



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 1, 2015

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

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect, Lia Yakumithis, and Flora Rogers, Administrative Assistant.

Applicants: Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan; John Woods, MKSK; and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Case 2).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the June 25, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

Mr. Langworthy announced this was Fred Hahn's last ART meeting due to his upcoming retirement and said his institutional knowledge, humor, and insights will be missed.

DETERMINATIONS

- 1. BSD Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center
School of Rock Sign
15-060MPR** **6727 Dublin Center Drive
Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said the applicant would not be present.

Lia Yakumithis said this is a request for installation of a new 20-square-foot wall sign for a tenant in the Dublin Village Center shopping center on the west side of Dublin Center Drive, east of Village Parkway (northeast of the movie theater). 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. Yakumithis said the proposed sign is consistent with the dimensional and design requirements for signs in the Bridge Street District and meets all the review criteria. She said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this Minor Project Review.

- 2. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park – Phase 2 (B Block)
Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
15-052DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU Development Plan/Site Plan/Conditional Use Reviews**

Joanne Shelly said this is a request for the second phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 228 dwelling units, 42,644 square feet of office uses, 55,500 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant, personal services) uses, and an 894-space parking structure on a 5.74-acre site. She said the proposal includes three new public streets and two blocks of development. She

said the site is north of State Route 161/West Dublin-Granville Road at the intersection of Riverside Drive, and (future) Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Shelly said the Site Plan Review applies only to the first phase of development for the Bridge Park mixed-use development project. She said the Development Plan Review for the initial phase includes a grid street network, three new public streets (Banker Drive, a portion of Mooney Street, and a portion of Longshore Street), two lots/blocks (3 and 4) subdivided by public streets, and portions of a shopping corridor.

Mr. Langworthy asked for clarification about where the shopping corridor was provided with this application.

Ms. Shelly said the shopping corridor is 335.51 feet along the south side of Bridge Park Avenue and 190.22 feet along Riverside Drive for a total of 526.42 feet, which exceeds the 1,200-linear-foot requirement for this overall development when added to the C Block total of 787 feet.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTURES

Ms. Shelly suggested that given the ART's familiarity with this project, she would move to the required determinations, starting with the Administrative Departures. She explained the review criteria for Administrative Departures, which state that the need for the Administrative Departure may be caused by unique site conditions on surrounding properties, and/or otherwise complies with the spirit and intent of the Bridge Street District Plan, and is not being requested simply to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience. She said Administrative Departures should not have the effect of authorizing any use, sign, building type, or open space type that is not otherwise permitted and should not modify any numerical zoning standard related to building dimensions, lot dimensions or coverage, open space, landscaping, parking, fencing, walls, screening, or exterior lighting by more than 10 percent of the requirement. She said if approved, the Administrative Departures will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality with respect to design, material, and other development features than without the Administrative Departure.

The ART then reviewed each proposed Administrative Departure.

Ms. Shelly said the request is for approval by the ART of 8 Administrative Departures and provided a summary of each:

- 1) Balcony Dimensions – §153.062(I) – Requiring a 6-foot depth for balconies. Allow the balconies on buildings B1 & B2 to range in depth from a 5.5 feet minimum while maintaining a minimum of 30 square feet on all balconies.
- 2) Front Property Line Coverage – §153.062(O)(5)(a)1 – Allow the front property line coverage to be 89% for building B5, where the requirement is 90%.
- 3) Story height – §153.062(O)(5)(b) – 12 ft. maximum upper story height permitted. Allow building B5 to have a 12.5 ft. upper story height.
- 4) Transparency – §153.062(O)(5)(d)1 – Allow the following:
 - a. B1 – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on west, Longshore

- Street elevation;
- b. B2 – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on the 3rd, 4th & 5th story of the west elevation (Riverside Drive); 29% on 6th story of the north elevation (Bridge Park Avenue); 29% on the 6th story of the east elevation (Longshore Street).
- 5) Vertical Increments Require – §153.062(O)(5)(d)4 – No greater than 45 ft. Allow the following:
- a. B1 – 47.33 ft. on the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 46.62 ft. on the north elevation (open space).
 - b. B4 – 45.60 ft. on the west elevation (Longshore Street); 48.93 ft. on the north elevation (open space).
- 6) Primary Façade Materials – §153.062(O)(5)(d)5 – 80% permitted primary materials required. Allow the following:
- a. B1 –78% primary on the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 74% primary on the north (open space) elevation, 72% primary on the south (Banker Drive) elevation.
 - b. B2 –75% primary on the east (Longshore) elevation.
 - c. B3 –72% primary on the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 78% primary on the east (Longshore) elevation.
 - d. B4 – 76% on the west elevation (Longshore Street).
- 7) Tower Height – §153.062(O)(5)(d)6 - Allow the tower height to be 13.04 ft., where the maximum permitted height is 12 ft.
- 8) Mid-Building Pedestrianways – §153.065(I)(2)(b), Walkability Standards – Requiring a mid-building pedestrian way on buildings over 250 ft. in length. Not requiring a mid-building pedestrian way for building B1 (255 ft. building length).

Jeff Tyler asked about the mechanical screening on the roof.

Ms. Shelly said the mechanicals will be hidden by the parapets or additional mechanical screens to meet the Code requirement, and asked that the applicant provide verification during the permitting process that the requirement had been met.

Rachel Ray said this was standard review process through building permitting.

Teri Umbarger said the mechanicals are not higher than the parapets.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any other issues related to the eight Administrative Departures as many of them had been previously discussed. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the eight Administrative Departures.

PRIMARY MATERIALS

Ms. Shelly said §153.062(E)(1)(c) states that “permitted primary building materials shall be high quality, durable materials including but not limited to stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick and glass.” She noted that the ART had previously discussed other materials that may be considered primary materials for this particular project to enhance the variety of materials used throughout the project, and at the same time encourage a variety of architectural character. She specified that composite metal panels and

stainless steel metal mesh panels were under consideration for this particular project, and not for broader application throughout the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Shelly stated that this is a consideration by the ART for a recommendation for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the following to be used as primary materials:

1. Composite Metal Panels (CMP)
2. Stainless Steel Metal Mesh Panels (MMP)

Ms. Ray said if these materials are not approved by the Commission to be considered as primary materials for this project, then this will result in an additional Waiver request. She clarified that either way, they are not recommending any changes to the buildings; this is primarily a question of how these materials are used.

Ms. Shelly said she would begin with the request to consider the CMP and MMP as primary materials, and if they are not approved, she will have a Waiver request prepared for the Commission's consideration.

Following a discussion regarding the need to have some consideration for a more diverse palette of primary materials that would allow more architectural variety to buildings, Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's recommendation of the proposal to consider CMP and MMP as permitted primary materials.

Ms. Shelly asked the applicant to be prepared with samples of the requested materials and be ready for a discussion with the Planning and Zoning Commission.

WAIVERS

Ms. Shelly said the next item for ART discussion is the Site Plan Waivers. She stated that there are 12 Waivers for which approval is recommended (some with conditions) to the Commission. She began by summarizing each of the Waivers and requested that the ART provide a recommendation for each. She noted that most of these issues had been worked through in prior staff and ART meetings with the applicant.

1) §153.062(D)(1)(a)-(c), Parapet Roof Type

- a. *Parapet roof height shall be between 2 ft. – 6 ft. in height;* A request to allow the height of parapets to drop below the minimum height of 2 ft. in numerous locations on buildings B1, B2, B3 & B4 as the roofline jogs in height across the elevations.
- b. *Parapets shall wrap around all sides of the building;* A request to allow parapets which are not continuous. Parapets are present on portions of the front and side facades of all buildings, but as the roofline jogs up and down along the elevation, the parapet is not continuous.
- c. *Horizontal Shadow Lines:* Encouraged to distinguish parapets from upper stories and to define the top of the parapet. Horizontal shadow lines have been incorporated to define the tops of some parapets, but not always between the upper story and the bottom of the parapet.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Ms. Shelly continued.

2) §153.062(N)(4)(a)5, Façade Requirements

- a. *Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements*; These elements are not permitted to be part of any street-facing façade, unless permitted for individual building types. A request to allow dryer vents, range vents and fresh air intake vents located on street facing facades of buildings B1, B2, B3, and B4.

Mr. Hahn asked if this Waiver should be considered for a potential Code amendment, since this question is likely to come up with most other buildings that are sited in the same manner, with streets on three or more sides.

Ms. Ray agreed that it may be appropriate to consider as a Code amendment.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Ms. Shelly continued.

3) §153.062(O)(5) & (12) (1)a, Building Siting

- a. *Front Required Building Zone, 0-15 ft.*; A request to allow building B1 to have 128 ft. of the building façade outside of the RBZ due to a recess in the building centered on the façade to create a large entry and private patio. A large stair case enhances the public streetscape and accommodates some change in grade.
- b. *Corner Side RBZ, 5-25 ft.*; A request to allow building B5 (parking garage) to encroach on the RBZ below the min. 5 ft. requirement.
- c. *Right-of-Way Encroachments, none allowed*; A request to allow the pedestrian bridge to encroach over the public ROW of Longshore Street to building B5.

Mr. Langworthy asked Ms. Shelly for more details on 3a.

Ms. Shelly said building B1 is set back from the RBZ along the center of the façade, where there are steps up to patio spaces, a portion of which is covered.

Mr. Langworthy said the building is a corridor building and appears to be set along the curve of Riverside Drive.

Ms. Shelly said the open space is being used by the commercial tenants and therefore cannot be considered an open space type, but would generally look and function as a public space.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Ms. Shelly continued.

4) §153.062(O)(5)&(12) (a)(2), Buildable Area

- a. *Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage, 80%*; A request to allow 98% impervious lot coverage for:
 1. Lot 3 – buildings B1 & B2; and
 2. Lot 4 – buildings B3 & B4/B5

Ms. Shelly asked the applicant to find more space for pervious pavement within the open spaces on site, because the areas available will not reach the 80 percent requirement; however, finding a few more areas on site would bring this closer to the level of an Administrative Departure. She noted she had spoken with the applicant about this already. She recommended that a condition of the Waiver was that the applicant continues to work with Staff on this item prior to permitting.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, stated that he and his team were already looking for opportunities to increase the pervious pavement throughout the site.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the applicant would work with Staff on this.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. Mr. Hahn pointed out that this was an issue with C Block as well, and asked the applicant to think about this requirement for the future development blocks and try to meet the requirement from the start as part of the initial site planning, rather than asking for a Waiver for each block.

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

Ms. Shelly continued.

5) §153.062(O)(5)(d)1-2, Façade Requirements, Transparency

- a. *Ground Story Street Facing Transparency, 60% minimum*; A request to allow less than the 60% transparency required for building B4 west, east & south elevation at residential units. Typical residential transparency would be 30%.
- b. *Street Façade, Blank Wall Limitations, not permitted*; A request to allow a blank wall on building B4 (west elevation) due to service.
- c. *Street Façade, Blank Wall Limitations, not permitted*; A request to allow a blank wall on building B5 (south elevation) due to grade changes.
- d. *Non-Street Façade, 15% min.*; A request to allow less than 15% transparency required for building B4 (north elevation) due to the change in grade across the site.
- e. *Non-Street Façade, Blank Wall Limitations, not permitted*; A request to allow a blank wall on building B1 & B4 (north elevations) due to service rooms on the building interior.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Ms. Shelly continued.

6) §153.062(O)(5)(d)3, Building Entrances

- a. *Principal Entrance Location, on primary street façade*; A request to allow building B2 entrance not on a PFS and building B3, primary entrance on the open space and not on the primary façade.

- b. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 ft.;* A request to allow the 2 lobbies for building B4 to substitute for the 4 required street entries.
- c. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 ft.;* A request to allow less than the required number of entries per street façade for building B5, east elevation 4 required, 1 provided; south elevation 3 required, 1 provided (through lobby); west elevation 1 required, 1 provided.

Mr. Langworthy referred to the number of entrances required for building B4, which is the residential portion of the parking garage building (corridor building type) and said this is another Waiver that might be a candidate for a Code change.

Ms. Ray agreed. She stated that although the corridor building type allows ground floor residential uses, it was not designed with that intent, so that is part of the need for the Waiver to the entrance requirements.

Ms. Shelly referred to the entrance requirements for the parking structure and thought the number seemed excessive as well, since it would require a number of ground floor parking spaces to be removed.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Ms. Shelly continued.

7) §153.062(O)(5)(d)4, Façade Divisions

- a. *Vertical Increments Divisions, no greater than 45 ft.;* A request to allow the following deviations, which are greater than the 45 ft. maximum due to variations in the overall building design.
 - 1. B1 – west, south & north elevations at parapet
 - 2. B2 – west elevation at parapet
 - 3. B3 – north, south, east & west elevations at parapet
 - 4. B4 – north west section adjacent to bldg. tower
 - 5. B5 – east & south elevations over garage vehicle access points
- b. *Horizontal Façade Divisions, within 3 ft. of the top of the ground story;* A request to allow building B5 to forego horizontal façade division requirements where the façade is covered by the green screen screening material.

Ms. Shelly noted that, with the exception of building B5, this primarily applies only to the tops of the buildings, rather than not being met at ground level.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Ms. Shelly continued.

8) §153.062(O)(5)(d)5, Façade Materials

- a. *Permitted Primary Material, Stone, Brick & Glass, minimum 80%;* A request to allow façade materials to be less than 80% on the following elevations:
 - 1. B1 – east elevation, 71%

2. B3 – north elevation, 56% & south elevations, 71%
 3. B4 – north elevation, 69% & east elevations, 69%
- b. *Permitted Secondary Façade Materials, maximum 20%*; A request to allow secondary façade materials to exceed 20% on the following elevations:
1. B2 – east elevation, 25%
 2. B4 – north elevation, 31%, east elevation, 31% & west elevation, 24%

Mr. Langworthy stated that this was the set of Waivers that may need to be modified if the Planning and Zoning Commission does not approve the CMP and MMP to be considered primary materials. Ms. Shelly agreed.

Mr. Hunter referred to the 56% primary materials on the north elevation of building B3, and said he thought it seemed low, since the building was almost entirely brick with big windows.

Ms. Ray verified that that is the same number on the Site Plan Analysis table for building B3, which had been verified by Dan Phillabaum, the City's consultant on this project.

Teri Umbarger verified that was the same percentage on the plans. She said she would verify with the architect who calculated the numbers.

Ms. Shelly stated that it might be because of the fiber cement panels at the very top of the building and noted that this was a smaller elevation than the others.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Ms. Shelly continued.

- 9) §153.062(O)(12)(d)6, Parking Structure, Roof Types
Tower height/width, maximum height may not exceed width; A request to allow the height and width to exceed the allowable height of 14 ft. and width of 14 ft. for the tower on the following buildings:
 1. Tower height: B4/B5 16.88 ft.
 2. Tower width: B4 – south elevation 41.61 ft. & west elevations 27.15 ft. wide
 3. Tower width: B5 – north elevation 34.85 ft. & west elevations 48.18 ft. wide

Mr. Hahn asked about the intent of this requirement.

Ms. Ray explained that since the building types have story height limitations, some also allow towers. The height-to-width limitation is intended to prevent the tower from becoming an additional story. She noted that, for large buildings like the parking structure (building B5), the tower may be proportionally wider and still maintain the look and function of a tower.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Ms. Shelly continued.

10) §153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064A, Open Space Types

- a. *Pocket Plazas, minimum 300 sq. ft./max 1,200 sq. ft.;* A request to allow The “Plaza” – pocket plaza to exceed the size requirements for pocket plazas.

Ms. Shelly suggested this Waiver was another candidate for a Code amendment. She noted that the Code includes requirements for Pocket Plazas and Pocket Parks, but there is a “gap” between the maximum permitted size of a Pocket Plaza and the minimum size of a Pocket Park. She noted this open space falls in that “gap.”

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Ms. Shelly continued.

11) §153.065(B)(5)(a)-(d), Site Development Standards Parking Structure Design

- a. *Entrance/Exit, Number of Exits Lanes 5 required;* A request to allow one less (4) than the required entry/exit lanes.
- b. *Stacking Spaces, two 20 ft. stacking spaces to be provided between ROW and entry gate;* A request to allow the stacking to occur interior to the structure.
- c. *Interior Circulation, Ceiling Clearance, 12 ft. req.;* A request to allow the Mooney Street entry to be 10.66 ft., which is less than the minimum requirement.
- d. *Pedestrian Safety/Circulation – Maximum distance to nearest exit 200 ft.;* A request to allow the maximum distance to the nearest exit to be exceeded by 60 ft.

Mr. Tyler asked about the use of vehicles like U-Hauls and the limited height of the entrances and the minimum ceiling clearance.

Ms. Shelly said there are loading zones provided and U-Hauls will not be allowed in the parking structures. Mr. Hunter agreed.

Mr. Tyler referred to the Pedestrian Safety/Circulation – Maximum Distance requirement, and said that, while the Waiver made sense, there may be a Building Code requirement for distance that cannot be waived.

Ms. Umbarger said they will make sure they meet the Building Code.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any other issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

Ms. Shelly continued.

12) §153.065(I)(2)(a), Walkability Standards

- a. *Mid-Building Pedestrianways, Requiring a mid-building pedestrianway on buildings over 250 ft. in length;* A request to allow the following: B4 – 291.48 ft. building length without a mid-building pedestrianway.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. [There were none.] The ART agreed with the recommendation of approval for this Waiver.

SITE PLAN REVIEW

Ms. Shelly said the request for Site Plan Review is a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the following 11 conditions:

- 1) That a Development Agreement be approved by City Council prior to issuance of building permits for any of the buildings (B1 – B4/B5), and that the agreement include the aerial easements for the pedestrian bridge encroachments;
- 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 balconies are modified to provide the required material transitions on the interior of the corner of the balconies;
 - b. 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 or by the ART through the Minor Project Review process, as applicable;
 - c. That the applicant continue to work with the City and the DAC as they develop the final elements for the building B2 and Bridge Park Avenue pocket plaza located at the terminal vista of the pedestrian bridge; and
 - d. 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.

Ms. Umbarger referred to condition 3a and asked that the material transitions within the balconies be considered as a Waiver, since they felt that it was an aesthetic decision not to return the brick all the way to the inside corner of the balconies.

Ms. Shelly said this was not considered, because not all buildings have the wall section detail defined on the plans, so Staff did not have enough information to consider this Waiver.

Ms. Umbarger said they only provided the detail for Building B4 because the returns were questioned during the review process. She said the lower levels of all the buildings have brick materials.

Mr. Hunter said the approvals are shown in the drawings.

Ms. Shelly said the drawing for building B4 provides the details of the returns and Code requires this information for all buildings.

Mr. Langworthy clarified that the details are needed for buildings B1, B2 and B3.

Mr. Hahn said if a Waiver is requested, it should require the brick to return around the corner for not less than 16 inches, so that it does not appear as if the brick is pasted to the front of the building.

Ms. Umbarger agreed, and said the aesthetic is to highlight the thickness of the walls, and have a contrasting material within the inside of the balconies, which she said would add variety to the architecture.

Ms. Ray said the Code requirement for vertical transitions to occur at inside corners was primarily intended for one ground-to-roof building mass to appear appropriate when constructed adjacent to a separate ground-to-roof building mass, such as connected buildings having been constructed over time. She said this application, inside balconies, still met the condition for requiring the material transition to occur in this manner, but was not what was originally envisioned when the Code was drafted.

Mr. Hahn said there needed to be a measurable return.

Ms. Shelly suggested that if the ART wanted to recommend approval for a Waiver to this requirement for the Commission's consideration, a condition that the applicant provides the details at building permitting should be attached.

Mr. Langworthy stated that this would be a 13th Waiver recommended for approval to the Commission, if the rest of the ART agreed. The ART concurred.

Ms. Shelly continued with the conditions.

4) Open Space Conditions

- a. That the applicant continue to work with ART to provide a variety of design and seating opportunities within the pocket plaza prior to building permitting, subject to Planning approval;
- b. That the building permit plans and Final Plat include notes that state that the Pocket Parks and Pocket Plazas will be owned and maintained by the property owner, with public access easements; and
- c. That the applicant continues to work with Staff to ensure that additional pervious pavement is provided within the open space, subject to Planning and Engineering approval at building permitting.

5) Parking & Loading Conditions

- a. That 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; and
- b. 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.

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 Engineering comments subject to approval by the City Engineer;

Ms. Shelly said there were additional Engineering comments provided in the report that the applicant needs to address.

8) Screening Conditions: That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.065(E)(3) subject to Planning approval, prior to building permitting;

- 9) That the applicant revise the lighting plans and provide fixture power and efficiency information at building permitting to verify that the exterior lighting requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(F) and Engineering standards are met, subject to Engineering approval at building permitting;
- 10) That a Master Sign Plan be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the shopping corridor segments prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (B2 and B3); and
- 11) That the applicant addresses the comments in the "Additional Plan Review/Detail Comments" section of this report at building permitting.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the applicant agreed to the conditions. Mr. Hunter agreed.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any other issues related to the Site Plan Review. [There were none.] He confirmed that the Site Plan Review was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 11 conditions.

CONDITIONAL USE

Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Conditional Use to allow parking structures visible from the right-of-way, with three conditions:

- 1) That the interior circulation plans are revised at building permitting to allow for adequate stacking space at each entry to the garage between the ROW and the entry gate (building B4/B5);
- 2) 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
- 3) That the applicant enhance the pedestrian entrance along Mooney Street with pedestrian scale features such as brick paving wrapping into the garage; protective bollards or fencing to separate the vehicular space from the pedestrian walk and pedestrian scale canopy.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the applicant agreed to the conditions. Mr. Hunter agreed.

Mr. Langworthy said this was discussed during the case review and asked if there were any issues related to the Conditional Use. [There were none.] He confirmed that the Conditional Use was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with three conditions.

FEE-IN-LIEU OF OPEN SPACE

Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a request for payment of a fee-in-lieu of open space dedication for 0.75-acres of the required 1.08-acres of open space for this phase of the Bridge Park mixed-use development.

Mr. Langworthy said the first preference was to have open space over the fees.

Mr. Hahn said the proximity to open space it is appropriate for this site, but when a development is not adjacent to an open space, it will be much more difficult to accept a fee-in-lieu and suggested that the formula for calculating the open space be reviewed.

Mr. Hunter said the density of the development should also be considered. He said for their site, a fifth of the site area would be required to be provided as open space given the proposed densities, which defeats the purpose.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related the Open Space Fee-in-Lieu request. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Open Space Fee-in-Lieu request.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan Review with the following two 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 B1 – B4/B5) and recording of the Final Plat for Bridge Park, Phase 1 (B Block); and
- 2) That a Master Sign Plan is approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the shopping corridor segments prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (B2 and B3).

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to the Development Plan Review. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan with two conditions.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed with Ms. Shelly that there were no further items for discussion on this application. He thanked the applicant and stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission would review this application at their meeting on Thursday, July 9, 2015.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

Mr. Langworthy adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on July 23, 2015.