



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 30, 2015

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

Other Staff: Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Tammy Noble-Flading, Senior Planner; Jenny Rauch, Senior Planner; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Devayani, Puranik, Planner II; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

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

Applicants: Brendan Moody, Sign Affects (Case 2); Russ Hunter and Brent Crawford, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 4, 5, & 6); Melissa Spires, OHM Advisors (Case 5); Brian Quackenbush and James Peltier, EMH&T; Teri Umbarger, Miguel Gonzales, and Steve Jacobs, Moody Nolan; and Darren Meyer and John Woods, MKSK (Case 6).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the April 23, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTIONS

1. **Verizon Wireless – Dublin Coffman High School – Field Light Pole**

15-031ARTW

**6780 Coffman Road
Administrative Review - Wireless**

Rachel Ray said this is a request to install a new 150-foot field light pole designed to accommodate wireless antenna arrays, and associated ground equipment at the Dublin Coffman High School. She said the site is on the east side of Coffman Road at the intersection with Emerald Parkway. She said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless communications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Ray explained a temporary wireless communications facility “cell-on-wheels” (aka “COW”) was installed at the Dublin Coffman High School sports field on the east side of Coffman Road at the intersection with Emerald Parkway in November 2014 to provide service until a new permanent wireless communications facility could be installed in the vicinity. She said that original need for service was due to the loss of service when the Verizon antennas were removed from the roof of the office buildings (formerly Verizon offices) on the south side of Emerald Parkway across from the high school. She said a new field light pole installation is now being requested to replace the COW and restore reliable service to this part of Dublin.

Ms. Ray presented the site and said there are a number of other field light poles providing stadium lighting around the football field at the height of 140 feet tall. She said this pole will be 150 feet above grade with antennas. She pointed out the locations for the proposed pole, telephone/fiber trench and proposed coax cables routed in an underground conduit as well as the proposed pullbox. She noted the sewer line that is to be avoided.

Ms. Ray said a target ART determination was scheduled for May 28, 2015, but a determination could be achieved sooner, pending the comments from the ART members.

Steve Langworthy confirmed there were no comments from the ART members at this time.

**2. BSD Commercial District – Shamrock Family Eye Care – Sign 5151 Post Road
15-032MPR Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for replacement of a 14.6-square-foot tenant panel for an existing medical office west of the intersection with Frantz Road/US 33/West 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. Ray presented the existing joint identification ground sign located on the corner. She pointed out the current list of three optometrist names on the sign as well as the single chiropractor's name. She showed the proposed rebrand style sign face, which removes the individual optometrist names in a list form but leaves the separate chiropractic office information in place.

Ms. Ray said enclosed in the rebranding, which covers an area of 54 inches wide by 39 inches high, is a shamrock and the name Shamrock Family Eye Care with the phone number in the middle and the names of three optometrists below. She said her concern was with the secondary images, which is everything included in this area as it needs to be less than 20% of the sign.

Brendan Moody, Sign Affects, said he thought the tenant name and logo were separate.

Ms. Ray said that is all considered a secondary image, even if part of it is considered a registered trademark.

Mr. Moody said the top portion is not part of the trademark.

Ms. Ray noted what has to stay under the 20% limitation, which is the logo, phone number, and doctor's names.

Mr. Moody said his main goal is to be compliant with the City's Code requirements. He said he thought the doctor's names just had to be under the 20% limit but the logo would not be included in that calculation.

Ms. Ray indicated the goal of the regulations is to achieve simplified sign graphics.

Dave Marshall asked if the 20% calculation was per the actual sign or the whole sign that also included the address of 5151. Ms. Ray stated that in this case, it would be limited to the new sign panel.

Steve Langworthy gave an example of another sign (Nationwide) where each panel was viewed independently.

Mr. Marshall inquired about the shamrock in relation to the size.

Mr. Moody said he would design a new sign face to fit within the 54 inch x 29 inch sign area.

Ms. Ray indicated a determination can be scheduled for next week if the applicant is able to revise the plans in time or the applicant can request a time extension.

Mr. Moody indicated he would have enough time to complete the revisions, keeping the scheduled target date for an ART determination for May 7, 2015.

3. BSD Commercial District – Trader Joe’s Center – Parking Lot & Wall Lighting
6301 – 6393 Sawmill Road
15-033MPR **Minor Project Review**

Tammy Noble-Flading said this is a request to replace the existing parking lot and wall sconce fixtures with new LED fixtures for a shopping center located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Sawmill Road and West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Noble-Flading said the applicant is proposing to update all exterior lighting to new LED fixtures including the wall sconces, parking lot poles, and strip lighting located under/over the sign band. She said the redesign for the whole parking lot and center is proposed to comply with the new BSD requirements. She explained the existing 15 light poles (35 feet tall), and concrete bases (36 inches) are in good structural shape and will be reused without modifications; the applicant is just changing out the fixtures. She said the applicant has provided an existing light level plan to compare to the proposed light level plan, which is still under review.

Jeff Tyler asked why this was not being handled at the Building Standards level.

Ms. Noble-Flading said the lighting is being brought up to BSD lighting standards so ART approval is necessary but she is relying on Dave Marshall of Building Standards to provide assistance on the analysis.

Mr. Marshall said he would like to see how the strip lighting fixtures would be mounted and screened from view.

Fred Hahn questioned the process as it seemed that the applicant would either meet or not meet the numeric calculations since they were just changing light bulbs.

Ms. Noble-Flading said the applicant is changing the fixture heads too, not just light bulbs, which requires review.

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any further questions or comments for this application. [Hearing none.] He said an ART determination is scheduled for May 7, 2015.

4. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Pointe Shopping Center – Demolition
6500-6544 Riverside Drive and 4500 Dale Drive
15-034MPR **Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request to demolish an existing shopping center and car wash located on the north and south sides of the intersections of Dale Drive and Riverside Drive, and associated site modifications. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said the applicant would like to move forward quickly to demolish the entire shopping center and car wash. She presented the aerial views of the site and pointed out that Tim Hortons is not part of the demolition. She explained the applicant intends to take down the buildings to the foundation but leave the concrete slabs in place. She said this application is very similar to other demolition requests except that the applicant is not being asked to comply with certain conditions for the site to be presentable in an interim basis, given the short turn-around between the demolition, and ideally, the new Bridge Park

Steve Langworthy inquired about the plat. Ms. Devayani said this site is governed by deed restrictions enforced by the City of Dublin, which will need to be modified or removed as part of the plat review by City Council. She added the original plat for Upper Metro will need to be re-platted to remove outdated information and reflect changes to the right-of-way and include any additional requirements outlined in the BSD Code provisions. She said the applicant is considering sub-dividing the single lot into two lots to separate the hotel and the office building. These changes will have to be reflected in the plat as well.

Ms. Devayani presented the ground floor plan. She said the public spaces such as the main hotel lobby, bar, and fitness center are facing Frantz Road to activate the street, however the three guest rooms adjacent to the pedestrian walk closer to the intersection at this ground level, will for the most part have curtains drawn; thereby creating blank spaces defeating the intent of activating the streetscape. She recalled that the ART has strongly expressed concerns about the need to activate the area at the Frantz Road/West Bridge Street intersection. She stated that two set of door are provided on the Primary Street Façade (Frantz Road): on set of doors will be open to the public during business hours and the other is part of the tower at the Frantz Road/West Bridge Street intersection but can only be used by keycard holders. She said the entrance on Frantz Road near the patio will provide access to the public uses in the building, though not the main entrance to the building. She said the main entrance to the building is accessed internally off the drop-off area under the canopy.

Ms. Devayani presented the facades on the proposed elevations. She said the applicant has proposed materials of brick, stone, fiber cement panels, and glass. She pointed out the two towers, one located at the main intersection to serve as a gateway tower feature and the other is proposed closer to the main lobby for a staircase. She said one tower is permitted per building unless approved by the required reviewing body. She presented the southeast, southwest, and northeast perspectives. She pointed out the sandstone color stone at the base, a combination of gray brick and beige fiber cement panels for the façade, and darker fiber cement bands at the top. She said the applicant is requesting a Waiver to permit fiber cement panels as a primary material. The ART recommended the applicant provide product information, installation details, and pictures of the product being used in a high quality manner in a similar climate and after the product had been installed for several years. The ART is not only concerned about initial installation and aesthetics but how the material performs over time (wear and tear, color fading, etc.)

Ms. Devayani presented the proposed Landscape Plan. She reported that a tree survey table was provided along with the landscape plan but clarification is needed as there are discrepancies. She said the proposed parking lot islands need to be at least 10-feet in width and many are not in compliance. She said a street wall and shrubs are required along vehicular use areas. She indicated that bike paths may need to overlap the right-of-way and property lines.

Ms. Devayani said she recommended approval of the Basic Development Plan with the following six conditions:

- 1) Resolve all the drawing discrepancies and issues for consistency prior to Development Plan Review;
- 2) Determine Bridge Street and Frantz Road right-of-way change details and reflect on the drawings prior to the Development Plan Review;
- 3) Provide details for the bike path connections from the site and proposed outdoor spaces by taking overlapping right-of-way and property lines into consideration;
- 4) Resolve phasing, demolition, and interim site condition plans for the Development Plan Review;
- 5) Coordinate fire access, building access, hydrant location details for the Development Plan Review; and
- 6) Coordinate the Upper Metro Plat update application process with the future applications.

Ms. Devayani said she recommended approval for two Basic Site Plan Waivers:

1. Building Type –Corridor Building
2. Ground Story Transparency – Corridor Building

Colleen Gilger asked how close the applicant came on transparency. Ms. Devayani stated that Code requires a minimum of 60% transparency for the ground story street facing elevation. She said this was met along the Frantz Road elevation at 61%. She said transparency for the West Bridge Street elevation was 43% and the 60% requirement is intended for retail use in the Corridor Building type.

Ms. Devayani said she is recommending disapproval of the third Basic Site Plan Waiver the applicant requested:

1. Blank Wall Limitations – Corridor Building

Ms. Devayani explained that the blank wall limitations are 15 feet horizontally and the staircase tower exceeds that requirement. Mr. Langworthy said the sign that reads “Home2” appears to blend into the wall. Melissa Spires, OHM Advisors, said the drawing did not do the sign justice and ensured the ART that the sign will be brighter.

Ms. Devayani said there were other items she wanted the ART to provide feedback on. She asked if the ART had an issue with two towers and brought attention to the height of the tower.

Fred Hahn inquired about the rationale for the additional tower. Rachel Ray said the tower was to serve as a focus feature for the terminal vista. Ms. Spires clarified that the vista tower was located on SR 161.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the towers are not in view at the same time as when one tower is in view, the other is tucked around the corner.

Jeff Tyler said the towers were architecturally appropriate even though they appeared different from each other because the towers were located far enough apart.

The ART agreed they approved of the two towers.

Ms. Devayani asked the ART for feedback on the fiber cement panels being added to the permitted primary materials of brick, stone, and glass.

Mr. Tyler suggested the fiber cement be considered a secondary material as he thought a Waiver might be approved easier for the percentage for a secondary material. He said he was concerned that requesting a Waiver for fiber cement to be a primary material may be setting a precedent. He noted that it was approved as a secondary material for the Tuller Flats application.

Claudia Husak said the percentage was twice the amount permitted.

Jennifer Rauch suggested requesting additional product information for the Site Plan.

Mr. Langworthy said he wanted to hear this topic discussed with the PZC. He indicated he did not believe the issue was as much about the materials as it was in the details and installation. He said he had no bias against fiber cement. He said ART’s issues have been with the products installation details, how it is used, maintained, as well as how it appears over time.

Ms. Devayani encouraged the applicant to provide this information to which Mr. Hunter replied he would prepare.

Ms. Devayani asked for feedback about the Dublin wall that was coming down in some places. She asked the ART if the wall should be reconstructed in kind with limestone or if the wall should be designed closer to the architecture proposed.

Ms. Husak asked if the wall was coming down, if it had to be replaced.

Ms. Devayani explained Code requires a wall to screen the pavement where it is visible from the street.

Laura Ball said the Dublin wall has a weaving shape with daffodil beds flowing through the area but are struggling to keep the beds alive and most of the beds on the private side are failing.

Mr. Hahn questioned how the traditional Dublin wall would look next to this more contemporary building. Joanne Shelly suggested a wall design such as alternating a wall with shrubs. The ART determined that a Dublin wall should be resurrected as the same Dublin wall.

Ms. Devayani said she recommended approval of the Basic Site Plan with 14 conditions:

- 1) Resolve all the drawing discrepancies and issues for consistency prior to Site Plan Review;
- 2) Revise the Bridge Street and Frantz Road corner treatment and design to address the concerns regarding creating an activity node;
- 3) Provide additional information for the parapet height and parapet wrapping to determine the Code compliance;
- 4) Provide additional dimensions for the Tower height to determine Code compliance;
- 5) Provide detailed percentage calculations for the Primary Material coverage and product information and installation details to adequately support the use of these materials for the Site Plan Review;
- 6) Provide public access easements for the all publicly accessible open spaces (pocket plazas) for Site Plan Review;
- 7) Finalize the character, area, and suitability of each open space (pocket plaza) for Site Plan Review;
- 8) Coordinate and finalize loading spaces and building access zones for Site Plan Review;
- 9) Provide landscaping and tree preservation details and designs for Site Plan Review;
- 10) Provide Parking Plan at Site Plan Review;
- 11) Finalize details for the screening and wall for Site Plan Review;
- 12) Provide exterior lighting details to be finalized for Site Plan Review;
- 13) Finalize stormwater and utility details for Site Plan Review; and
- 14) Provide sign designs and locations for Site Plan Review.

Ms. Devayani said she wanted to discuss condition #2 as this was her main concern. She asked how this would be addressed. Mr. Langworthy discerned that conditions 7 – 14 would be dealt with later.

Mr. Hunter asked for clarification on condition #2.

Ms. Puranik said part of the issue was the three guest rooms that would have their curtains drawn for the most part, reducing activity at that corner.

Mr. Hahn inquired about the grades and if those rooms would even be seen at street level between the walls and grade changes. He asked if renderings could be provided to help visualization of that area. He requested a rendering that shows the area along SR 161 too.

Mr. Hunter referred to condition #3 and said the applicant could make that blank wall look better. He said they would work through it to prepare for the Site Plan Review.

Ms. Husak inquired about the pillars for the roof for the outdoor space along Frantz Road. She asked about the patio and if steel was being used. Ms. Spires recognized this was missed from the plan and said she thought the front canopy would be stone. Mr. Hunter said the applicant would make this consistent.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if he agreed to the six conditions for the Basic Development Plan as stated earlier. The applicant agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the Basic Development Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission, with six conditions:

- 1) Resolve all the drawing discrepancies and issues for consistency prior to Development Plan Review;
- 2) Determine Bridge Street and Frantz Road right-of-way change details and reflect on the drawings prior to the Development Plan Review;
- 3) Provide details for the bike path connections from the site and proposed outdoor spaces by taking overlapping right-of-way and property lines into consideration;
- 4) Resolve phasing, demolition, and interim site condition plans for the Development Plan Review;
- 5) Coordinate fire access, building access, hydrant location details for the Development Plan Review; and
- 6) Coordinate the Upper Metro Plat update application process with the future applications.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for two Basic Site Plan Waivers:

1. Building Type –Corridor Building
2. Ground Story Transparency – Corridor Building

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant about the ART's recommendation of disapproval of the third Basic Site Plan Waiver:

- 1) Blank Wall Limitations – Corridor Building

Mr. Hunter said he was okay with the disapproval for now but might have it worked out by the time the application gets forwarded to the PZC.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended disapproval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the following Basic Site Plan Waiver:

- 1) Blank Wall Limitations – Corridor Building

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they had any issues with the 14 Basic Site Plan conditions. Mr. Hunter responded he was fine.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the Basic Site Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission, with 14 conditions as listed above.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or comments. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval of the Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission for May 7, 2015.

6. 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 review and approval of the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 153 dwelling units, approximately 81,500 square feet of office uses, approximately 47,500 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant, personal services) uses, and an 869-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 a Development Plan for the first phase of the Bridge Park development and a Site Plan for the building and site details in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.066(E)-(F). She said this is also a request for review and approval for Site Plan Waivers under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(I), a request for an Open Space Fee-in-Lieu in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.064(D)-(E), and a request for review and approval of a Conditional Use for the parking structures under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.

Steve Langworthy said the goal of today's meeting is to work through a number of items so a positive recommendation can be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said this would require cooperation from both the applicant's team and the ART members, although some items might be left to work through next week and following the Planning and Zoning Commission's review.

Ms. Ray presented an overview of the site. She said six actions were presented to the ART today:

- 1) Site Plan Waivers (19 proposed)
- 2) Open Space Fee-in-Lieu Determination
- 3) Administrative Departures (5 proposed)
- 4) Development Plan
- 5) Site Plan
- 6) Conditional Use

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for all 19 Site Plan Waivers, the Open Space Fee-in-Lieu, all five Administrative Departures, and the Conditional Use request.

Ms. Ray said overall, Staff is supportive of the project, but they have some issues with the plan detail and the implementation of those details. She explained that this project is the most complex project that Staff and the ART have had to respond to. She said collaboratively, it is well done. She stated the number one concern is when this plan proceeds to construction and ensuring that all details come together. She noted that this project represents a significant investment on behalf of the applicant and the City, and everyone wants to ensure that it will be constructed to the City's high standards. She indicated that detailed comments have been included in the Planning Report. She said Planning has noted issues with open space and Jeff Tyler has commented on some of the building plans. She stated that the objective for today's ART meeting is to review Staff's comments and concerns so that a resolution can be achieved and recommendations of approval can be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Langworthy said as this is the first phase, Block C will be an example for going forward, and Staff would prefer not to run into similar issues for the upcoming blocks.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the same teams working on Block C will also work on the subsequent blocks, so they will take the comments into consideration.

Parking Structure Design

Ms. Ray stated she wanted to discuss some of the changes that have been made to the parking structure since the plans were previously submitted to the ART. She noted that the ART has discussed their support for the architectural character of buildings C1, C2, and C3, but there had been some changes to the parking structure (building C4/C5) that seem to be a step backward. Previously, she said there was a glass corner for C4/5 at the northwest intersection at Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive, which contained an elevator and stairwell. She said the elevator has since been removed and is now an open brick feature, similar to the rest of the parking garage architecture. She said Staff preferred the previous glass tower, which mirrored the main public lobby in the base of the glass tower at the southwest corner of the site near Longshore Street and Bridge Park Avenue. She noted the difficulties with pedestrian entry on the west elevation. She said now there is a condition that a man door be provided in the tower.

Dan Phillabaum said the changes to the pedestrian circulation resulting from the eliminated glass tower and doorway at the base of the tower created the need for Waivers. He said the purpose of the design requirements for parking structures is to funnel pedestrians to prominent entryways to assist with wayfinding, safety and visibility, etc. He said the glass tower accomplished this more effectively than the revised brick design.

Mr. Hunter said he was under the impression that towers were not permitted, but this addresses that issue and eliminates the need for a Waiver for the second tower.

Ms. Ray said that was not the case. She stated that the required reviewing body has the option of approving more than one tower per building, if it is determined to be architecturally appropriate (much like the discussion on the towers for the Home-2 Hotel). She said the ART supported the second tower on this parking structure because they believed it to be architecturally appropriate.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said they were trying to eliminate as many Waivers as possible. Ms. Ray said Staff had stated their support for the second tower.

Mr. Hunter asked Ms. Umbarger if the tower has to remain open and since she answered it did not, he said the applicant could work on this. Ms. Ray invited feedback from the ART on this.

Colleen Gilger asked if a Waiver would still be necessary. The ART determined that a second tower could be approved if "architecturally appropriate" by the required reviewing body, but it would not be processed as a Waiver.

Fred Hahn inquired about the functionality of that tower. Ms. Ray said a pedestrian cannot enter from the street under the current condition. She acknowledged there were grade issues, and previously, there had been a problem with the door on the glass tower encroaching in the right-of-way. She pointed out where the new entrance was placed in the center of the Longshore Street elevation. She recommended that the glass tower element be reinstated, with a doorway opening. She noted that there would be stairs required, but since there was no longer an elevator in that tower, the accessibility of that entrance was no longer a building code issue.

Mr. Hunter said the tower design was changed because of the five-foot setback required along Tuller Ridge Drive, and that is why they scaled down the tower element, removed the ramp, and moved the accessible entrance to the center of the Longshore Street elevation. He asked if adding stairs would be a possible solution.

Mr. Langworthy said the idea is to provide a door and steps to make it a usable entry. Mr. Hahn asked if the entry would be visible.

Mr. Langworthy invited a response for the ART about the preferred tower design to recommend to the Planning and Zoning Commission, to which the ART stated an entrance with stairs was desired, with the glass tower element in lieu of an open brick tower. Ms. Ray said conditions to that effect were included in the ART Report.

Mr. Tyler suggested that the ADA accessible entrance on Longshore Street be better articulated so it is more visible. Ms. Ray said there is also a condition for that in the ART Report as well.

Ms. Ray said the parking garage material had changed from the last submittal as well, with a lighter shade of brick on the upper stories, and a darker shade along the lower stories, which is in lieu of the masonry cladding. She said in some ways, the different shades of brick help articulate the lower portion of the building from the upper stories, so it is not necessarily a negative change, but she wanted to point it out to the ART members.

Mr. Phillabaum inquired about the changes made to the east and south elevations that mainly focused on a five-foot shift. He said since that relates more to the building placement, he asked what drove the change to the cladding scheme. He explained that before, the application of materials on the residential portions of the building helped it to read with a base, middle, and cap in terms of its architectural composition, but now the sections are not as clear with the more varied application of color.

Ms. Umbarger answered it was to create verticality on the east side and to help address the blank wall requirements. Mr. Phillabaum said if there is no change in the recesses or projections, a color change alone does not help the issue of the blank wall.

Ms. Ray said the applicant may present it to the Commission as it is to obtain their feedback at this point, but she wanted the ART to discuss the modifications to the parking structure.

Waiver Review

Ms. Ray stated she would like to address the 19 proposed Waivers; she went through each one. The numbers below correspond with the Waiver of the same number.

Waiver 1: Parapet Height & Façade Wrapping – Code Section 153.062(D)(1)(a)-(b)

Ms. Ray said the shifts in parapet height result from the applicant's efforts to create visual interest by staggering the roofline around the buildings without inappropriately increasing the height of the parapet consistent with the modern architectural character of these buildings, as well as (in some areas) screening mechanicals in an architecturally appropriate manner (rather than installing separate mechanical screens).

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 2: Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements – Code Section 153.062(N)(4)(a)5

Ms. Ray said this Waiver affects the buildings with residential units on upper stories. She said the intent of this requirement is to minimize views of all vents, air conditioners and other utility elements on non-street facing building façades; however, due to the site arrangement with streets on three of the four building elevations for all of the impacted buildings, there is no way to conceal these fixtures and continue to meet Building Code requirements for venting. She recommended approval with a condition that the vents be painted to match the color of the adjacent exterior building finish.

Mr. Tyler asked if flaking was a problem. Mr. Hunter said flaking had not been a problem yet, but they will try and find a color closer to the building materials to minimize the need for painting.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 3: Right-of-Way Encroachment – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)1)

Ms. Ray said Code does not address pedestrian bridge connections between buildings over right-of-ways so this is considered a technical Waiver.

Aaron Stanford said this would require an aerial easement per Legal.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T asked how to best address this since it is not on the plat. Mr. Stanford said he was amenable either way; it comes down to timing and has to have Council approval.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 4: Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(a)1)

Ms. Ray said Lots/Blocks 4 & 5 are at the center of activity in the Bridge Park mixed-use development, centrally located in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District. She said since these buildings are sited along the shopping corridor on Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive, development intensities are expected to be higher on this site than anywhere else in the Bridge Park development.

Mr. Hunter said it fits the desired urban environment. Ms. Shelly suggested green roofs would help this number and encouraged the applicant to consider with the next application. She said it will be worse the next time without green open spaces between buildings. Mr. Hunter noted the roof top terrace but understands they are not green roofs. Ms. Shelly said the key is to process stormwater.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 5: Transparency – Building Type Table (Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)1-2)

Ms. Ray said since the Basic Site Plan Review, the applicant has made great efforts to increase the building transparency on all floors of all elevations while ensuring the buildings remain architecturally appropriate in terms of window placement, overall material composition, etc. She said generally, where blank walls remain, or where the transparency is more than a few percentage points less than the minimum requirement, there are conditions present that warrant Waiver consideration, such as grade issues, utility locations adjacent to the open spaces (with blank walls to be screened by amenities such as screens, landscaping, and other vertical elements within the open spaces).

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 6: Principal Entrance Location – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)3)

Ms. Ray said the applicant is proposing to site these lobby entrances along the side streets, which is convenient for visitors and residents arriving and parking in the parking garage, and to prioritize active uses such as restaurant and retail uses along the shopping corridors/PFS – Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. She said building C1 & 3 lobby access to residential units on secondary stories, approximate to the parking structure instead of the street.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 7: Vertical Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)4)

Ms. Ray said a couple of elevations exceed the vertical façade division requirement just a bit on buildings C1, 3, and 5. She explained this was an aesthetic choice by the architect, consistent with the architectural character of the buildings.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 8: Primary Façade Materials – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)5)

Ms. Ray said the applicant is proposing to use a variety of materials to accent and provide visual interest in character with the modern architectural style of these buildings. In many cases, alternative materials including composite metal panels and fiber cement panels are proposed on the top-most stories of buildings to define the top of the buildings, lighten the overall building mass, and from a technical standpoint, provide a material that can be applied at higher building heights. She said that this request considers fiber cement panels as secondary materials, rather than a Waiver to consider them to be primary materials. The ART would like the Commission to consider the use of this material.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they felt limited on the selection of primary materials and Mr. Hunter responded it does become limiting when they are limited to brick, stone, and glass. He added that when an applicant wants to create something different, there needs to be a different palette.

Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to show compelling pictures to support the use of this material. Mr. Hunter said fiber cement can be well done and they will produce examples of where they have used it on actual buildings for other projects.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 9: Upper Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))

Ms. Ray said building C2 serves, in part, as a gateway to the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, and the overall architectural composition, including a top story that is slightly greater in height than the lower stories, is appropriate for the building in this location. She added the height maximizes natural light into the building and opens up views of the Scioto River and a future park and pedestrian bridge.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 10: Ground Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))

Ms. Ray said building C4 is just below the minimum requirement. She explained the applicant is proposing to locate residential uses along the ground floor of this building type that is generally intended for commercial uses, although it allows residential uses on the ground floor (provided they are not sited within a shopping corridor). Further she said, the height of the ground story is coordinated with the height of the parking structure, which is wrapped by these residential uses. She stated the upper stories meet the minimum and maximum height requirements.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 11: Blank Wall Limitations – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)2)

Ms. Ray stated that, as noted previously, all of these buildings have four prominent elevations, with streets lining three of the elevations, and open spaces along the fourth. She said as such, siting elevators, utilities, and other building functions is challenging. She said while these functions take place along the open space elevation for building C4, the blank walls are behind electrical transformers, which are in turn screened by a decorative metal screen that serves as an amenity and interesting vertical element in these open spaces.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 12: Number of Street Façade Entrances – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)3) and 153.062(O)(12)(d)3)

Ms. Ray stated the parking structure entrance requirements are better suited to parking structures with commercial uses lining the buildings. She said parking structures in this configuration benefit from concentrating pedestrian access points to relatively limited locations to facilitate improved safety and surveillance, as well as enhance wayfinding for visitors. She said the applicant has agreed to provide stairs to a doorway at the tower in the northwest corner of the building and emphasize the main pedestrian entrance on Longshore Street through additional architectural detailing.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver with the condition noted.

Waiver 13: Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4)

She said the ART has previously discussed that the “stepped” horizontal façade divisions are architecturally appropriate and are in keeping with the intent of the regulation to break down the vertical massing of the building.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 14: Corner Side RBZ – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(12)(a)1)

Ms. Ray said the proposed parking structure configuration is intended to maximize parking for this phase of the development and achieve an efficient layout. She said the intent of the 5 to 25-foot corner side RBZ requirement is to provide a buffer between the edge of the parking structure to soften the edges, screen vents and other mechanical elements, and provide space for stacking. She said the building has been designed with planters along the ground story to soften the edge of the parking structure.

Mr. Hunter said the planters would be integrated architecturally into the building. Ms. Ray encouraged the applicant to ensure there are adequate stacking spaces for the garage, as conditioned.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver with the condition noted.

Waiver 15: Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (153.062(O)(12)(d)4)

Ms. Ray explained this Waiver for building C5 is caused by a grade change, and the applicant has incorporated architectural features including a brick reveal at the top of the second story, which is an architecturally appropriate application of this detail.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver with the condition noted.

Waiver 16: Towers – Building Type Table (153.062(O)(12)(d)6)

In the opinion of the ART, the tower element is appropriately sited, and the dimensions are architecturally appropriate and asked that this now be removed from the Waiver list. Ms. Ray stated that a recommendation would be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission that the second tower on building C5 should be permitted.

Waiver 17: Open Space Types – Pocket Plazas – Code Section 153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-A

Ms. Ray said the applicant has worked closely with the Administrative Review Team to identify locations where smaller, intimate gathering spaces can be provided throughout the Bridge Park public realm. She said the applicant has provided five other open spaces that meet the dimensional requirements, while these additional two spaces are provided to enhance the public realm and provide additional public spaces, while the open space fee-in-lieu request continues to be required. She said if the ART does not approve this Waiver, the fee-in-lieu amount increases.

Ms. Shelly encouraged the applicant to look at planting details to make the most of these areas. Mr. Hahn inquired about meeting the maximum for patios, if there would be leftover space. Mr. Hunter said they

expect the complete opposite to be true, he said tenants will be clamoring for table space. He said he is comfortable with the locations for pocket plazas given the tenants that are interested in those adjacent spaces.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Waiver 18: Parking Structure Design - Pedestrian Circulation – Code Section 153.065(B)(5)(d)

Ms. Ray stated that, based on the size and dimensions of the parking structure, there are some instances where the maximum distance is exceeded by 57 feet. She said this could be addressed by adding an additional elevator; however, Code only requires one elevator to serve parking structures. She said providing a man door at the northwest corner could meet the intent.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver with the condition noted.

Waiver 19: Mid-Block Pedestrianways – Code Section 153.065(I)(2)(a)

Ms. Ray stated that the location of the mid-block pedestrianway is a result of the configuration of the front property line along Bridge Park Avenue, and the three corner side property lines along the remaining three streets. She said the mid-block pedestrianway is intended to facilitate pedestrian access throughout the site. She noted that most visitors will be arriving to the site and parking in the garage, and therefore will be minimally affected by the mid-block pedestrianway being located slightly outside of the middle third of the block. She added the open spaces have been designed well to appropriately funnel people where they need to go.

The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 18 Site Plan Waivers:

1. Parapet Height & Façade Wrapping – Code Section 153.062(D)(1)(a)-(b)
2. Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements – Code Section 153.062(N)(4)(a)5
3. Right-of-Way Encroachment – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)1)
4. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(a)1)
5. Transparency – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)1-2)
6. Principal Entrance Location – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)3)
7. Vertical Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)4)
8. Primary Façade Materials – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)5)
9. Upper Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))
10. Occupation of Corner – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(a)1)
11. Ground Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))
12. Blank Wall Limitations – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)2)

13. Number of Street Façade Entrances – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)3) and 153.062(O)(12)(d)3)
14. Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4)
15. Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (153.062(O)(12)(d)4)
16. Open Space Types – Pocket Plazas – Code Section 153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-A
17. Parking Structure Design - Pedestrian Circulation – Code Section 153.065(B)(5)(d)
18. Mid-Block Pedestrianways – Code Section 153.065(I)(2)(a)

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for Open Space Fee-in-Lieu request for open space dedication for 0.39-acres of the required 0.77-acres of open space for this phase of the Bridge Park mixed-use development.

Ms. Ray said five Administrative Departures were recommended for approval and went through each one. Since there was no discussion needed for any of the departures, Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART approved the five Administrative Departures:

- 1) Balcony Dimensions – Code Section 153.062(I) – Allowing several buildings C1, C2, and C3 balconies to range in depth from 5 feet to 5.8 feet (minimum 30 square feet is maintained on all balconies).
- 2) Transparency – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)1 – Allowing the following:
 - a. C1 – Ground Story Street Façade Transparency (70% required): 66% on north (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation; Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on east (Longshore Street) elevation, 5th story.
 - b. C3 – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on south (Bridge Park) elevation, 5th story
 - c. C4 (Corridor Building) – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 28% on east (Mooney Street) elevation, 5th story and 29% on north (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, 5th story; Non-Street Façade Transparency (15% required): 14% on south (“Mews” open space) elevation, ground story.
- 3) Primary Façade Materials – Code Section 153.062(O)(6)(d)5 – Allowing the following:
 - a. C2 – 72% permitted primary materials on the north (“Pavilion” open space) elevation, 72% on the east (Longshore) elevation, 73% on the south (Bridge Park) elevation, and 77% on the west (Riverside Drive) elevation.
 - b. C3 – 78% permitted primary materials on the east (Mooney) elevation and 77% on the south (Bridge Park) elevation.
 - c. C4 (Corridor Building) – 75% permitted primary materials on the north (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation and 77% permitted primary materials on the east (Mooney Street) elevation.
- 4) Tower Height – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)6 – Allowing the tower height to be 15.71 feet for building C2, where the maximum is 14 feet.
- 5) Parking Structure Ceiling Clearance – Code Section 153.065(B)(5)(c) – Allowing 11.5-foot ceiling height on the ground story on Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive, where the minimum clearance is 12 feet.

Ms. Ray asked the ART to provide comments on the Development Plan and Site Plan, and concerns with the plan details as noted in the ART Report.

Ms. Shelly said it is very apparent that the plans are not well-coordinated between all plans from all of the different applicant consultant teams, which causes Staff to be in the position of quality checking and finding these errors, which in turn causes concern over the overall plan quality and whether the proposed project can be implemented as shown.

Ms. Shelly said Staff met with the applicant several weeks ago specifically to coordinate the streetscape plans with the project plans to determine where the planters should be placed etc., and these comments were never addressed. She said there have not been any changes as a result of that meeting. She said places for future amenities such as bike racks, trash receptacles, benches, etc. that have to be part of the streetscape per the BSD Streetscape Design Guidelines have not been determined.

Mr. Tyler reported he finished the Building Code review for the Site Plan for four buildings and it took twice the amount of time than it should have based on the lack of coordination and the need for quality control. He said that Building Standards had also previously had meetings with the applicant where they went sheet by sheet to help determine what was necessary, and a lot was not taken care of, which resulted in a 25 page correction list. He stated that the ART believed that Staff is satisfied with the design direction, and a relatively small number of Waivers, but the attention to detail is a concern.

Ms. Shelly said because of her experience implementing these types of projects in the field, she is familiar with what can go wrong, and she wanted to raise these concerns. She said quality of the details is important because it is directly related to the longevity of the project.

Mr. Tyler stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission should only have to focus on final, well planned out packages of materials that the ART is comfortable recommending. He said projects should be evaluated based on the merits of their design, not with construction details that can be approved at the building permit stage.

Mr. Quackenbush admitted plans have not been coordinated as well as they should have. He said they are in the process of pursuing a building permit at the same time, and this process is moving fast. He said he believed the ART is also approving the overall concept of the project. He said he was not under the impression that they are at the construction document level of detail in terms of the submittal requirements. He said he believed that the applicant team is pretty well coordinated given how fast this is moving. He said some of the plans are not perfect, mainly because changes are being made daily. He said he thought perhaps too much detail was given to the ART and for the PZC review than is appropriate at this stage.

Ms. Gilger asked what level of detail should be expected for projects in the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Shelly said the main concern is that this project involves a high degree of coordination between the public and private realms. She said when she sees details that are not drawn correctly, it raises a red flag for her that the process is not orderly. She said she understands the speed at which this is moving, but reiterated the importance of collaboration among the applicant team and Staff.

Mr. Langworthy said it appears that quality control has been done by Staff and it should have been done by the applicant. He said the ART expects some level of quality review before the ART is asked to review and make determinations on plans.

Darren Meyer, MKSK, said he struggles with the level of detail needed for the project at this stage of review. He said he was sure that this could be a well-coordinated project as this moves forward.

Ms. Gilger asked if a lot of these details and concerns raised by Staff should happen at the building permitting stage.

Ms. Ray said typically, the answer is yes – however, since there is so much “overlap” between the public improvements and the private project elements, the ART has a responsibility to ensure that this project can be built as shown on the plans.

Mr. Tyler asked the applicant to understand this is the first big project in the BSD and for the ART. He said the ART is working their way through this process just as much as the applicant. He acknowledged that the BSD has many details and nuances that have to be guaranteed correct and appropriate before they are forwarded to the Commission. He said Staff is responsible for checking on details, and if there are problems with coordination, that needs to be brought to the applicant’s attention.

Mr. Langworthy concluded that the ART has reviewed and is comfortable with the Waivers and Administrative Departures. He asked to review the issues listed in the ART Report to see if as many of them can be resolved as possible today to get to an approval recommendation.

Mr. Langworthy referred to the Additional Plan Review/Detail Comments on page 18 of the ART Report:

1. The plans should be modified to demonstrate better coordination:
 - a. Tree, light pole, and utility locations still to be in conflict with each other and other site furnishings, as well as the street layout.
 - b. Where placed within the streetscape, bike racks should be sited and aligned within the furnishings zone.

Ms. Shelly said this was a coordination issue and the placements should be included in the streetscape as what is shown on the plans is not what was agreed to. She suggested another meeting to ensure everyone was in agreement.

Mr. Quackenbush agreed they should all meet again. Ms. Shelly brought up the example of tree grates where detail is needed. Mr. Tyler said this level needs to be with the building permit process. Ms. Shelly said street trees on each block need to be coordinated with the building placement, parking, streetscape, etc., requiring individual coordination per block.

Mr. Langworthy suggested a condition that these be addressed to the City's satisfaction prior to building permitting.

Mr. Langworthy referred to the second comment:

2. Reconsider the following design details:
 - a. Select an alternative material for the “Pavilion” canopy (corrugated polycarbonate is not recommended). Further, western red cedar will weather to gray if not sealed or stained annually. The applicant should specify the maintenance schedule on the permit plans.
 - b. Verify the boulder installation details, including cutting and anchoring, subject to Planning and Engineering approval.
 - c. Provide an appropriate detail for the structural soils in the street section details.
 - d. Modify the on-street ADA parking space detail subject to Planning and Engineering approval.
 - e. Verify the finish of the concrete walls.
 - f. The brick paver detail should not have weep holes.
 - g. An “isolation joint” should be provided between the building and the brick walk (similar to between detail of the brick walk and the concrete wall).

The Pavilion canopy material and the treatment of red cedar were discussed. Mr. Langworthy said with the exception of d, all others are a question of maintenance and constructability. Mr. Meyer said the cedar was expected to turn gray over time, and that was an intentional selection.

The ART members discussed the ADA spaces and configuration on the on-street parking spaces, which, as shown, are not preferred. Ms. Shelly suggested that the ADA spaces also be discussed at the upcoming meeting to finalize these streetscape details.

Mr. Langworthy referred to the third and fourth sets of comments:

3. Site Design

- a. The Pocket Plaza at the Riverside Drive/Bridge Park Avenue intersection of building C2 should better relate to the design of the adjacent streetscape, subject to Planning and Parks approval.
- b. The Pocket Plaza at the Riverside Drive entry to building C2 should be modified to better enhance the seating and landscaping opportunities, subject to Planning and Parks approval.
- c. The open space between building C4 & C3 does not have sufficient path lighting.
- d. Details for all tree grates and permeable pavers need to be provided.
- e. All of the pre-cast concrete curbs and seating walls should be designed to deter skateboard gliding.

4. Landscaping

- a. The applicant should specify a minimum size boulder. The plans show minimum 30"-72"width; however, 30 inches is small for a seat and may become a trip hazard. The applicant should consider 48 inches in width as a minimum.
- b. For the bio-retention area, the applicant should consider reinforcing the stormwater with rebar embedded down into the footer as ice pressure will crack non-reinforced concrete.
- c. Label the Eastern Redbud locations on the planting plans (seemed to have been an omission).

Mr. Langworthy asked how many of these items could be addressed now, or in the next week prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Ms. Shelly stated that the same thoughtful planning that went into the designs on the larger pocket parks between the buildings needed to put into the pocket plazas along the streetscape. She said the spaces were on the right track and appropriately placed, but the details need to be thought out a bit more. She referred to the need for ADA accessibility, appropriate plant materials, and installation details to ensure that the plan can be constructed.

Mr. Meyer asked what level of detail is appropriate for this stage of review. He said typically, what they have shown is enough for this phase, which is nowhere near construction document level of design.

Mr. Hahn stated that design feasibility needed to be determined at this stage, and so enough detail needs to be provided to ensure the designs can be implemented, with attention to details for ADA accessibility, and that the 12-foot clear walkway area is provided, etc.

Mr. Meyer asked what information the Planning and Zoning Commission will be looking for in their review. He said he would be fine with working with Staff next week to resolve any remaining concerns and revise plans prior to the Commission meeting next Thursday.

Ms. Shelly said PZC will not look at the illustrative drawings and see the grade change that has a critical impact on the designs of some of these spaces, unless they reference a number of different plans.

Ms. Ray said at this point, the applicant needs to be able to communicate a clear idea of what these spaces are going to be, and that they can actually be installed as shown, with an understanding that

there are many more details to be determined through the permitting and construction stages. She said since the Commissioners are getting plans this evening, and the report is going out tomorrow, there is no more time to make revisions. She said the applicant should be prepared to get feedback from the Commission on the open spaces and the architecture before any more changes are made anyway.

Mr. Meyer said the applicant's objective was to leave today's meeting with the ART's recommendation of approval, so they would like to understand what needs to happen from a timeline perspective for this to be a possibility.

Ms. Ray stated that based on the discussion, she thought the ART would be receptive to moving this forward with a recommendation of approval, and Staff would be open to meeting with the applicant next week prior to the Commission meeting to work through the details.

Mr. Tyler emphasized that accessibility is an issue.

Mr. Hahn reiterated the importance of the minimum 12 feet of clear walkway.

Mr. Langworthy stated that the ART would like to leave the ART meeting with a level of comfort that the issues noted in the report will be able to be addressed. He commented that many of the items listed under 3 and 4 on the comment list are details and corrections, and suggested a reworded condition "that the applicant and Staff continue to work through the details of the open space designs".

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the Development Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission with three conditions:

- 1) That a Development and Infrastructure Agreement (as applicable) be approved by City Council and all impacted property owners prior to issuance of building permit (buildings C1 – C4/C5) and recording of the Final Plat for Bridge Park, Section 1;
- 2) That the streetscape exhibits are modified to show the 12 feet of clear area along the entire length of the designated Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive shopping corridor, and each patio space, when installed, should provide the minimum 12 feet of clear area; and
- 3) That a Master Sign Plan is approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5).

Ms. Ray stated that there is a recommendation of approval for a Parking Plan allowing for a combined total of 921 parking spaces (garage and on-street) for Lots 4 and 5 where 964 spaces are required by Code.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the Parking Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Ray stated that approval for a second tower element on building C5 is recommended in accordance with the provisions of §153.062(D)(4)(a).

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the second tower element for the parking garage, as it was determined to be architecturally appropriate.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART and the applicant if any more of the Site Plan conditions needed to be discussed. Ms. Ray stated that condition 12 should be modified to indicate that the public improvements should be modified through coordination with the City.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they agreed to the Site Plan conditions. Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions:

1. That a Development Agreement be approved by City Council and approval is obtained from all impacted property owners prior to issuance of building permits for any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5).
2. That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy.
3. Building Type Conditions
 - a. That the applicant give additional consideration to the design of the resident/pedestrian bridges to address the ART's safety concerns and to incorporate greater architectural interest, and that they be modified subject to ART approval prior to building permitting;
 - b. That the balconies at the southwest corner of building C2 are modified to provide the appropriate material transitions on the interior of the north walls of the balconies;
 - c. That the balconies are modified to provide a minimum depth of 5 ft. as measured from the façade to the inside of the railing;
 - d. That the windows installed within fiber cement panels are detailed with projecting sills to provide articulation along these portions of the building façades;
 - e. That the applicant selects vents that are coordinated with the color of the adjacent exterior building finish materials, or that they are painted a coordinating color, subject to Planning approval;
 - f. That the applicant modify the north and west elevations of the uppermost story of residential units facing the top open deck of the parking structure (building C4) to be clad with a permitted primary or secondary building material, subject to ART approval; and
 - g. That the applicant provide additional details for the canopies at the building entrances, including material, illumination, and mounting details, prior to building permitting and to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Master Sign Plan.
4. Open Space Conditions
 - a. That the applicant continue to work with the City (Planning, Parks, and Engineering) on the design details of the Pocket Plazas based on the discussion at the April 30, 2015 ART meeting; and
 - b. That the building permit plans and Final Plat includes notes that state that the Pocket Parks and Pocket Plazas will be owned and maintained by the property owner, with public access easements.
5. Parking & Loading Conditions
 - a. That the Planning and Zoning Commission approve a parking plan for this phase of the development, allowing for a combined total of 921 parking spaces (garage and on-street) for Lots 4 and 5 where 964 spaces are required by Code;
 - b. That, as part of the parking plan, the applicant provides information about how the parking spaces within the garage are to be controlled and/or designated for resident use, valet use, etc. at building permitting;
 - c. That the applicant provide the cut sheets for the bicycle parking facilities (on-street and in the garages) at building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and
 - d. That the applicant provide stairs to a doorway at the tower in the northwest corner of the building and emphasize the main pedestrian entrance on Longshore Street through additional architectural detailing, at building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and

- e. That loading spaces meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(B)(7) are identified on the plans at building permitting.
6. That the plans demonstrate compliance with the City of Dublin Stormwater Management Design Manual at building permitting, subject to approval by the City Engineer.
7. That the applicant addresses the Washington Township Fire comments in the attached report at building permitting.
8. That the applicant addresses Engineering comments in the attached report, subject to approval by the City Engineer.
9. Screening Conditions
 - a. That the parapets that exceed the maximum height of 6 feet are coordinated with the location of rooftop mechanical equipment to limit the need for additional rooftop mechanical screens; and
 - b. That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner and meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(E)(3), subject to ART approval.
10. That the applicant provide fixture power and efficiency information at building permitting to verify that the exterior lighting requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(F) are met, subject to Planning approval.
11. That a Master Sign Plan be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5).
12. That the applicant continues to coordinate with the City on the public improvement plans and construction details, and that the City's comments are incorporated into the plans prior to issuance of permits.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the Conditional Use for a parking structure with non-occupied space in accordance with the provisions of §153.059(C)(3)(g) to the Planning and Zoning Commission with four conditions:

- 1) That the parking structure design and interior circulation is modified to limit the entrance/exit on Tuller Ridge Drive to not more than 24 feet wide;
- 2) That the interior circulation plans are revised at building permitting to allow for adequate stacking space at each entry to the garage (building C4/C5);
- 3) That the applicant verify whether cameras will monitor pedestrian activity in the parking garage from a remote location, or if other security measures will be taken, at building permitting; and
- 4) That the applicant provide stairs to a doorway at the tower in the northwest corner of the building and emphasize the main pedestrian entrance on Longshore Street through additional architectural detailing, at building permitting, subject to Planning approval.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if he agreed to the four conditions.

Mr. Hunter asked where #3 comes from. Ms. Ray said it is a Code requirement. Mr. Hunter said he agreed to the four conditions as part of the Conditional Use request.

Mr. Langworthy summarized the seven actions that were taken during the meeting:

- 18 Waivers – Recommended for approval.
- Development Plan – Recommended for approval with three conditions.
- Parking Plan – Recommended for approval.
- Administrative Departures – Approved.
- Conditional Use – Recommended for approval with four conditions.
- Site Plan – Recommended for approval with 12 conditions.
- Open fee-in-lieu – Recommended for approval.

Mr. Langworthy said Ms. Ray would modify her Planning Report accordingly. He concluded by stating that all the actions were approved or recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Mr. Quackenbush asked Ms. Ray about scheduling coordination meetings with Staff early next week.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's recommendations of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the May 7, 2015 Commission meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.]

Mr. Langworthy adjourned the meeting at 5:12 pm.

The Administrative Review Team approved the minutes May 7, 2015.