can provide a technical review of projects like this based on the numerical requirements of the Code; however, she noted the importance of stepping back and asking if the overall application makes sense, and how all of the big pieces fit together. She explained that the Principles of Walkable Urbanism, which the Planning and Zoning Commission had added in the 2013 Code amendments, provides some criteria for this overarching evaluation. She summarized the comments in the ART report. She said the application has come a long way, but additional details will be needed.

Steve Langworthy suggested that more information be provided on transit. He said the applicant needs to address how transit stops could be integrated into the project. Ms. Ray said work needed on transit should be coordinated with COTA, to which Mr. Langworthy agreed should happen at the appropriate time.

- Building Types and Architecture
Ms. Ray said the following comments are particular points of emphasis to be addressed at the Site Plan Review:
 - Future Waivers
Ms. Ray said material details such as durability, performance over the long term, and installation details will need to be addressed, in particular for the proposed materials that are not permitted by Code.
 - Terminal Vistas/Pedestrian Bridge Landing Point
Ms. Ray advised the applicant to pay special attention to the elevations of Buildings B2 and C2 at the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, which had been discussed previously.
 - Pedestrian Experience
Ms. Ray said the design of the individual storefronts will characterize this project, and a Master Sign Plan will start this conversation. She said the next level of detail will be required at the Site Plan Review.
 - Framing Open Spaces
Ms. Ray said all eight proposed buildings are four-sided buildings, with no true “rear elevations,” and as such, siting service areas, utility rooms, and other architectural elements that would normally be placed on an alley-facing elevation must be located on an elevation that faces either a street or an open space. She said the proposed buildings generally locate these building mechanicals on the elevations facing the open spaces between the buildings, and as a result, many of these elevations fail to meet many of the building type requirements of the Code. She said as noted earlier, that could be acceptable, assuming the screening is accomplished through creative architecture and

interesting open spaces. She reiterated the importance of the design concepts for these spaces at the Site Plan Review.

- **Parking Garages**

Ms. Ray said at the Planning and Zoning Commission review of this project on October 21st, the Commission stated that parking structures need to be “works of art,” with an interesting concept and should not appear to be “just parking garages.” She said they needed to be well-designed and interesting buildings. She commended the applicant for their collaborative effort to come up with two unique designs that the ART feels positively about, with details to be reviewed at the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Langworthy suggested that the applicant provide a graphic showing the lighting effects in daytime and nighttime.

- **Sky Bridges**

Nelson Yoder asked that these be referred to as “residential pedestrian bridges,” as that is a more appropriate term. He reiterated the bridges will only be accessed by residents and visitors to the residential units.

Ms. Ray said the applicant should be prepared to discuss the bridges, their design, and functionality at the City Council review.

- **Shopping Corridors/Pedestrian Oriented Streetscape**

Ms. Ray said a minimum of 12 feet of clear sidewalk width is required to be provided along designated shopping corridors.

- **Block Size and Access**

Ms. Ray said Waivers are required for the sizes of Lots/Blocks 6 and 9, which the ART is supportive of due to the greenway along the south side of John Shields Parkway.

- **Crime Prevention Thru Environmental Design**

At the Site Plan Review when additional details are available, Ms. Ray said the open spaces and spaces around the buildings will be evaluated to ensure that opportunities for crime are minimized, such as shrubs or architectural elements that can conceal someone, and appropriate lighting levels and sight lines are maintained. She said that although Sgt. Barnes was unable to attend today’s ART meeting, Police has also recommended that plenty of locations to secure bicycles are provided throughout the streetscape. She reiterated that bicycle parking will be finalized at the Site Plan Review.

- **Economic Development**

Colleen Gilger said she likes this project and is eager to see it built. She confirmed that the C2 building will be built first along with the parking garage. She inquired if a tenant would be able to occupy office space in 18 – 24 months.

Mr. Yoder responded he certainly hoped it would be possible to expect occupancy by then.

- **Engineering**

Barb Cox referred everyone to her memo dated January 5, 2015, and said she was curious about how stormwater integrates with open space.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, stated they had been working very recently with MKSK Studios on the designs of the open spaces and the stormwater facilities, and would be prepared to share the concepts soon.

Mr. Hahn verified that the plan was for the stormwater facilities to function as amenities to the open spaces, and that the open spaces are not secondary to the stormwater function.

Mr. Yoder agreed, and said the applicant was also working on outdoor Wi-Fi work areas for laptops and plans to conceal transformers.

- Fire
Ms. Ray referred the ART to the letter from Alan Perkins at the end of the report that references the recommended fire access zones, a site utility plan, and 22-foot drive aisles.

Alan Perkins explained that fire setup zones are not necessarily required as the whole street provides fire access.

Ms. Ray stated that approval for two Development Plan Waivers is recommended to be forwarded to City Council:

1) Maximum Block Size – Zoning Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(b)

To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Lot 6 (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±584 feet on the west and 617 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,979 feet); and

To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Lot 9 (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±640 feet on the west and 687 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,894 feet).

2) Front Property Lines – Zoning Code Section 153.060(C)(3)(b)

Allowing only one front property line (and three corner side property lines) instead of two front property lines (and two corner side property lines) for Lots 3 and 5 containing parking structures, where a minimum of two front property lines are required.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding any of the Waivers. The ART confirmed that these were primarily “technical” Waivers. He confirmed the ART’s recommendation for approval of both Waivers.

Ms. Ray stated that approval for three Site Plan Waivers is recommended to be forwarded to City Council, and briefly summarized the analysis for each, as explained in the ART Report:

- 1) Front Property Line Coverage – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(a)1/ 153.062(O)(6)(a)1
Allowing Front Property Line Coverage to be 52.52% instead of 75% for Buildings B1 and B2 along Riverside Drive, and allowing Front Property Line Coverage to be 63.32% for Buildings C1 and C2 along Riverside Drive.
- 2) Horizontal Façade Divisions – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4
Not requiring a horizontal façade division at the top of the ground story (allowing a horizontal façade division at the top of the second story instead) for Buildings B1, B2, and C3.

- 3) Ground Story Height – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b)/ 153.062(O)(12)(b):
Allowing ground story height to exceed the maximum permitted height for Buildings B3 and B4 (Parking Structure Façades), C3 and C4 (Parking Structure Façades) from maximum 12 feet for parking structures and 16 feet for corridor building types up to maximum 22 feet.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding any of the three Waivers. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation for approval of all three Site Plan Waivers with a condition for the second Waiver.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the Basic Development Plan to be forwarded to City Council with the following six conditions:

- 1) That the applicant works with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;
- 2) That the applicant selects building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
- 3) That the applicant provides the full 12-foot minimum clear sidewalk area within the designated shopping corridors as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 4) That the applicant describes 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;
- 5) That the applicant provides a phasing, demolition, and interim site conditions plan for the development as part of the Development Plan Review; and
- 6) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering comments as part of the Development Plan Review.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART had no further questions or concerns regarding this application for a Basic Development Plan with six conditions. He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval for this Basic Development Plan to be forwarded to City Council.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the Preliminary Plat to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council with the following four conditions:

- 1) That the plans are revised to include parking on the south side of Banker Drive for the section between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street;
- 2) 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;
- 3) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering comments prior to final review by City Council; and
- 4) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to final review by City Council.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application for a Preliminary Plat with four conditions. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval for this Preliminary Plat to be forwarded to City Council.

Ms. Ray stated approval is recommended for this Basic Site Plan with the following eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant seek approval of conditional uses for the proposed parking garages prior to (or with) Site Plan Review approval;
- 2) That the parking garage entrance/exit drives are reduced to less than 24 feet wide, or seek approval of a Waiver at Site Plan Review;

- 3) That the applicant provide awnings and/or canopies and/or other elements wherever possible and architecturally appropriate at the determination of the required reviewing body at the top of the first story (as conceptually shown in most of the renderings) at the Site Plan Review;
- 4) That the plans are revised to include a crosswalk at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Longshore Street;
- 5) That the building plans are modified to address the potential "Future Waivers" and other modifications noted in this report prior to the Site Plan Review, or Site Plan Waivers will be required;
- 6) That the applicant seek approval of a request to pay a fee-in-lieu of dedicating the full open space requirement;
- 7) That the proposed open spaces that fail to meet the minimum dimensional requirements are modified prior to the Site Plan Review, or Site Plan Waivers will be required; and
- 8) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering comments as part of the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application for a Basic Site Plan with eight conditions. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval for this application to be forwarded to City Council.

Ms. Ray stated approval is recommended for the following four Administrative Departures:

- 1) Front Property Line Coverage (minimum 75% required)
 - a. Building C2 – 73.46% along Bridge Park Avenue
- 2) Upper Story Height
 - a. Building B4 (Garage) – 12.5 feet (maximum 12 feet)
 - b. C2 – 15 feet (max. 14 ft.)
 - c. C4 (Garage) – 12.67 ft. (maximum 12 feet).
- 3) Upper Story Street Façade Transparency Requirement (minimum 30% required)
 - a. Building B1 – 27.70% at 4th floor (Riverside Drive elevation);
 - b. C3 – 29.19% at 5th floor (Bridge Park Avenue);
 - c. C4 (Residential) – 29.31% at 2nd floor and 29.88% at 5th floor (Mooney Street).
- 4) Minimum Primary Façade Materials Requirement (minimum 80% required)
 - a. Building B1 – 74.45% (Longshore Street elevation); 74.71% (open space); 73.85% (Banker Drive)
 - b. B2 – 76.15% (open space)
 - c. B3 – 73.06% (Longshore Street); 78.70% (Mooney Street)
 - d. B4 (Residential) – 73.08% (Longshore Street; 78.73% (open space)
 - e. C3 – 74.13% (Mooney Street)
 - f. C4 (Residential) – 74.58% (Mooney Street)

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding the four Administrative Departures. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval for Administrative Departures.

Mr. Langworthy thanked the applicant stating the ART appreciates their patience and willingness to work with the City.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [Hearing none.] He asked that each of the ART members attend the City Council meeting at 6:30 pm on January 20, 2014. He recommended that the applicant talk about the character of the project and how pedestrians will interact with the street, and provide a sense of day-to-day activity and what the project is going to be like. He also said descriptions of the various units and who the tenants will be marketing to

should be included in the presentation to City Council.

Ms. Ray suggested that staff and the applicant meet next week to coordinate their presentations.

Mr. Langworthy adjourned the meeting at 3:25 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team January 29, 2015.