



## ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

### MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 23, 2015

**ART Members and Designees:** Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Colleen Gilger, Economic Director; and Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer, II.

**Other Staff:** Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Michael Hendershot, Civil Engineer, II; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

**Applicants:** Nelson Yoder and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Darren Meyer and John Woods, MKSK; James Peltier and 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 April 16, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

#### CASE REVIEW

##### 1. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park – Phase 1 (C Block)

15-018 DP-BSD/SP-BSD

Riverside Drive and Dale Drive  
Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews

Rachel Ray said this is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 149 dwelling units, 98,700 square feet of office uses, 48,900 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 864-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Ray reported the determination had been postponed on this application so the applicant could make changes and the revised plans have been submitted today. She explained the purpose for today's review was to discuss the aforementioned changes and ways to possibly eliminate more of the Waivers that had previously been identified. The was to allow sufficient time to provide a recommendation at next week's ART meeting for the PZC meeting on May 7, 2015. The application to the PZC will include the Final Plat.

Steve Langworthy asked if a separate recommendation was needed for a parking plan. He asked if there are to be any Administrative Departures. Ms. Ray indicated there may be a few but would know better next week.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, referred to her Summary of Changes exhibit that she sent to Ms. Ray just prior to the meeting:

#### *Building C1*

- a) Parapets on all sides of the building have been reduced with the exception of the middle portion of the north elevation where the elevator shaft is located. The height at this location is determined by the overrun required for the elevator. (Waiver 1)
- b) EIFS has been removed entirely from the building and has been replaced with a fiber cement reveal system and board and batten system. (Waiver2) The facade material chart has been modified to reflect this.
- c) Metal panels on the corner elements have been modified to fiber cement with the reveal system.
- d) Vents will be a standard color of brown when they are on brick and white when they are on fiber cement. (Waiver 4)

#### *Building C2*

- a) Metal panels on the building became a fiber cement reveal system except for the roof cantilevered façade.

#### *Building C3*

- a) Parapets on all sides of the building have been reduced. (Waiver 1)
- b) EIFS has been removed entirely from the building and has been replaced with a fiber cement reveal system. The facade material charts have modified to reflect this.
- c) Metal panels on the corner elements have been modified to fiber cement with the reveal system.
- d) Vents will be a standard color of brown when they are on brick and white when they are on fiber cement. (Waiver 4)
- e) The pedestrian bridge between C4/C5 and C3 has changed in design from the pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street. (Waiver 5)

#### *Buildings C4 and C5*

- a) Parapets on all sides of the building have been reduced. (Waiver 1)
- b) EIFS has been removed entirely from the building and has been replaced with a fiber cement reveal system. The facade material charts have modified to reflect this.
- c) Metal panels on the corner elements have been modified to fiber cement with the reveal system.
- d) The northwest stair exit door has been removed and therefore no longer in the right-of-way. (Waiver 3)
- e) The northwest stair has been modified to tie more into the rest of the garage façade. (Waivers 3, 5 and 19)
- f) Vents will be a standard color of brown when they are on brick and white when they are on fiber cement. (Waiver 4)
- g) The pedestrian bridge between C4/C5 and C3 has changed in design from the pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street. (Waiver 5)
- h) The parking layouts have been modified due to the change in stair #4 and the removal of stair #3.
- i) The north side of C5/C4 is currently 5 feet away from the property line on Tuller Ridge Drive and landscape will be placed between the building and the sidewalk. (Waiver 6)
- j) The southwest lobby has been modified, but the basic elements of the façade are still the same.
- k) The calcium silicate was removed from buildings C4 and C5 and replaced with brick along the base of the building on all facades.

#### *Parking*

- a) Parking counts have increased from 864 to 869, due to the design of the northwest corner.

#### *Material Sheets*

- a) EIFS has been removed.
- b) Fiber cement has been added.

Colleen Gilger asked if fiber cement was a permitted material. Ms. Ray said fiber cement is permitted as a secondary material, limited to 20% of the facade.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, referred the modified tower on the parking structure. He said even though the tower is now open to the elements, it still has a roof over it. Ms. Umbarger explained the tower is open but perforated panels will be used to enclose the tower. She added since the building has now been set back to meet the RBZ requirement, the door has been removed due to grade issues.

Mr. Langworthy asked if cars will be visible in the parking garages. Ms. Umbarger said the tops of some cars may be visible but the applicant tried to cover them up with an upturned beam, which serves as a crash rail. She said they also buffered the view with planters on the west side and where it is higher on the north side, cars may not be visible. She explained the applicant added five feet of landscaping along the Tuller Ridge Road frontage.

Mr. Langworthy noted that the parking counts had increased by five parking spaces and asked where those five spaces had come from. Mr. Hunter explained that more internal bollards were in the plan than were necessary for circulation, and when many of those bollards were removed there was more space for parking.

Ms. Ray requested permit-level drawings to which Ms. Umbarger responded were available and would be sent.

Ms. Ray recalled the ART's prior comments on open pedestrian bridges to C4 and asked the applicant to summarize their response to that comment.

Ms. Umbarger explained the applicant tried to distinguish between the various pedestrian bridges so they would tie into the individual buildings' aesthetics. She said they already raised the guardrail to four feet and offered to raise it to five feet, which she thought would be higher than necessary or practical.

Mr. Hunter added C Block will have two different styles of pedestrian bridges to be consistent. He said the pedestrian bridges are still left open but the applicant feels very strongly about that. He said the applicant would like to take this plan to the PZC to see where they stand.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant if they were keeping the arch design on the pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street. Ms. Umbarger replied the applicant was keeping that design.

Ms. Ray inquired about transparency and whether those percentage calculations had changed with the revisions. Ms. Umbarger said transparency has stayed the same. She noted the applicant had already opened up the windows with the previous submittal to increase transparency. Mr. Hunter said transparency only changed for the garage.

Dan Phillabaum inquired about the move of the tower five feet away from Tuller Ridge Drive and whether it had a domino effect on the loss of parking spaces. Ms. Umbarger explained the right-of-way angles on the northeast side versus the corner on the northwest side and the size of the tower decreased by five feet allowed for some flexibility to keep the number of parking spaces. Ms. Ray said a Waiver is still needed on the Longshore Street elevation for the corner side setback.

Ms. Umbarger summarized the three Waivers that had been eliminated and said the applicant did the best they could about transparency but keeping the units private above was an issue. She said they enlarged the windows to gain transparency but still have a few areas that do not meet the transparency requirement by 1 – 2%.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the applicant addressed and eliminated the issues the Commission seemed to be most concerned about as stated at prior meetings, including no longer using metal panels.

Mr. Phillabaum inquired about a change to the access for Building C4, where the tower was eliminated and a less prominent entrance was relocated to the center of the elevation on Longshore Street. He explained the intent of the provision is to try to steer pedestrians to certain points of a building for access. He asked if the planter introduced is going to be an issue and if an additional break is necessary.

Mr. Hunter added grade was an issue. He said an accessible entry on that corner is impossible, now that the tower has been reduced and moved to the south. He noted the applicant is trying to make the garage as accessible as possible, and the new entry is adjacent to the ADA spaces.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, confirmed that corner is the location of an ADA space.

Mr. Langworthy said he wanted to talk about the architecture. He said he had heard from Council that the architecture had not gone far enough, and so the applicant will need to be prepared to talk about the character and longevity of these buildings, and what they tried to achieve as opposed to what they were trying to avoid.

Jeff Tyler suggested that material choices are included in that discussion. He said there are legal requirements per Code but they can still have opinions on whether the architecture is or is not appropriate for this area.

Mr. Hunter indicated he thought that approach was almost more important than going through descriptions of each building one by one.

Mr. Yoder requested the ART's support for the applicant's direction as the Commission relies on the ART and Staff's recommendations.

Mr. Langworthy said he anticipates most of the comments to be geared towards the corner building and how it will be viewed by pedestrians approaching the building from the pedestrian bridge. He asked if addressing all those past comments had been accomplished.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the architecture planned for the future hotel and office space.

Mr. Yoder stated the hotel will be different, given its location at the roundabout.

Mr. Hunter indicated the ART knows what Block B looks like and with the hotel at the end with the roundabout serving as a gateway; the buildings will need to fit the neighborhood by threading all the elements together but also feel special.

Mr. Langworthy said he thought the parking garage has been disguised really well.

Ms. Gilger noted a typo on page one of the plat that states that Angel Mumma is the acting City Manager, which is incorrect.

John Woods, MKSK, said a round of revisions had been made to the pocket plazas in addition to plant beds and planters on the west side of Building C4. He noted: they added more detail to the plans for the pocket plazas; materials are shown on the perimeter spaces; Bridge Park/Riverside Drive intersection has more detail for the corner; there are granite stairs at the corner of building C2 at the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue; and there are areas preserved for potential art work.

Darren Meyer, MKSK, presented the landscape plans and material palette for the main spaces to the pocket parks surrounding buildings C1, C2, & C3. He explained the right-of-way line will not appear as shown from the pedestrian's standpoint. He pointed out various details regarding the plans, including:

- The locations at some entrances that a granite pavement would be used, which is a charcoal gray
- Locations for the brick pavement that will be laid in a herringbone pattern and is the color of Dark and Manganese ironspot blend for the main areas and eating areas
- Café enclosures that are a modular and metal post and rail systems for infill
- Granite seat walls (18 inches high, 24 inches wide, and ±20 linear feet) that are charcoal gray for various places
- Granite treads (7 inches high and 15 inches wide) in charcoal gray at the corner entrance of building C2
- Precast concrete seat walls (18 inches high, 18 inches wide, and varied lengths)
- Granite planter curbs shown around building C3
- Salvaged boulders
- Ornamental plantings consisting of large masses of understory plants
- Architectural planters that are fiberglass reinforced plastic planters with an integral drainage system
- Precast concrete ornamental planters
- Areas preserved for potential art work

Mr. Meyer showed various examples of café enclosures with varying materials and colors that could be created for different tenants. He said the landscape plan is their "intent" but with the salvaged boulders, it will depend on what they find, etc.

Mr. Tyler inquired about the granite steps and monument stairs since no ADA entrance was shown. He said currently the main doors are not ADA accessible and disabled people cannot be routed around a building to a different entrance. Mr. Tyler assumed the main door would be at the front entrance. Ms. Umbarger said there is no front and back delineated entrances; they are dependent on the potential tenant's needs. Mr. Tyler said that does not matter; they need ADA accessible entrances at the perceived main front entrances.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they know currently enough about the tenant. Mr. Yoder responded they will engage the tenants quickly but it is speculative at this point in regards to table and chairs as they will need to reflect the tenant's character.

Ms. Ray asked how and when public art is determined or obtained, generally. She said right-of-way encroachment could be an issue.

Fred Hahn said art work can be handled in a number of different ways; it is not a one size fits all process.

Mr. Hunter said the applicant will not be looking into art work for about a year as occupancy will trigger what happens.

Ms. Ray said the intent for art work needs to be written into the report.

Mr. Tyler asked if the public art process could be written in the development agreement moving it out of the regulatory process.

Mr. Hahn asked when the design would be reviewed that works with or without art to ensure it would not interfere with the clear zone by reserving a space. He said then the applicant does not have to agree to some condition they may not be able to comply with.

Mr. Meyer said the pocket parks will have a pattern, and lobby entrances are good for that because they are fixed to the character of the tenant.

Mr. Langworthy asked whether the applicant might consider interior gathering spaces as there has been some discussion as to whether this could count towards open space if the public could congregate there. He explained that currently that is not written into the Code but Staff is discussing that change, especially for projects of this size. He gave an example of an atrium in between buildings that would be open 24 hours a day. Mr. Tyler provided an example of the Old Galleria space.

Mr. Hunter said they always envisioned a gallery in the theater space but otherwise he is having hard time scaling and envisioning such a space. Mr. Langworthy suggested the applicant keep interior gathering spaces in mind if they are short on open space but reiterated this provision does not exist today.

Ms. Ray confirmed the other green spaces that the ART requested along Bridge Park Avenue have been added.

Mr. Meyer pointed out the transformers that will be screened with metal.

Mr. Hahn inquired about an area designated as a pocket plaza on the Riverside Drive elevation of building C2. He asked if it was an architectural enhancement and not an open space; it does not meet any definition. Mr. Langworthy inquired about the required size and dimensions. Ms. Ray said the smallest permitted size is 300 square feet. She asked if it will read like a public space. Mr. Meyer said pocket parks have to be logical resting spaces.

Ms. Ray confirmed that none of these patios were being proposed on day one. She said that separate Minor Project Reviews will be required for each tenant to review the patio placement. She noted that the graphic is shown with what might be considered a "worst case scenario" to show how much patio space could be envisioned, and how that would interact with the dedicated public open spaces and the pedestrian realm.

Mr. Meyer said ferns will be planted in deeply shaded areas. Ms. Ray confirmed the ferns would partially block the vent on the north elevation of the parking garage.

Mr. Hunter said open air garage exhaust will be screened with bulbs and ferns.

Mr. Langworthy asked if tree types had been selected. Mr. Meyer reported an updated plant selection list was reviewed by Brian Martin and Joanne Shelly.

Mr. Woods added trees with higher canopies will be used in areas where pedestrians will be underneath. He said only a few trees will be growing out of pavement areas.

Ms. Ray inquired about stacking spaces for the garage as two spaces are required. Mr. Quackenbush said they met the requirement at the exit but the entry has only about 1.5 car length stacking spaces. Actually, he said he was not quite sure where the stacking is figured; he thinks the layout may be fine.

Mr. Langworthy said Staff assumed there would be some sort of control at the entrances/exits if it was a paid lot. Mr. Hunter said they would just have to be careful about where they place the gate in the future if it is controlled.

Mr. Hahn asked about the size of the cycle track icons placed in the pavement and how many are planned for one block. Mr. Quackenbush answered the inlays occur approximately every 40 feet.

Ms. Ray asked how the intersections were being treated with respect to the cycle tracks. Mr. Quackenbush said the ramp is wider, they plan to have a different style of crosswalk, and the intention is for the cycle track to share the space.

Mr. Hahn indicated that the design of the cycle track icons are not meant for just one block but will be repeated elsewhere in the Bridge Street District, so we should make sure we are in favor of the proposed symbol.

Ms. Ray asked if the circle shape would cause a problem with the brick cuts. She asked if there would be arrows to denote that these cycle tracks are one-way. She pointed out that there is a potential here of having way too much stuff incorporated into the streetscape.

Mr. Langworthy suggested waiting to see how it operates before determining the need for additional signs or identification.

After a brief discussion, it was decided to have the cycle track icons in a shape of a diamond as opposed to a circle to make installation easier. Chevrons within the diamonds to indicate direction were also suggested. Mr. Meyer said both feasibility and cost had to be considered. Mr. Quackenbush suggested defining the path at both ends as opposed to placing an icon every 40 feet.

Alan Perkins said the FDC for building C1 located in the private patio has a landscape planter in the way and having it moved to the corner still did not provide access. He said this needed to be evaluated more.

Mr. Tyler cautioned the applicant to make sure all outdoor balconies have covers underneath so no wood is exposed.

Mr. Phillabaum asked if there were alternatives for the roof vents that were just proposed in white or brown. He said previously the plans stated the vents would be painted to match. He expressed his concern about the stark white color and would prefer that the vents coordinate with the building materials and not stand out. Ms. Umbarger responded that white and brown were the standard colors that they planned to use because paint chips but offered to look into this matter further.

Mr. Langworthy noted that some of the Waivers may become Administrative Departures if they fell within the requirements for a Departure.

Ms. Ray concluded that with an ART determination scheduled for April 30, to be forwarded to PZC on May 7, 2015, the final materials would need to be submitted at the ART meeting on Thursday to go out in the Commission packets on Friday.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or comments. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:20 pm.