

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 15, 2015

AGENDA

- 1. BSD Historic Core – Keller Williams – Sign** **14 South High Street**
15-028ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review (Approved 5 - 0)**
- 2. BSD Historic Transition – Bridge Park West** **94-100 North High Street**
15-014ARB-SP **Site Plan Review (Approved 4 - 0)**

Jennifer Rauch called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance as there was no Chair or Vice Chair at this point. Board members present were David Rinaldi, Neil Mathias, Thomas Munhall, Jane Fox, and Everett Musser. City representatives were Jennifer Rauch, Tammy Noble-Flading, Steve Langworthy, Joanne Shelly, Alan Perkins, Dana McDaniel, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Ms. Rauch recognized Robert Schisler as an outgoing Board Member. She said he served with the Board for many years as the Vice Chair and Chair. She presented him with a plaque, recognizing his service and time with the City of Dublin. Ms. Rauch said Bob Dyas was not present to receive his recognition.

Neil Mathias thanked Mr. Schisler for his detailed knowledge of all the Code issues and said it was nice having him on the Board.

Ms. Rauch said council woman Amy Salay was in attendance to swear in the new board members, Ms. Jane Fox and Mr. Everett Musser.

Amy Salay thanked the members for their service on the ARB, doing this important work and congratulated the new members.

Mr. Mathias moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to adjourn into executive session to consider the appointment of a public employee or official. The Board adjourned into executive session after which Ms. Rauch reconvened the meeting.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Mathias moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to elect David Rinaldi as 2015-2016 Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Mathias, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to elect Neil Mathias as 2015-2016 Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Mathias seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Mathias moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to accept the February 25, 2015, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**1. BSD Historic Core – Keller Williams – Sign
15-028ARB-MPR**

**14 South High Street
Minor Project Review**

Tammy Noble-Flading said this is a request for replacement of an existing projecting sign with a new 5.90-square-foot sign. She said the office building is on the east side of South High Street, south of Bridge Street. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Noble-Flading presented the site including a multi-tenant building that has frontage and access from High Street. She said the uses surrounding the site are mostly retail, restaurant, and office.

Ms. Noble-Flading said the applicant proposes to replace the sign and hang the new sign from its current location directly above the doorway between two window awnings using the existing metal scroll bar bracket. She explained that Keller Williams is the primary broker and is listed in the center part of the sign and the agents identify themselves as The Close Connection, which is printed directly below Keller Williams on the proposed sign. She described the proposed sign as wood and shaped like a house with a white background, black text and border, and a red Keller Williams logo.

Ms. Noble-Flading said the application meets all of the zoning requirements for size, number, and color while meeting the aesthetic character of the Historic District.

Ms. Noble-Flading reported the ART recommended approval to the ARB with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant verifies the sign is located within six feet of the principal entrance, as measured horizontally along the building façade at sign permitting; and
- 2) That the applicant verifies that the height of the sign will not extend above the sill of the second story window at sign permitting.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there was a question of whether the sign is located within six feet of the entrance since a condition was attached.

Ms. Noble-Flading explained the sign location was not included in the plans and ART wanted to ensure that this information would be included with the permit to verify the sign is within six feet of the principal entrance.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.] He invited the applicant to come forward and asked if he agreed to the conditions. Rion Myers agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall motioned, Mr. Mathias seconded, to approve the Minor Project with two conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair, Mr. Rinaldi, swore in anyone planning on addressing the Board with regards to the following application.

Mr. Mathias recused himself as he has a conflict of interest with case 15-014ARB-SP.

**2. BSD Historic Transition – Bridge Park West
15-014ARB-SP**

**94-100 North High Street
Site Plan Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for a two and a half story mixed-use commercial development and 42 condominium units in a seven-story building with associated parking and site improvements. She said the site is on the east side of North High Street approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(F) and (J).

Ms. Rauch presented the site location and noted the project limits as the property extends further to the north and south, which is not part of this application. She explained there is a significant 40-foot grade change from North High Street down to the future extension of North Riverview Street.

Ms. Rauch said for the benefit of the new members she wanted to provide a history of this application. She reported there has been three Informal Reviews in May, August, and October of 2014 that covered conceptual lots, blocks, streets, open space, and building mass. She indicated a lot of time was spent upfront meeting on-site and meeting with the Board to discuss and receive feedback before starting through the formal application process. She said the Basic Development Plan Review was conducted and approved by the Board on October 22, 2014, which laid out the lots, blocks, streets, open space, and building mass. She said on November 19, 2014, the Basic Site Plan Review was conducted and approved, that covered uses, buildings, site, and open space plans; the Demolition of existing buildings was approved; and the Development Plan Review that approved the plans for final lots, blocks, streets, open space, and building mass. She reported an Informal Review was held on December 10, 2014, to further refine the architectural concept.

Ms. Rauch said tonight the Board is being asked to review the final application, which is the Site Plan Review for all the final details. With that, she said two motions will be required:

- 1) Site Plan Waivers – 12 proposed, ART recommended approval; and
- 2) Site Plan Review – approval with 29 conditions, ART recommended approval.

Ms. Rauch indicated the Waivers requested by the applicant are fairly minor in nature and the conditions are issues the applicant will need to continue to work through as they move forward to the building permit stage.

Ms. Rauch presented the proposed Site Plan showing: three historic mixed-use buildings on North High Street; the apartment building located to the rear along the future North Riverview Street; and parking structure in the center. She explained the requirements are specific to each of those building types, which is why they vary in the Planning Report. She said two access points on the North High Street elevation have been approved by Engineering. She explained the main access to the internal parking structure that includes access of parking for the individual residents as well as public parking to accommodate the uses in the mixed-use buildings. She said the second access point on North High Street is a private, gated access, only for the residents in the five units on the top story of the apartment building. She described this access as minimized and narrow to discourage other people from trying to enter there. She said in order to access the apartments on the back side of the building, there is a single main access set back to give an appearance of going between two separate buildings. Additionally, she said, there is public open space located on the southeast corner of the site, which respects and takes visual advantage of the unique geological cliff formation and future vistas east towards the proposed

pedestrian bridge. She noted the two circled areas on the slide that show the fulfillment of the terminal vista requirement within the Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Ms. Rauch presented the final proposed architecture on the west and east elevations based on the discussions and feedback received from the Board. She pointed out the 2.5 story buildings on the west elevation and the main northern entrance on North High Street; the secondary entrance for those five units; and the rear of the building, which is the apartment building. She noted the character of these two elevations are very different, which has been discussed at length to ensure the character and compatibility with the Historic District, but permitting the river side to be more contemporary. She explained the transition between the two sides was also discussed prior and showed how the applicant handled the transitions on the proposed north and south elevations as well as the significant grade change.

Russ Hunter, 555 Metro Place, said he is the design director for Crawford Hoying Development Partners. He said this project is a transition between the contemporary architecture and neighborhood being created on the east side of the river. He said crossing the pedestrian bridge will be the invitation into Dublin's Historic District. He said this project allows Crawford Hoying to extend that retail and restaurant experience to the north, almost a full two blocks.

Mr. Hunter said the topography was a challenge but turned out to be an opportunity. He restated there is a 40-foot grade change between North High Street and North Riverview Street. He said the ability to tuck all of the parking into the hillside created a two-story experience on North High Street where the shopping experience is historic in nature. He said transitioning to the back where there is virtually a building of the same height but includes seven stories as it is built down to the river and mirrors what is happening on the other side of the river. He indicated there have been a lot of iterations of this proposal since purchasing the property in late 2012 and several architects have been involved with this project. He said the applicant has been meeting weekly with Staff and have even had trace paper discussions with the ARB and has appreciated all of the input they have received. He said what they have landed on is really special, which they are really proud of. He reported that 80% of this building on the residential side had deposits on it so people are really excited to be a part of this project and to be part of the Dublin experience.

Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors, 101 Mill Street, Gahanna, Ohio, welcomed the new board members and thanked the others for working with him over the past year. He said the project began over what would be done with this site to accommodate two buildings, hide parking, and make it pedestrian-friendly. He said the constant vision was the building would encircle the parking area.

Mr. Sebach presented the current site plan and pointed out that for North Riverview Street, they really wanted a pedestrian-friendly connection so the front doors to the units on the lower level face out, patios and landscape engage the streetscape, a bio-swale is incorporated into the park, and noted the boxes on the far right that represent the location of some transformers and generators. He said those have been enclosed and placed there intentionally to be accessed from the street but as the pedestrian bridge goes over the top, it is away from their building so hopefully the transformers will not be viewed from above, but more tucked away from view. He said there is a fairly steep rock face there. He said they are continuing to work with the City on the development of the area that is grayed out in the plans right now in the southern southwest corner for a public plaza. He said the streetscape on North High Street was created in a way that is familiar to old Dublin.

Mr. Sebach highlighted the North Tower piece that they treat as if it is a separate tower, which will become clearer on the street elevations and highlighted the South Tower next. He noted the two public connections where the public engages the parking garage, where they move in and out and can reach the retail from the parking garage through the vertical circulations. He explained there are elevators and stairs in both of those public connections. He then highlighted the parking garage and noted the main

entrance off of North High Street but there is also an entrance on North Riverview Street. He pointed out the commercial area that appears as three buildings and where there is a bridge that connects the north building and the middle building.

Mr. Sebach began to show detail on the parking starting with the lowest level on up to the fifth level and invited questions.

Mr. Sebach presented the north elevation and explained there will not be much to see coming into town at this point as the treetops are still there along the actual ravine. He showed transitioning around to the east elevation, which is more contemporary architecture, stating they had to find a balance between traditional and contemporary design so there is a base, middle, and top section and each one is broken up with setback balconies so the scale has a lot of movement to it. He said the upper floors were stepped back and a lot of glass was used on those levels to provide visual interest into the project. He said those units are about the view and the setting. Lastly on the residential side, he said turning the corner, that elevation is very important because it will be seen as folks come over the pedestrian bridge, intentionally separating the contemporary to the traditional on that south side. He said they envision a restaurant on the corner up the hill to further engage that plaza. He explained that it took a lot of work to get the west elevation to everyone's satisfaction and fulfill the vision the Board had for Historical Dublin while not being too ornate and detailed to appear faux historic. He presented some renderings to give a sense of shadow lines and the amount of detail in the architecture that moves in and out with patios on the corner. He remarked on the "eyebrows" of the fourth floor. He pointed out the tower, which is the public connection point to the garage. He provided a night rendering to show the wonderful streetscape, that has invited people to be in that area and a night rendering of the historic side showing the charm of the streetscape that ties into what is already old Dublin. Lastly, he noted the two towers that were visible.

Mr. Sebach presented all of the brick and stone materials and color palettes both on slides as well as actual material boards along with pictures of lighting fixtures. He said he could also show slides from previous submissions, if the Board wanted to refer back to those.

Mr. Munhall asked to compare the north and south elevations and the breaks appearing between the front and rear buildings. He said he liked the transition on the north elevation but questioned the second break on the south elevation where the "squares" are shown.

Mr. Sebach confirmed it was all the same stone and said that is where the elevator is located.

Mr. Munhall asked if glass could be used there, even though it is an elevator. Mr. Sebach said it could not be done easily.

Mr. Munhall said he did not remember seeing that before. Mr. Sebach said the hand-drawn sketch from before makes it appear like glass and that was taken out because once they got the elevator size, the override made it taller. Mr. Munhall admitted it will probably look better in person than it appears in this rendering.

Mr. Rinaldi thanked Mr. Sebach and his team for listening to all of the Board's comments to improve this plan. He said the transition works well and the modern and historic characteristics were clearly identified and he likes the distinction between the two. He said he did not have a problem with the stone wall to hide the elevator.

Mr. Hunter explained they tried to do different things with that elevator but each time it brought attention to something they did not want. He said this sits back and is not seen from every view. He indicated after six or seven versions, they decided this was the most appropriate and honest.

Mr. Musser indicated that elevations can sometimes be deceiving because they are not three-dimensional. As a new member, he said this is the first time he has seen the drawings and is very impressed. He said it is an exciting building and it will be exciting for the residents of Dublin.

Mr. Musser asked if the City was planning on doing anything at the intersection of North Street and North High Street; it is a very awkward intersection. Ms. Rauch said there is master planning going on in the Historic District as it relates to the library and the area further up North High Street.

Mr. Musser said most of the traffic from this building however will not actually use that intersection.

Ms. Rauch said the intent at this point is to use North High Street and access from North Street for now for the apartment, but the long-term plan is for North Riverview Street to be extended and cross the Indian Run and connect the future park land to the north.

Mr. Rinaldi clarified the ARB approved two towers on the building but now it appears we have two buildings, each with a tower. He asked if the number of units would be 40. Mr. Sebach answered 42 units are planned.

Mr. Rinaldi said the chart on the front page does not add up. Ms. Rauch agreed and said that was condition #11 for approval.

Mr. Hunter said to some degree the number of units is a moving target.

Mr. Rinaldi asked what function the generators serve. Mr. Sebach replied life safety for the building, primarily for the residents.

Mr. Rinaldi said he agrees with Staff on the location of the generators and transformers. Not knowing where the pedestrian bridge will land, he said it is tough to make a call but appears to cut off the park flowing out to the south but it is a concern.

Mr. Sebach responded the applicant is absolutely willing to work with Staff on location for those generators/transformers.

Ms. Rauch explained there was a lot of discussion at ART on the design and location of the proposed enclosures. She said having access to the generators/transformers is the biggest challenge. She said it has been suggested they fit into one of the abutments of the bridge and disguised as art. She noted in a plan view how it appears to be the very first thing you see when you come on North Riverview Street.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated with the pedestrian bridge, there could be an overhead view of the generators/transformers. He understands it cannot be fully enclosed but suggested some lattice work or something like it to help screen it.

Jane Fox said as a new member, she is just getting familiar with these plans. She asked about the elevator stone tower. She asked if that particular stone had to be used. She explained she lives in the Historic District and when she walks the riverfront, and comes up the staircase underneath the bridge, the stone that walks its way up the river creates a stair-step effect all the way up. Since that is such a large mass, she asked if they could mimic what is happening on the river front with stone that gives the sense that this extended up the hill. She said it is just one piece and there is a lot of glass, but maybe that view would somehow connect to the riverfront.

Mr. Sebach said the stone that they chose needed to be in scale with some of the other historic buildings with a ledger stone such as the Dominoes' building and the building across the street. He said they plan on having an over-buttering in the joint in a lot of these stones to appear more aged.

Ms. Fox asked if that piece from this elevation is seen from the west elevation, if that elevator tower can be viewed from the street or is it only visible on the south elevation.

Mr. Sebach replied it sticks out and all three sides are visible so it will be visible from the street. Ms. Fox said it really has to relate to the stone.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if all the Waivers were to be reviewed. He recalled how trash is to be handled in this project, everything is internal and coming out through the front. He asked how mail delivery is handled for the apartment/condominiums.

Mr. Sebach reported that they had a meeting today with the mail service in Dublin; each tower has a lobby that is off North Riverview Street, and the mail will be inside those lobbies so the mail carriers agreed to split the facility between the two towers.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there would be additional structures outside to which Mr. Sebach answered there would not be.

Mr. Musser asked how the visitors would access the various units. Mr. Sebach said, as a visitor, there are a couple of options: 1) there are front steps and a front door on North Riverview Street if the visitor is walking to enter by being buzzed in; and 2) coming from the garage after parking, there are entrances from the garage into the lobbies. He said there are different ways to enter the core lobby and then move vertically but would need access by being buzzed in.

Mr. Musser inquired about the interior circulation of the parking garage. Mr. Sebach answered it is two-way traffic in and out and it spirals up and out on the fourth level. He showed the entry is on the lowest point of level one, going up the ramp, constantly circulating around the ramp until the fourth floor is reached.

Mr. Musser asked if there was enough parking for each residence. Mr. Sebach confirmed there is private parking for each resident and added enough parking to support the proposed commercial development plus extra parking for public use.

Mr. Rinaldi requested a quick summary of the plaza level and interior courtyard.

Mr. Sebach explained it will mainly be the residents that will see down onto it but they broke it up with some paver patterns and a concrete deck. He said they wanted the green space but do not feel they can keep grass wet because there is not much room for dirt. He said they are proposing a synthetic grass that has a drainage field underneath like the new turfs seen on football fields.

Ms. Fox asked if the intention of that inner courtyard is to be part of green space. Ms. Rauch answered it does not count toward the requirement for green space. Ms. Fox asked if the requirement for green space had been met on this project to which Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively.

Mr. Sebach confirmed there would be some potted trees, synthetic grass, and concrete.

Ms. Fox asked what the upper balconies look out over. Mr. Sebach said the garages are actually outdoor space above the sixth floor units. He said there are some outdoor spaces that take advantage of the courtyard.

Ms. Fox commented that the landscaping looks sparse. She understands it could be easily added.

Mr. Sebach said the issue is the landscaping has to be potted and turning radii is needed for the cars to maneuver. He pointed out the garages and the circulation of the traffic.

Mr. Musser inquired about the construction schedule for this building at this time. Mr. Hunter said they are hoping to go out to bid in mid-May so they could begin demolition; site work in June; and in August, they would begin to go vertical and by vertical he meant foundation. He said there is a lot of concrete work to be completed first.

Mr. Musser inquired about the completion schedule. Mr. Hunter said they are planning on Fall of 2016.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated he appreciates the package that the applicant put together on the finishes; he said it answers about as many questions as the applicant could possibly answer with just pictures. He noted the historic-looking light poles around the site and asked if they were carried around to the back as well. He said he noticed some light bollards back there with more modern character. He said it appears the modern bollards are in the same area of the park as the historic-looking light poles. He asked if there was going to be a distinction transitioning from the front to the back with the light fixtures.

Mr. Sebach said the fixtures on the front were selected to be much more historic and “Dublinesque” and going to the back they used a more contemporary light on the building but he does not recall if something was done on the pedestrian walkway.

Mr. Rinaldi suggested the applicant be consistent with the thought on lighting.

Mr. Sebach referred to page 27 of their presentation that shows the more contemporary light fixture but he could not show where they are located exactly on the building.

Mr. Munhall said he assumed that North Riverview Street is going to have street lighting on the east side of that street so there are still going to be details to be ironed out on the lighting on that side of the building.

Ms. Rauch noted condition #10 about the light fixtures themselves but that is more about addressing the wattage to meet the Code as written in condition #6. She said a more historic light fixture is noted in the plans but if Mr. Rinaldi wants a more contemporary fixture, they can request that.

Mr. Rinaldi reiterated that the applicant just needs to be consistent and does not feel the historic features need to be extended around the back. Mr. Sebach recalled they selected a bollard that matched that was a little bit cleaner and more contemporary to go with the architecture on the back.

Mr. Rinaldi said he thought it was around the park that he noticed there was a mixture of both the historic-looking light poles and the more contemporary bollards. He suggested the applicant go one way or the other. Mr. Sebach said the applicant would go back and revisit the lighting to stay in context with the area.

Mr. Rinaldi said material-wise he did not have any issues and the applicant did a great job at their selections, which are architecturally appropriate. He said he recognizes there is one Waiver regarding facade materials. He added the front and back transition well.

Mr. Munhall indicated he liked how the west elevation – North High Street was treated.

Ms. Fox said there have been some site visits and requested an explanation of the view from across the river to the east elevation wondering if the entire mass will be visible, or part of it, or if the mass would be hidden by trees.

Mr. Hunter said his company bought a little drone with cameras on it, specifically for this project to see exactly the area out over the river, following the path of the bridge to understand what Ms. Fox is asking. He said if you are down at grade level on the re-aligned Riverside Drive looking across the river, the trees

will obscure the view for the most part. He said the tops of the two residential towers might be seen but just a little bit as they pop up above the trees. He said as you go across the pedestrian bridge, that south side elevation will begin to present itself. A slide was shown to present this view of the corner of the building. He said once you are up on one of the upper levels then you begin to see what the building looks like.

Ms. Fox asked about pedestrians on North Riverview Street as she walks this area all the time, and there are certain elements about the Historic District and the river that are just precious. She asked if North Riverview Street will be a comfy, comfortable place to walk, as a safe, warm, intimate, and pedestrian-friendly area. She said seeing this mass, and walking this street, she was concerned with how she would feel on that street.

Mr. Sebach referred back to one of the renderings, that is why it was so important to get those first floor units to open out to that where there are patios with tables and chairs and landscape to feel real pedestrian-friendly and a neighborhood as opposed to a commercial building that is straight up.

Mr. Sebach confirmed the sidewalk is going to be along the building side, connects, and then there is green space in between.

Mr. Munhall said we were concerned about the extension of North Riverview Street, which Dublin still has to figure out. He said when that gets done, normally this is done pretty well with landscaping. He asked if there were plans to raise up the area in the flood plain to make it a park. He said that street should then connect over the Indian Run creek going into properties that have been acquired by Dublin. He said the surrounding area is actually going to be a lot friendlier for pedestrians than was before from what he could tell and what the City has been saying about the adjacent properties. He said there should be parkland across the creek.

Joanne Shelly said the City is planning an Open House on April 23, 2015, to talk about the park on both sides of the Scioto River. She said the intent is that there will be a trail that comes down through Indian Run and Staff has discussed how it wraps this building. She said there will be a sidewalk adjacent to the building and then there will be a path down closer to the river so there are two options for traversing this area.

Mr. Munhall said this is not as much for ARB as it is for PZC and ART but this is going to be a much more useable space.

Mr. Sebach stated the applicant does not have any issues with any of the conditions.

Ms. Rauch asked the Board if they wanted to go through the Waivers. She restated that most of the Waivers are minor and within the threshold of the requirement. She said the ART discussed the pocket park and the generator/transformer at length.

Mr. Rinaldi said going through each Waiver was not necessary but he had comments on a couple of them. He inquired about the Waiver for the 3:12 pitched roof on the tower that is part of the historic, mixed-use building when 6:12 to 12:12 pitch is required. He said he does not have a problem with it; he just wanted to know why a 6:12 pitch was not just put on there when the applicant was fine height wise.

Mr. Sebach said it looks like a top hat because of the shape of the tower; a 6:12 pitch adds too much to the top of that tower and they just wanted a really simple top. He said that goes more with Italianate style with the lower-pitch roofs.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the proportions of the south tower had been changed since the last iteration. He said he understands there is already a Waiver to get the height.

Mr. Sebach confirmed the south pedestrian tower got taller because when they brought the elevator up, they had to bring the tower up because of the glass that was going to get into the wall of the elevator.

Ms. Fox inquired about condition #28 for benches extending out into the public space on North High Street.

Mr. Sebach said it is really the steps and the wall in the right-of-way because of the grade. He stated the applicant wants to maintain the grade in front at an ADA accessible grade and maintain the floor of the building, similar to BriHi coming into the back. He indicated they are maintaining the grade across the front and want to have steps that can terrace. He said the steps and wall will be in the right-of-way.

Ms. Fox asked how much space there is on the street for anything beyond bench seating and for restaurant seating. She said along Bridge Street where Starbuck's is and Jeni's Ice Cream, the sidewalk space is so narrow but everybody wants to be there and so you find you are trying to keep your dogs and kids from falling into the street. She asked if enough space was provided so people could gather in comfort.

Mr. Sebach said the only thing the applicant has proposed are benches facing out so people can sit there and wait but the applicant is not proposing any dining or outdoor retail furniture.

Ms. Fox requested the sidewalk width.

Mr. Sebach said the lower part was just changed to eight feet. Ms. Rauch said condition #28 was related to the street furniture here and that Staff wanted those benches to be relocated because there is ADA accessible parking and want to make sure there is enough depth to the sidewalk.

Mr. Sebach explained the applicant just shifted a foot from the upper to the lower so the lower be wider. He said it is wider than what is found at Starbuck's.

Ms. Fox said the pieces that are going to be fronting there in this Historic District needs enough space for people to feel if they are comfortable on the sidewalk.

Ms. Rauch pointed out the area that is 9.5 feet from the edge of the curb to the stairs and when going further south, at the most narrow point, like the edge of the bench to the curb, is almost five feet. She said the widest point is at the furthest most northern point.

Mr. Hunter indicated the stairs do a really nice job of keeping people safe on the street. Mr. Sebach said it really creates that zone between moving in and out of the retail area.

Ms. Rauch said it does encroach in the right-of-way but the applicant has significantly reduced that encroachment from a previous iteration. She said they have really tried to make this space pedestrian-friendly.

Mr. Munhall said the library has nothing to do with this application but asked if it will improve this issue. He supposed if the library brought forth plans so to widen High Street, more than I think it is already going to be widened, the point is this will only get better.

Ms. Rauch said Council has reviewed and approved the streetscape guidelines for the entire Bridge Street District, including the Historic District, and this meets those guidelines.

Mr. Rinaldi asked about the Waiver for ceramic tile and wanted to see the sample. Mr. Sebach said the tile would be used on the north tower, next to Nob Hill brick, to add a little bit of color and detail.

Mr. Munhall inquired about awnings. He wanted to know if the applicant would need to come back to get those approved. Ms. Rauch said condition #22 states the applicant will continue to work with Staff to coordinate the awnings.

Mr. Sebach confirmed the applicant would come back for signage and awnings once they know who the tenants are going to be. He said the applicant just provided a color palette to show they were not going to get too crazy but it is not too bad to add color in awnings for a pop of color.

Mr. Rinaldi referred to condition #15 for lintels and sill treatments. Mr. Sebach said there will not be any traditional lintels or sills on the contemporary side.

Mr. Rinaldi said the details should be consistent with the rest of the architecture.

The Chair invited public comment.

Garrick Daft, 21 Indian Run Drive, said ever since Tom has mentioned looking at Building Z from up on the library height, and also where his house sits, he has been looking at it ever since. He noted in the plans it is grayed out but he wondered the architectural details are with the north tower. He inquired about the garage doors; would they be wooden or look industrial.

Mr. Sebach said they were looking at the east courtyard elevation and the north courtyard elevation shows it in context to the High Street buildings.

Mr. Daft seemed okay with it not looking industrial but a little more modern. He said he thought parts of this building might be hard to get into with the traffic.

Mr. Sebach said he was just clarifying where the pedestrian connection was from the west across North High Street.

Mr. Daft said as a pedestrian he was concerned about traffic.

Mr. Munhall said part of the misunderstanding is the whole building is considered "Building Z" and not just a portion of it. That seemed to clarify some confusion on the resident's part.

Ms. Rauch said there was not a stop sign there, just a designated left-turn lane.

Mr. Munhall asked the proposed square feet for the restaurant. Mr. Hunter answered 4,800 square feet.

Mr. Munhall said he did not think crossing that one intersection was going to be an issue and most traffic was supposed to be off North Riverview Street. He said he does not see this as a super high traffic area.

Ms. Shelly said Traffic and Engineering has looked at it and there is not a significant amount of stacking for the turn lanes because they do not anticipate a lot of traffic. She said the parking in there would probably be the same experience you would have if you were walking down High Street and traffic was turning into the town center parking lot between the restaurants. She said it would not be a constant flow of traffic because it is just a parking structure and we are anticipating with the North Riverview Street extension, when it is complete, would carry more of the traffic from people coming in from a distance to get into the parking structure before they get to this entrance.

Mr. Daft asked about the landing of the pedestrian bridge and when it would be finished.

Ms. Shelly said the landing has not been identified exactly as there are some issues to be worked out and would be completed on a schedule more closely aligned with some of the construction of the park.

Mr. Hunter agreed that the town center was a good example for comparison and it is also about the same width. He said they are using brick pavers which delineate the area.

Mr. Hunter said what is being discussed currently is there will be a public plaza that will receive the bridge that will land somewhere south of the North High Street building.

Mr. Garrick said the applicant did a nice job on the North Street side.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the pavers for the drive are the same as the sidewalk pavers. He asked if there was any delineation for the pedestrians crossing there. Mr. Sebach said the pavers are drivable and very similar in color.

Mr. Rinaldi said his point was for the pedestrian not to assume they are walking across a sidewalk but crossing a vehicular zone. Mr. Hunter said there would still be a curb.

Mr. Rinaldi asked for a handicap ramp.

Mr. Munhall asked if the brick frontage could change at that restaurant on the north side of the entrance depending on what happens April 23 at that public meeting. He said there could be a path on the other side of the street.

Ms. Shelly said the other side of the street will remain as it is. She said the meeting on April 23 is to discuss the Scioto River Park and that would be on the rear of the building, the east side coming down Indian Run. Ms. Shelly pointed out the existing path is to remain the same along the west side of North High Street.

Mr. Munhall asked why there could not be a path on the east side of North High Street. Ms. Shelly said the grade is such and there is an existing culvert and the entire road would have to be rebuilt to accommodate this. She said there is a retaining wall that is going to be built to support all of this development. She said the retaining wall will hold up the building and the slope of the road.

Mr. Munhall said he wanted to make a comment to the resident that he is assuming these restaurants are going to make it very friendly to the consumers, providing valet and watching out for the pedestrians. He recalled that was brought up at a meeting this past summer and ensured that pedestrian safety is a priority.

Ms. Rauch noted the spot in the front that is part of the valet loading and fire access, which is addressed in condition #12 for the applicant to further define this area along North High Street.

Ms. Shelly reiterated that all of the curbs, cuts, and sidewalks will have to meet ADA compliance so there will have to be the warning strips applied before anyone goes down a ramp or steps over a curb and it requires a differentiation of colored materials for ADA that have to be drastic changes in color. She explained that Staff requested that the applicant make them different from the interior circulation so when the car hits the brick pavers, they hear the noise and they get the awareness that they are crossing a pedestrian space making it a pedestrian priority space.

The Chair invited any other comments with regard to this case. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Rauch said a motion could be made for the 12 Waivers as a group and then a separate motion made for the Site Plan with 29 conditions as a whole.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi made a motion, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve the 12 Basic Site Plan Waivers. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall made a motion, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve the Site Plan Review with 29 conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said she did not have anything additional to discuss.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:05 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on May 27, 2015.