

Marie Downie said there was a minor text modification included on the published agenda but is no longer necessary.

Ms. Downie reviewed the codified steps of the Planned Unit Development process and said this application is the third step of the PUD process, which is the Final Development Plan. She stated the Commission is the final determining body on the Final Development Plan and the Conditional Uses, but the plats will be forwarded to City Council.

Ms. Downie said the site is at the southwest corner of the Emerald Parkway and Sawmill Road intersection with Kroger to the south, the City of Columbus to the east and multi-family developments to the north and west. She said Lots 1 and 2 are both included in the application for the preliminary and final plats, but Lot 2 is not included in the final development plan. She said Lot 2 will be required to be brought back to the Commission for the final development plan stage.

Ms. Downie said the site is within Subarea 5B of the NE Quad PUD, and permits uses listed in the SO portion of the Code. She said the outparcels are permitted to be retail and restaurant uses in addition to the SO uses. She said there is a fair amount of history dealing with the NE Quad and that the PUD was originally zoned in 1990. She said Subarea 5A includes the Kroger Marketplace which was reviewed and approved in 2004 and the Chase Bank located in Subarea 5B was reviewed and approved in 2010.

Jackson Reynolds, Attorney with Smith & Hale, said he was here on behalf of Northstar Realty, the applicant. He said they are subdividing Lot 1, approximately 3.1 acres, and Lot 2, approximately 6.2 acres, through the platting process. He said when the Chase Bank was developed they were able to locate predetermined curb cuts, therefore parameters were in place for the extension of the private street to service both lots. He said they are proposing a 12,000-square-foot multi-tenant shopping center with 3 to 4 tenant spaces with one being a barbershop requiring a conditional use. He said there will be patios on the north and south side of the building, each being approximately 510-square-feet in size which also require a conditional use. He said they will be extending the bikepath, landscaping and mounding from the Chase Bank site north to Emerald Parkway. He said the site contains 151 parking spaces, which is well over Code requirements. He said they have met the development standards within Subarea 5A and 5B.

Mark Ford, Ford and Associates Architects, said they were the original architects that worked on the Kroger Marketplace including the outlots in front of the center. He said they had a pattern book to work from and the proposed buildings look very much like the existing buildings. He said the materials are a combination of brick and stone which is exactly the same as the other buildings and will be the same tan color. He said the only change from the existing buildings is a smaller light fixture, which was a recommendation of Staff. He said they have matched the existing masonry enclosure to enclose the dumpster and loading space so that it will be screened from public view. He said there is four-sided architecture, with the west side being the service side with all the delivery doors and meters. He said the awnings are being matched exactly to the existing buildings. He said the signage package is the same as the approved signage for Subarea 5A.

Mr. Miller asked that the waste disposal screening to be defined.

Mr. Ford said they are building a masonry wall with brick that will extend off the corner of the building. He said it will be approximately 15 feet in width matching the existing buildings where there have not been any complaints.

Ms. Salay asked if there was going to be a door on the screening structure.

Mr. Ford said there is a gate across the opening to fully enclose the dumpster.

Todd Faris, Faris Planning and Design, presented an overview of the landscape master plan. He pointed out where the existing trees are located along Emerald Parkway. He indicated the applicant tried to preserve as many of those trees as possible but some were lost due to the installation of the bio-retention areas. He pointed out the replacement trees based on the trees removed which would fulfill all of the requirements. He explained the parking will either be screened with mounding, or hedges, or a combination of the two. He said the applicant will work with Staff to make sure that screening is compliant. He pointed out the detention cells, which will be bio-retention areas. He said potted plants will be planted there instead of seeds. He explained the planting patterns and species will match the others that have been used in this area.

Ms. Salay inquired about screening for the mechanicals on the north and west sides of the loading areas.

Mr. Faris said there will be ornamental grasses and arborvitaes along the 10-foot wall in front of the loading area from the west side. He said the applicant could potentially screen the opening with additional evergreens towards the north. He said he would swap out the boxwood with something taller to screen the mechanicals and meters.

Ms. Downie stated there are four different motions required and the applicant has agreed to all of the conditions listed in the Planning Report.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for a Final Development Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to provide appropriate landscaping for the bio-retention cells, provide a phasing plan that includes the protection of plants in the basins, connect the shrub lines being used to meet the minimum screening requirements, and add additional landscaping to provide additional screening of the service areas and mechanicals. Plans will be required to be updated during the building permitting stage;
- 2) That the applicant to update the plan to correctly reflect the parking requirement; and
- 3) That the applicant work with Washington Township Fire to assure the building meets the Code requirements.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for a Conditional Use for patios with three conditions:

- 1) That all site furnishings be black;
- 2) That the patio furniture be stored off-site during the off season; and
- 3) That the applicant work with Staff to find appropriate locations for the recycle/litter bins and benches.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for Conditional Use for personal service with no conditions. She said the personal use is for beauty and barbershop services, occupying one tenant space with eight barber chairs and a waiting area for 20 customers and 10 employees. She said the hours of operation would be normal business hours.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended to be forwarded to City Council for the Preliminary and Final Plats with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

She said Lot 1 will contain the proposed retail center and is 3.19 acres southwest of the Emerald Parkway and Sawmill Road intersection and Lot 2 is on 6.923 acres includes Summer Drive which is a private access drive.

Randy Roth, 6987 Grandee Cliffs Drive, said he is the president of the East Dublin Civic Association and is here to say they appreciate the applicants meeting with the civic association to discuss this application and are unanimous in their support of this application and the conditional uses. He said he would like to hear comments about mechanicals but not having any expertise in the area of mechanicals. He said he appreciates that Staff has kept them informed throughout the process. He said this has been a successful shopping center and has been 27 years in the making. He said the project has gotten better over time and having this site be a mirror image is appropriate for the center and the community.

Mr. Brown asked if there were any further comments. [There were none.]

Ms. Salay said she is in favor of this project and asked if there was a sense of how Lot 2 will be oriented.

Ms. Downie said it would depend on what is proposed to be on these sites working with the pre-determined access points and connecting to the parking areas on Lot 1.

Ms. Husak said when Chase developed they were asked to do a sample layout of what might be expected to be developed such as an office building on Lot 2 with the concern being the interior access points. She said recently there was a development proposal for a fairly large day care operation and they chose to center the building on the site with most parking and daycare activity on the rear facing Emerald Parkway. She said since Summer Drive is a private drive the signs guide where buildings might locate because the only location for permitted signs is Emerald Parkway. She said it seems to make sense to make Emerald Parkway the frontage and consolidate parking in the center.

Ms. Salay said she would agree with that and wondered if there were any ideas related to Lot 2.

Ms. De Rosa said she is supportive and thought the current center is vibrant and appreciates the development being placed in the center of the site to retain trees and the look of the area.

Mr. Stidhem said he is supportive as well and asked if the private drive is common for this type of development.

Ms. Salay said Council has struggled with maintenance of the private drives and is a concern but is common.

Mr. Brown said there are four votes required. He said the **Final Development Plan** has three conditions and asked if there is agreement to all the conditions.

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to provide appropriate landscaping for the bio-retention cells, provide a phasing plan that includes the protection of plants in the basins, connect the shrub lines being used to meet the minimum screening requirements, and add additional landscaping to provide additional screening of the service areas and mechanicals. Plans will be required to be updated during the building permitting stage;
- 2) That the applicant to update the plan to correctly reflect the parking requirement; and
- 3) That the applicant work with Washington Township Fire to assure the building meets the Code requirements.

Mr. Reynolds agreed to all the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan because the proposal meets the applicable review criteria, with three conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Mr. Brown said the **Conditional Use for the Patios** has three conditions and asked if there is agreement to all the conditions.

- 1) That all site furnishings be black;
- 2) That the patio furniture be stored off-site during the off season; and
- 3) That the applicant work with Staff to find appropriate locations for the recycle/litter bins and benches.

Mr. Reynolds agreed.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Ms. DeRosa seconded, to approve the Conditional Use for Patios with three conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Mr. Brown said there are no conditions for the Conditional Use for Personal Service.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the **Conditional Use for Personal Service**. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Mr. Brown said the **Preliminary and Final Plat** has one condition and asked if there was agreement to the condition.

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Mr. Reynolds agreed.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to recommend approval of the Preliminary and Final Plat with one condition. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**2. BSD Commercial District – Home2 Hotel 5000 Upper Metro Place
15-017BPR Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan Reviews**

Vice Chair Brown said the following application is a request for review and approval of a basic development plan and a basic site plan for a new four-story hotel with 129 suites and associated site improvements on a 2.57-acre site on the south side of SR161 and on the west side of Frantz Road between West Bridge Street and Upper Metro Place. This is the first formal step for this Bridge Street District application and there is no development agreement contemplated, so the Commission is the final authority on this entire application and we will need to swear-in. He swore in anyone that had intended to address the Commission.

Devayani Puranik said this is a request for construction of a new four-story hotel with 129 suites and associated site improvements on a 2.57-acre site on the west side of Frantz Road between West Bridge Street and Upper Metro Place. She said this is a request a Basic Plan Review (Basic Development Plan Review and Basic Site Plan Review). She said this is the first stage for reviewing this application with two components to this application- basic development plan and basic site plan. She said the basic development plan review is required when there are more than one principle buildings being proposed on a block and basic site plan is to conduct the conceptual analysis for arrangement of the proposed uses, buildings, open spaces, and provide initial feedback on conceptual architecture. She said future

applications for this case will be final plan review which will be development plan and site plan review with detailed review of all the components of the case. She said this site is also part of the Upper Metro plat that was approved in 2001 and the plat will have to be updated to include the lots, right-of-way changes, and development standards.

Ms. Puranik said the development review process does not require a development agreement because there are no new roads or public infrastructure proposed for this site hence the Planning Commission is the required reviewing body in this case.

Ms. Puranik presented the proposed site plan saying that the site is located on the southwest corner of SR161 and Frantz Road. She said the site is zoned BSD Commercial which permits both hotel and office uses. She said the proposed layout with Frantz Road being designated as principle frontage street per the BSD Code and Upper Metro Place is designated as a neighborhood connector street and West Bridge Street stops being the principle frontage street because it is ODOT territory west of Frantz Road. She said there are limitations to what can happen because of the right-of-way limitations and also because of the interchange improvements.

Ms. Puranik said the proposal is for a hotel building and includes subdividing the block into two lots with a future phase being a two-story 14,000-square-foot office building. She said the hotel building is a four-story corridor building that is about 80,500-square-foot with 129 units. She said this plan will require 133 parking spaces or shared parking for the hotel and office. She said the applicant is proposing 122 spaces considering the overlap of hours of operation for hotel and office.

Ms. Puranik stated that 0.043-acre of open space is required for the hotel and office buildings and the applicant is proposing 0.044-acre, which is over 1,900 square-feet of open space to be distributed within two pocket plazas, one of which is toward the northeast corner and the other along Frantz Road. She said the initial concepts for this project showed the main entrance lobby for the hotel and fitness center mirrored with all the public spaces fronting on SR161 but with the limitations as to what can happen on SR161, Planning was concerned that the layout was not meeting the intent of the Code. She said that the ART suggested the building could be flipped so that all the public spaces, lobby areas, and the fitness area front on the principle frontage street that is Frantz Road. She said the extra patio space connecting landscaping is also provided along Frantz Road to enhance the pedestrian experience. She said there is a bikepath running along the eastern property line. She said the open spaces and patio areas are connected to the bikepath. She said there is a pedestrian connection provided near the main entrance to the building.

Ms. Puranik said a tower feature is proposed along the intersection of SR161 and Frantz Road and a second tower is proposed along the staircase near the main entrance lobby.

Ms. Puranik presented the facades on the proposed elevations. She said the applicant has proposed brick, stone, fiber cement panels, and glass. She presented the southeast, southwest, and northeast perspectives.

Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors, 161 Mill Street, Gahanna, said they started with the most ideal way to layout the site which was to maximize the parking and get the building to fit. He said they agree with the engagement to Frantz Road and to get the pedestrian activity onto the road, but knew in doing that, they would lose the efficiency of the layout of the site. He said when they flipped the building they lost seven or eight parking spaces to the original layout. He described the entrance to the hotel with a lobby, public space with breakfast snack light service for food, and an outdoor living room as part of the hotel brand, which includes some seating and a fire pit that is attractive and a way to energize Frantz Road. He said the second floor have rooms with a lounge area in the tower. He said they were trying to balance the Brand identity, image and look, so that it is recognized by the brand and the BSD Code requirements.

Mr. Sebach said they looked at 80 percent brick, stone and glass and felt the brick and stone made the building look heavy. He said they were considering a 21st century product that is available in the Midwest which is fiber cement panels. He said they are willing develop a mock up to get everyone comfortable with the material. He said the brand uses a lot of EIFS and siding for a very specific look. He said they have modified this building to meet with the Code. He showed examples of the fiber cement panel being used in other areas. He said it is a panel system available in up to 4 x 10 sizes with a reveal system and a rain screen providing the ability to remove the water properly.

Mr. Miller asked if the patio setup is primarily for the use of the hotel guests.

Mr. Sebach said there is light food available but is intended for the guests.

Mr. Miller asked how the hotel is being heated and cooled.

Mr. Sebach said the PTAC system will be in the room with louvers below the window and wall vents.

Mr. Brown asked if there were anyone from the public that wanted to speak on this project. [There were none.]

Ms. Puranik said she and the ART recommended approval of the Basic Development Plan with the following six conditions and the applicant has agreed to the 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. Puranik said they need feedback regarding the materials being proposed and the future review will depend upon the feedback.

Ms. Salay asked about the tower on the south side, which looks as though there is a patio with glass.

Ms. Puranik said the tower will be lit at night but there will not be a patio.

Ms. Salay asked about the northern tower.

Ms. Puranik said they had indicated the glass will be slightly dark in color and lit at night.

Ms. Salay said she is not ready for fiber cement material and had not seen a building where it has worked well for the total building and being that this is a community that wants a product that looks really great forever. She said a hotel never looks better than the day it opens and as it changes hands she wants to make sure it looks good for the next use. She is also concerned with the green element on the building and said it looks like signage and should be placed inside the building with the exterior being neutral in color. She is favorable on the brick, stone and glass as materials and is supportive of the tall glass tower.

Ms. Salay said the louvers under the windows would not be a preference and would like to explore other options of high quality.

Russ Hunter, 555 Metro Place, Crawford Hoying Design Director, said at the City Council meeting there was some discussion regarding metal panels and they thought fiber cement might be a great alternative to get the contemporary look. He said this design is the white portion of the building protrudes from the darker pieces and has an 18 inch overhang and is impossible to do with brick and the fiber cement gives them design flexibility and if they use the right installers and materials the product has a 15-year color warranty and a 30-year product warranty. He said the reason it does because it is ordered with color which is painted twice and it is warranty the color. He said the Embassy Suites has really old EIFS which has a bad name and developers are going away from that product. He said the louvers is part of the window frame so it is one color and is a seamless solution.

Ms. Puranik said they recommend approval for two Basic Site Plan Waivers:

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

Ms. Puranik said they are recommending disapproval of the third Basic Site Plan Waiver the applicant requested:

1. Blank Wall Limitations – Corridor Building

Ms. Puranik explained that the blank wall limitations are 15 feet horizontally and the staircase tower exceeds that requirement.

Ms. Puranik said one tower is permitted by Code and if more than one is proposed it can be approved the required reviewing body, which is the Planning Commission. She said if there are two towers it would have to be approved by a separate motion.

Ms. Puranik said they recommend 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. De Rosa asked whose responsibility is the landscaping along SR161 with the plantings as it is a nice example of the area.

Ms. Puranik said it is part of the SR161 right-of-way and it is controlled by ODOT but they will decide through a maintenance agreement as the road work project is completed.

Ms. De Rosa said there are examples of mixed use branding of the hotel such as Cranberry, PA that could be interesting.

Mr. Miller asked about the materials of Tower 2.

Mr. Sebach said the medium grey is actually brick. He said that the tower element that is 17 feet has been moved to meet the requirement of 15 feet for a blank wall and have resolved the issue.

Mr. Miller said he agrees with the use of brick, glass, and stone. He said the statement of this building and the setback is essential for this impact building. He said the lower room's transparency can be handled with landscaping and has no problem with louvers with integration into the window frame. He said the tower has to have an architectural detail.

Mr. Stidhem said he is worried about the setbacks along SR161 and Frantz Road with the public events that take place at that location. He liked the fire pit on the patios.

Mr. Brown said he likes how the building engages the street and parking behind the building. He agrees with the landscaping along SR 161 but knows that is a staff and ODOT issue to resolve. He appreciates the rhythm and scale of the building and likes the two towers. He said the element as a singular monolithic piece itself is unique and dynamic. He said is big objection comes to fiber cement which he does know about.

Mr. Langworthy said the ART discussion had more to do with the limitation on primary materials and ultimately they have concern that it will lead to monotony buildings and the inability to get nice accents beyond the 20 percent limitation. He said with some really good creative architecture it can be overcome but that was their basic concern that they are narrowing down this pallet of materials. He suggested looking at other materials to add to the permitted materials palette that could expand their primary materials to use.

Ms. De Rosa asked what other materials that were discussed.

Mr. Brown said there are a ton of other materials that are available and is not opposed to fiber cement as a product in itself and it is a good material with longevity but it is how it is integrated into the building and what system is it being attached and mentioned a rain screen and how is it attached.

Mr. Sebach said they have spent a lot of time researching the details and they are using a extruded aluminum frame to create a crisp line on all the panel joints and all the corner joints and in this case it will be a wood frame with wood furring strips and the panel is nailed into that with the panel system with a pre-finish and gets a second top coat finish that paints all the reveals to look like one continues system. He said they will be doing a mock up for this and other projects because it is a worthy discussion to look at the product, the corner and joint details.

Mr. Langworthy said their discussion was regarding the installation manner and durability.

Ms. Salay asked about their project in Worthington if it is a good installation.

Mr. Hunter said the Worthington Heights project it is a good installation with a different installation method the way the panels are sealed together with a board and batten installation. The proposed project is just a different style. He said there is a Volunteers Of America is being built on Van Buren Drive south of Downtown and they are doing the installation wall by wall and offered that this project be watched to see how it comes together and look at the reveal and fastener details and evaluate if it is an appropriate material.

Mr. Langworthy said the ART discussed having a third party inspector to verify the installation is done as specified with separate reporting.

Mr. Brown said he is a huge fan of Rain Screen but the ability to shed dirt in a non-streaky manner is limited. He said there are some examples at Easton with dynamic façades because they have integrated other materials. He said he is not opposed to cement board in a siding. He said it is about life cycle of a building and how it transitions to something else in the future and this site is a gateway to the City and if it is wrong it says something about people's initial impression of Dublin.

Mr. Sebach said their struggle is that they want to introduce some color and is struggling because in using brick, stone and glass the building is very heavy and they have done buildings in Dublin for 20. He said they want to do something with a lot of impact that is why they are doing the different color brick and a thin brick in the white.

Ms. Salay asked they show renderings with the new brick and stone and at City Council they talked about using secondary materials but they really want them to use primary materials like brick, stone and glass because that is traditional Dublin with longevity of buildings to be around for 50 to 100 years. She said she is interested in seeing other materials to be used as secondary materials. She said without the renderings to see if they agree it is too heavy, but they need a signature hotel and maybe this isn't the brand that should be on this site.

Ms. Puranik showed some early renderings of the brick, stone and glass.

Ms. De Rosa said she agrees with Ms. Salay that the primary materials are preferred and this site needs to be more of tradition materials.

Mr. Brown said for this location it needs to be dynamic and needs to fold into the district and like the tower elements and the architecture, but as described he is not a huge fan of the system being used for the fiber cement.

Brent Crawford, 555 Metro Place, said regarding the brand, there was a lot of thought with Marriott, Hilton as to which brand would be appropriate on this site. He said the analysis came down to the average daily rate and looking at the market it was decided this product was what would be supported. He said he appreciates the comments with changes and improvements to the building but the brand is all they can get for this site.

Ms. De Rosa said the Marriott chain with the open patio and living spaces is probably the category that is right for this site.

Ms. Salay asked if the four-story building is enough for this gateway site, she had envisioned a taller building for this site.

Mr. Crawford agreed but thought it was a cost issue to go to the next level the financial model does not support.

Mr. Brown asked if there were any other comments. [There were none.]

Mr. Sebach said they would like to move forward with the waiver requests and come back with the revised concepts at the next stage of review to work through the envelope discussion.

Mr. Miller said there are six conditions proposed for the Basic Development Plan and asked if the applicant agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Hunter agreed to the six conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. De Rosa made a motion of approval for the Basic Development Plan with six conditions as stated, Ms. Salay seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Mr. Brown said there are waivers requested.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown made a motion of approval for the two Site Plan Waivers for Building Type – Corridor Building and Ground Story Transparency – Corridor Building, Mr. Miller seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown made a motion to disapprove the Blank Wall Limitations – Corridor Building, Mr. Stidhem seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Disapproved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay made a motion to approval of the Second Tower based on the discussion at ART, Mr. Miller seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Mr. Brown said there are 14 conditions and asked if there were any clarifications to the conditions.

Ms. De Rosa said condition #2 with regard to landscaping is very important and asked that they work with ODOT to maintain the high quality landscaping along that corner.

Ms. Husak said they will add to #5 the comments of the Planning Commission regarding materials.

Mr. Brown asked if the applicant agreed to the conditions and the modifications.

- 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 *taking the concerns and suggestions expressed by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 7, 2015 into account.*
- 6) Provide public access easements for all publicly accessible open spaces and pedestrian connections.
- 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.
- 14) Provide sign designs and locations for Site Plan Review.

Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown made a motion of approval for the Basic Site Plan with 14 conditions as stated, Ms. Salay seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Vice Chair Brown called for a short break 8:14 pm.

The meeting resumed at 8:21 pm.

**3. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park – Phase 1 (C Block)
15-018 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews
Conditional Use**

Vice Chair Brown said the following application is a request for 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. He said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. He said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. He explained that the Commission is the final authority on this entire application and swore in anyone that had intended to address the Commission on this application.

Phil Hartmann said with respect to cases 3 and 4, Bridge Park representatives and the City Administration have been meeting and going through outstanding issues. He said as a result of the outstanding issues, the applicant has agreed to request that the cases before the Commission this evening be tabled. He said they would like to go through the comment phase to get feedback from the Commission, but there will not be a vote on the cases, as they will be requested to be formally tabled.

Rachel Ray said this site located on the east side of Riverside Drive. She summarized the past actions and provided an overview of the process and the project and gave Staff comments and analysis. She said this project includes 18 proposed Waivers, but they are not looking for any actions, but would like to get the Commission's feedback on the proposed actions, including the proposed Waivers.

Ms. Ray said when this project comes back before the Commission, there will be seven motions proposed. She noted that in the Bridge Street District, decisions or applications are time-limited. She said there are Site Plan Waivers, a request for Open Space Fee-in-Lieu determination, which means the applicant is requesting to not have to provide all the required open space onsite, the (final) Development Plan, a Parking Plan, approval of a second tower, discussion of the Site Plan, and then the Conditional Use for the parking structures since they are visible from the right-of-way.

Ms. Ray said the Basic Development Plan and the Basic Site Plan were reviewed and approved by City Council in January 2015 and there were a lot of discussions on the architectural concepts, so the applicant will be talking about how they have responded to those comments in the weeks/months since that time. She said the Preliminary Plat approval was granted by City Council in March 2015, which focused on the street layout.

Ms. Ray said following this stage, the next steps required include an application for a Master Sign Plan for this project before building permitting and occupancy can be finalized. She said Minor Project Reviews will

be required for the open spaces/patio spaces once they have tenants they can announce and begin to personalize their spaces, but those will have to go back through the Administrative Review Team.

Ms. Ray said the Development Plan includes a street network that is consistent with what was shown in the Basic Development Plan and includes four new public streets (Bridge Park Avenue, Tuller Ridge Drive, Longshore Street, and Mooney Street), two lots for development, and designation of the mixed-use shopping corridor, which is a requirement of the Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood District. She said the intent is to designate where the highest critical mass of commercial activity is going to happen.

Ms. Ray said the Site Plan focuses on the two lots for development. She said there are four mixed-use 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, 0.37-acres of open space scattered throughout the site with two larger pocket parks between the buildings. She explained that Staff had worked with the applicant to get five smaller pocket plazas along the streetscape. She said there is an 869-space parking garage, 58 on-street parking spaces, and a requirement for 155 bicycle parking spaces.

Ms. Ray reviewed the different buildings with the main elevation and a three-dimensional view of each of the buildings. She said building C1 is a five-story building with commercial uses on the ground floor and four stories of apartment residential above. She said the building is approximately 84,000 square feet. She said building C2 is located at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive and is an office building primarily with commercial restaurant/retail uses along the ground floor. She said building C3 is up the street along Bridge Park Avenue with commercial uses along the ground floor with second floor office and three stories of residential above. She said the next building is a bit of a hybrid and is one building with two names. She explained building C4 is the east elevation facing Mooney Street and the south elevation facing one of the open space and is entirely residential. She said the C5 portion of the same building is the parking structure portion with elevations on Tuller Ridge Drive on the north and Longshore Street on the west, with the pedestrian bridges connecting to building C1 over Longshore Street and over the open space over to building C3.

Ms. Ray said the open space plan includes a variety of spaces, beginning with the pocket parks that are intensely planted and allow for different types of activities, whereas the smaller spaces along the streetscape are intended more for casual gatherings, seating, resting, or small performance spaces.

Ms. Ray summarized the recommendations made by the ART to the Planning Commission. She noted that the ART acknowledged that a project of this scale and complexity involves numerous details and the need for coordination through the private and public aspects of this project. She said there is still a Development Agreement to be approved by City Council with discussions of the property and land ownership issues to work through, which needs to be finalized before this project moves forward.

Ms. Ray said the other concerns of the ART included the terminus of the pedestrian bridge at the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. She said at the Basic Plan Review, there was a lot of discussion about the building C2 tower feature and the character of the building, and it was modified to be more of a glass tower feature with horizontal mullions as opposed to the metal panels. She said Staff worked with the applicant to get a pocket plaza at the base of the building to enhance the opportunity for activity and gathering space at the intersection. She said the applicant also added balconies on the building to help engage the streetscape and this important intersection. She said they are interested in the Commission's comments on the progress made by the applicant on building C2.

Ms. Ray said the applicant would also like the Commission's feedback regarding the architectural character of the pedestrian bridges and how they respond to the architecture of the buildings to which they are connecting, as well as how they relate to the streetscape as a whole, since they are a public realm aspect since they cross the Longshore Street right-of-way and the public spaces. She said the ART was concerned

that the bridges are open and have encouraged the applicant to consider a design that prohibits throwing, jumping or climbing out of them. She said the applicant has provided a 48-inch railing along the side that will meet Building Code requirements; however, from a design standpoint, the ART was concerned with the direction it had taken and would like the Commission's feedback.

Ms. Ray said the materials are primarily brick, stone and glass with quite a bit of fiber cement panels, and the Commission's feedback on the materials is also requested.

Ms. Ray said there are a series of Administrative Departures that the ART has the authority to approve assuming the overall project is approved. She said all of the Administrative Departures are, by nature, within the parameters of meeting Code so the ART has approved the series of five Administrative Departures shown on the screen and listed in the report.

Ms. Ray said the parking garage along the Longshore Street elevation has a glass tower and a bridge connecting over the open space with a similar glass tower on the north side of the elevation to cap off the building and make it look more symmetrical. She said the latest iteration of the parking garage has gone to a tower that more relates to the rest of the elevation with similar colored panels and is open rather than enclosed. She said as part of the ART's discussion, Staff preferred the approach as shown during the Basic Site Plan Review, with the glass tower element, but the applicant would like the Commission's feedback on the garage design. She concluded by stating that at this point, the applicant would like to provide an overview of their project, and she would return at the conclusion with a summary of the ART's recommendations on all of the required actions.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place North, said they are not asking for any kind of action this evening, but they are here to show the Commission where they are on the project and get feedback and talk through some of the issues that the ART has raised. He said this project is the result of tens of thousands of man hours, and they have been fortunate over the last three years to work some of the most respected and best professionals in the industry. He said this is the most collaborative project in the history of projects, with the input of the public, City Council, and other professionals included on design and materials. He said they are building on the years of effort and comments heard about the Bridge Street District over time and as far back to 2009. He said with City Council approval, the real estate industry groups that have given input, the tenants and potential tenants, the financial institutions, and the legal professionals, this project is much more completed than they have ever seen and they are excited to show the Commission where they are with this groundbreaking project. He asked Darren Meyer to speak first on the public spaces.

Darren Meyer, MKSK Studios, said their role in the Bridge Park project is creating a vibrant and high quality public realm. He said in late 2012, the City initiated the Framework Plan for the Scioto River Corridor, which was a tool for City Council and the community to use to help guide investment in the Bridge Street District. He said the result of that study was a focus on the Scioto River Corridor because Historic Dublin and the river are two of the treasures of the community that are going to endure for a long time and is an appropriate spot to invest. He said the outcome of that project was the recommendation to relocate Riverside Drive, plan for a riverside park, the roundabout at SR 161 and Riverside Drive, and the pedestrian bridge. He said those four public projects merged from that process with a key element of collaboration from Crawford Hoying at the urging of the City of Dublin. He said this was the best and most appropriate way to ensure that the product is an urban neighborhood that is knitted into the fabric of the community and is a seamless development integrated into Historic Dublin and the new east side.

Mr. Meyer said the first phase of the Bridge Park development, "C block," unlocks the pedestrian bridge's ability to merge with the activity proposed along Bridge Park Avenue and the entire east side of the Bridge Street District. He said the grid streets diffuse traffic and help improve walkability, and the strategically placed open spaces are elements of the preliminary plan that have been approved and are accomplishing the goal of improvements that are integrated into the fabric of the community.

Mr. Meyer said the project has two main open space areas, the “Pavilion” and the “Mews.” He said the applicant wanted to create a variety of “sub”-spaces and experiences within the open spaces that support a mixed-use environment. He said urban space has to be multi-purpose and multi-functional to ensure it is authentic. He said the forms and shapes are inspired by the Scioto River and the Indian Run and the natural features. He said they have identified very charismatic boulders that are granite and not limestone, and are tagging them and moving them to secure locations so they can be measured and integrated into the project. He said they have great durable, natural materials with masonry, brick, and metal that will weather well and endure. He said the plant material has some challenges with shade, stormwater requirements, and functional requirements of the plantings. He said they want to create ambiance in these open spaces and create layers that help diffuse the height of the buildings where the hardscape and landscape materials are working together to create great experiences in the open spaces.

Mr. Meyer said the sites need to dovetail very closely with the architecture, and they have worked hand-in-hand with Moody Nolan and with the engineering team to make sure the trash service, egress, etc. is addressed, as well as some of the considerations of the ground floor residential units as opposed to ground floor restaurants/retail where there is a need for transparency and a lot of views and the feeling of the indoors coming out and the outdoors coming in to the buildings. He introduced Curt Moody with Moody Nolan, who would speak to the architectural design approach to the project.

Curt Moody, President and CEO of Moody Nolan, said he is proud to be part of this project and believes that it will be setting the pace for the next level of new urbanism for this part of the country. He said Moody Nolan has taken a lot of time to dive into the project with the vision principles that Crawford Hoying set during the master planning phase. He said the principles have to do with creating a mixed character within the development for a variety and diversity of image, materials, and flavor given that there is a need to make sure that when they are designing and addressing human scale that street level is paramount. He said they are working together with MKSK on the spaces between the buildings, which are as important as the skin of the buildings. He said if the ground level planning is not done at the same level creatively as the building façades, then one will not be an accent and the entire project will suffer.

Mr. Moody said the design principle of their nationwide and worldwide firm is that their work is not aimed at one particular style of architecture. He said Moody Nolan has formed an approach by which many designers, collectively called “Studio 9,” made up of nine different individual designers, hold in-house design charrettes and talk about what is being designed with many different hands, making sure they are doing everything they can for staff to create the character we all want to see with this project.

Mr. Moody presented updated renderings showing the street level experience and using things like awnings and seating areas to activate spaces. He said they work to encourage socialization in these spaces by making sure people cross paths with other people in a positive way. He said the C Block was designed for both day and night activity venues with good lighting levels. He said the buildings are designed to look different, but feel like they are “part of a family.” He referenced the rhythm of window patterns, the patterns of projections and recesses along the façades, and vertical elements and openings that allow direct connections to the street, including the rooftop terraces. He said the parking structures are designed to be playful with art and color on the screening elements.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said he would like to speak to some of the specific issues raised by the ART. He began with the resident/pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street, which is inspired by a pedestrian bridge located at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, PA. He said they serve two functions, which are convenience and uniqueness, to be used by residents. He said the bridges “self-sort” the parking by those who lives on the upper floors of the buildings. He said they will park on the upper floors of the garage and walk directly across and into their units, which leaves the other floors dedicated to public parking for commercial tenants. He said it was their opinion that the designs of the bridges are sophisticated, beautiful, and simple, and that they add to the streetscape character without distracting

from the buildings that they connect. He said that all the bridges over streets will have a simple graceful curve, but the bridges that cross the open spaces will take on a different character, relating more to the buildings that they connect because those bridges are more visible by themselves. He said they want the bridges to be open so people walking through them can hear and be directly connected to what is happening on the street below. He said they did not want the bridges to be sealed containers. He said the bridges are only accessible by keycard and are video-monitored and will be limited to access only by residents. He said they looked forward to the Commission's feedback on these bridges.

Mr. Hunter said with respect to the proposed building materials, the cement panel products are really only planned to be used as a secondary material. He said in many cases, it is only expected to be used on the uppermost floors of the buildings because of Building Code limitations for wood-framed structures. He said this means that brick cannot easily go up more than three stories above the concrete plane. He said it does however give the buildings a defined top, which is a desirable architecture feature, with buildings having clear bases, middle, and tops. He showed examples of their two recent projects using fiber cement materials, include The Lane and the Worthington project. He said the beauty of the material is the 15-year color warranty and the peace of mind they give, knowing they can paint the panels if needed as an easy maintenance item. He showed pictures of the Volunteers of America project in Columbus where the panels are beginning to be installed. He encouraged the Commission members to visit the project to see the progress of the installation process.

Mr. Hunter said they understood that the concern from City Council was the "Wow Factor:" how are these buildings going to represent Bridge Park and Dublin? He said their goals were *legibility*, particularly for the office building, as well as *authenticity* and *timelessness*. He described the changes that kept these goals in mind, which was wanting the designs to be dynamic and beautiful over many years. He explained that for the tower element on building C2 at the corner of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive, they looked at dozens of different options and changes to the tower, including wrapping glass around the corner and enlarging it, but in the end, nothing completely different felt like the right solution. He said they ended up adding more human scaled architecture in terms of the horizontal louvers and shifted it to face the flow of traffic from Riverside Drive. He said they then played with the canopies and finessed the details and he thought they ended up with a beautiful design that will with stand the test of time.

Mr. Hunter said with respect to the design of the garage, they understood the need to soften the edges by adding planters into every bay, which blocks headlights. He said the screens are intended to be playful with glass, panels and the colors and lighting. He provided a demonstration, showing how the panels will be uplit from a lighting element in the bottom portion of the perforated panels.

Mr. Hunter thanked the Commission for their time and stated the applicant looked forward to their feedback on these items in particular.

Mr. Brown stated that he recognized the huge investment of time, talent, and treasure that has gone into this project, which is very much appreciated. He said this project is very exciting, and he said he is sure the Commission wants to be advocates for this development, so he would like to make sure that the comments given this evening are offered in that light. He said generally, his impression of the buildings in how they work together in terms of rhythm and scale overall, is that they are dynamic and nicely interrelate. He said his concern is how the development presents itself initially to people approaching it from farther away, and since it's in a valley, it is stepped up the hill, and the top floors on each building is important as they will be visible from across the river. He said that in recognizing how the Code issues with wood frame construction can limit certain building materials, he asked if they used steel studs, could the brick installation go higher on some of the buildings. He said his overall impression is that there is too much secondary material at the top of the buildings, which creates a repeated pattern of a single material from building to building. He said he does not mind the secondary material on some buildings, in moderation, which works in some areas, but not for the primary frontage buildings because of the location from across the riverfront.

Ms. De Rosa shared her daughter's first impression of seeing the plans on her table at home, which were that this would be a cool place to live. She asked if the buildings are all the same height.

Mr. Hunter said they are not the same height, but in the renderings the buildings are similar enough such that it is hard to see the difference where C1 is a five story building and C2 is a five story building, but because it is commercial building, there is a higher floor-to-floor height and is 25 feet taller overall. He said this factor would result in a varying skyline.

Ms. De Rosa said she likes the human scale of this project, which gives someone the feeling of being part of the space. She said she appreciates details like the awnings and the integration of the pedestrian spaces because of the experience they produce.

Mr. Yoder said the streetscape has been verified that in creating space within the existing areas patio furniture will fit while making sure they are able to maintain enough space up and down Bridge Park Avenue to handle the different bike and pedestrian activity, which he understood was an important consideration for the Commission.

Mr. Stidhem said he is impressed with the applicant team's passion and ownership of this project and is looking forward to seeing buildings going up and for this area to develop.

Mr. Miller agreed with Mr. Stidhem's admiration of the development team's passion, efforts, and ownership of this project. He thanked the team and Staff for getting this project this far, acknowledging it is exciting to see this project being brought to life.

Ms. Salay complimented everyone and said she is impressed, excited and proud to have been part of this project and hoped that this presentation is what they see at City Council because it was well done. She recalled the City Council, Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Staff visit to Greenville, South Carolina in 2008, where new, mixed-use development was happening in their downtown along their riverfront, and now Dublin has similar opportunities coming to life, which was very exciting.

Mr. Brown suggested that the Commission discuss the specific discussion items outlined by Staff and the applicant. He began by asking for comments regarding the C2 tower.

Ms. Salay said she likes it and believes it more than accomplishes its purpose.

Ms. De Rosa agreed and said she liked the orientation of the tower and the lighting, which will be favorable for the change of seasons.

Mr. Stidhem agreed that the glow of the tower would play well from the outside.

Mr. Brown said he likes the use of glass and feels there is a lot of room for even more glass in this project.

Mr. Brown said there is a place where cement panel is appropriate for building C4 because of the location on a less prominent street, streetscape, and being the residential portion of the parking garage. He said regarding the discussion item on the design of the parking garage, he said he likes the garage as proposed by the applicant. He said he felt a good effort had been made in making it dynamic.

Mr. Miller said he loves the glass tower on building C2, but he thought the garage looks boring. However, he admitted that he is color blind, which might be a factor in not seeing the differences along the elevations with the use of the colored panels. He said after the applicant's presentation and the demonstration of how the panels will be illuminated, he thought the use of panels is intriguing in bringing some life to the building during evening hours.

Mr. Hunter said because it is a parking garage, the structure does dictate the rhythm and they have to find other ways to make it interesting. He said the use of the panels, colors, and light will achieve that goal towards making it an interesting building.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the parking needs will be addressed with the overall project, if not necessarily this initial phase.

Ms. Ray said there is a parking plan for this phase of the development. She explained the applicant had submitted a parking study using Urban Land Institute (ULI) data to show the am and pm peak parking needs, both during the week and on the weekends. She stated that while the demand for parking and the parking actually provided is very close, the ART had discussed how the on-street parking would be used, as well as the garage parking. She noted that this first phase was the most intensely developed, and it was likely that future phases would balance the Bridge Park development as a whole, in terms of the number of parking spaces required and provided.

Mr. Hunter said it is important to understand they used a methodology to determine if there is enough parking, and it is always an educated guess, even with the ULI numbers, but it is a method that has been proven to work on a nationwide basis.

Ms. De Rosa asked if there is sound control for the residential units connected to the parking garages.

Mr. Hunter said this is a specific environment that people are looking for and the sounds will become familiar and not noticed.

Mr. Yoder said the parking garages are lined with a hallway and each residential unit is separated by a one-hour fire-rated wall, a hallway, and then a 3-hour-rated firewall, which will help with sound.

Ms. Salay asked why they changed the design of the tower on the north end of the parking garage.

Mr. Hunter said they were trying to eliminate Waivers and a misunderstanding occurred by changing the tower. He thought by changing the tower, they would no longer need a Waiver or a separate Planning and Zoning Commission action for having a second tower, but it is still defined as a tower anyway. He said the tower is the stairwell for the garage.

Ms. Salay wondered if the tower was glass, whether it would be unattractive if it were illuminated at night and the interior was not much to look at – more like a service stairwell.

Mr. Hunter said it is a stairway servicing the parking garage.

Mr. Yoder said it is an egress stairway satisfying a fire exit requirement.

Mr. Brown said there are examples downtown where there are ways to deal with aesthetics and recognize the stairs to make it dynamic. He suggested an example being the Hartman Building at Fourth and Main Streets.

Ms. Ray stated the ART's concern related to the intent for the Code's requirements for the design for parking structures. She said Code requires parking garage entrances to be visible so pedestrians know that is where they need to go, and glass or openings ensure the creation of a safe environment, so people can see in and out of the tower or stairwell.

Mr. Brown referred to building C2 and said the use of cementitious panels seem out of context with the rest of the building. He asked why composite metal panels were not used between the windows instead.

He said everything else is sleek and clean on that building, so he did not understand the use of the cementitious panels, although he acknowledged this was not a deal breaker for him.

Mr. Yoder said the Delta Energy building is an example of a local building with painted cementitious panels which pulls together a combination of brick, cement panel, glass and steel to create a beautiful building.

Mr. Brown said the addition of balconies onto C2 provides great interaction with the street, and he appreciates the building overall, noting that it fits the fabric of an office building and differentiates itself from the residential uses in the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Stidhem wondered if the buildings will be “smart,” with all the latest technologies such as solar power or otherwise.

Mr. Yoder said they are doing something special with lighting in the garages, using a new technology that is solar and wind combined by eliminating inverters between the solar panel and the light fixture. He said they wanted to maintain solar lighting in the garages, and through the use of solar panels on the roof they are able to work them into the design. He said they are excited about the test pilots that have been done, which are going great, and they have every reason to believe that they will be able to use the system and technology in each unit.

Mr. Miller asked if they were going for LEED certification for this project.

Mr. Yoder said they completed an initial checklist for LEED certification, but determined the registration fees and other costs did not make sense to pursue actual certification, but they did accumulate several points for initiatives such as bike racks, charging stations, white roofs, proximity to goods and services within walking distance, energy efficiency, access to transit, and covered parking, all of which they have in place for a sensible sustainable project.

Mr. Brown referred to the C3 building and its ins and outs, the vertical separation of the different use components, and said overall, it is dynamic and fits the fabric of the neighborhood. He said it will play well off the street, and he said he liked the balconies. He said, however, the elevator tower that extends over a story higher than the top floor over the roof level seems looks a growth on the building. He asked the applicant to explain their approach to the design of this element.

Mr. Hunter said it is the elevator overrun and in order to take advantage of the views, they had to take the elevator up to that height.

Mr. Brown asked if they could stair step or blend the element into the rest of the building at the front, or do something to blend the overrun or make it look less like a growth out of the top of the building.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, said they could add a top piece to the vertical element to enhance and tie it into the rest of the building. He said they could also detail cementitious panel elements.

Mr. Brown agreed it was a great idea. He said something needed to be done with this part of the building.

Mr. Brown said building C1 is a different building with a “pocket,” the terrace. He said he appreciated the balconies and the terrace, but does not like the cement panel because it is overwhelming in terms of how much is used on the front and top of the building. He said along the riverfront, he would not be able to support this amount of that material on the building. He said it does not relate well to the adjacent buildings or enhance views from the park.

Ms. Salay agreed.

Mr. Hunter clarified it was not the massing that the Commission was concerned with on building C1, but the amount of fiber cement panels used on this building.

Mr. Brown said it was the materials and that the massing can be addressed with the materials especially with the articulation on the front, which does not show on the elevations where the balconies soften the building. He said there so much “secondary” material that it adds up to a primary material. He said the view from the river should not have a building with so much cement panel as a major secondary material.

Ms. De Rosa said she agrees, but overall, she likes the texture of the building.

Mr. Brown referred to the proposed resident/pedestrian bridges. He said he has a lot of experience with these types of bridges, and he understood that they are intended to tie parking to residential units, which is a marketable part of development in this particular environment. He agreed that the bridges should be treated as a light element and should not be imposing on the street, but he thought the exposure to weather elements would be an issue at the higher levels. He said enclosing the spaces with glass would be his preference.

Mr. Stidhem said he was worried about the elements of a wind tunnel effect, but loved the overall curve of the bridges.

Ms. De Rosa preferred the openness, which she thought would create energy and would make them feel unique and different.

Mr. Miller agreed the pedestrian bridges add character to the project.

Ms. Ray summarized the ART’s concern that the applicant had not taken the designs of the bridges far enough, as well as the functional side of the design. She noted that in addition to Engineering’s concern with safety, they had practical concerns with wind, or snow collection, and the ART was not convinced this was the solution. She said the ART thought there might be options to leave the bridges open but enclose them a bit with unique screens.

Ms. Salay said she prefers the bridges to be open and had experienced an example of enclosed walkways while visiting Seattle. She said that there are options for design elements such as possibly adding planters to the bridges and providing overhead heaters to address weather issues that can be considered, but prefers the bridges to remain open-air.

Brent Crawford said he thinks about long-term maintenance issues with having glass enclosures. He said specifically, he thought enclosed glass bridges would be dirty constantly. He said he would rather there be an occasional panel or a slight overhang to block blowing snow while maintaining the views from the bridge.

Ms. Salay said the park area below is really special and having the bridges closed would take something away from that experience.

Mr. Langworthy said the larger part of the “closed or unclosed” discussion was the design of the bridge as an architectural feature. He said one approach was having uniquely designed bridges throughout the development.

Mr. Hunter said they preferred to have consistency throughout the development. He said there will be three arched bridges along Longshore Street for B- and C-Blocks, and two bridges over open spaces.

Mr. Brown asked if there were any other specific items on which the Commission needed to provide feedback. [There were none.] He asked if the Commission had other general comments to offer.

Ms. De Rosa said to make sure there is a lot of art in the public spaces.

Mr. Brown said having some kind of iconic elements, streetscapes, and building elements that have the potential to become meeting points or points of interest to draw people around the corner or down the street are really important to giving this development a sense of place and make it really special.

Ms. Ray went through the Site Plan Waivers with conditions, the Open Space Fee-in-lieu, the Development Plan, the Parking Plan, the architectural determination for the second tower on building C5, the Site Plan, and the Conditional Use for the parking structure being requested and the recommendations for when this does come back for a vote. She confirmed the Commission did not have any specific concerns with any of the Waivers or proposed actions or conditions.

Mr. Hunter asked that this application be tabled.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown made a motion to table this application at the request of the applicant. Ms. Salay seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0)

**4. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park East – Section 1
15-019FP Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Final Plat**

Vice Chair Brown said the following application is a request to subdivide an approximately 6.75-acre site into two blocks for development and associated public rights-of-way for a mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. He said the Commission will make a recommendation to City Council on this request.

Rachel Ray presented the proposed request for a Final Plat for Section 1 of the Bridge Park development. She began by summarizing the Preliminary Plat, which was approved by City Council in March 2015, and said this will be platted by section as each of the phases move forward. She said there are four streets with two lots with public access easements for the larger public open spaces.

Ms. Ray said the plat cannot be recorded until the Dale Drive right-of-way has been vacated by City Council action, which is a timing issue. She said all the criteria have been met or met with conditions relating to property ownership and the development agreement timing, as well as some of the technical notes on the plat. She said they are recommending approval with seven conditions to City Council.

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked that this application be tabled.

Motion and Vote

Ms. De Rosa made a motion to table the Final Plat application at the request of the applicant. Mr. Stidhem seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0)

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Chris Brown moved, Cathy DeRosa seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. DeRosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Vice Chair Chris Brown moved, Cathy DeRosa seconded, to approve the April 9, 2015 meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. DeRosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

Communications

Ms. Husak said there are two other sets of minutes that were put into Dropbox, so there will be several to review at the next meeting.

Ms. Husak asked that the binders for the applications that were tabled be turned in to update and reuse for the next meeting.

Ms. Husak asked about materials and sets of plans of which commissioners needed the large sets. [All 5 Commissioners indicated they are okay with small sets of plans for review.]

Mr. Miller suggested that the Commission go see the panel installation at the Volunteers of America site.

Mr. Brown agreed to visit the site, but not as a group.

Ms. Salay suggested a field trip for the new members to have a common language and there being a lot to look at around Columbus.

Ms. Husak said they are looking at work session types if things to be added to the June meetings to get a CIP presentation from the City Engineer or look at alternative dates for a separate work session.

Ms. Husak introduced Michael Hendershot, new Civil Engineer, who has been doing fantastic work with the review of projects.

Joanne Shelly said she has been working on an advisory committee with COTA's Next Generation where they are looking at the future of transportation for Columbus, Ohio and the metro region and not just buses, but looking at the purpose of transportation being economic development or people to get to jobs. She said they have created a set of values through the first set of meetings. She said they are trying to determine the type of transportation to support the purpose. She said they have asked for Dublin to give input on June 2, 2015 during the day 9 – 10:30 am for staff or members of the Commission or Council and there is a second session in the evening. She said the more people that can attend and give feedback on what they might need for the future.

Mr. Brown said it is important to have a strong presence to let COTA know that they want to stay connected in some way to the rest of central Ohio.

Ms. Shelly said that COTA is interested and recognized that Dublin is one of their communities that they most need to serve in and out of the City as well as locally and is interested in finding a way to make that happen that works for the City. She said it is a very positive relationship.

Ms. Salay said they have talked about committing to a transportation plan and what COTA can be to Dublin.

Mr. Crawford said they appreciate the excitement and thoughtful comments provided during the review and the manner and respectfulness in which the Commission gives the comments to them is hugely important and feels right to them to go back and do better based the comments in the manner that they delivered them and thanked the Commission for respecting the work over the last few years is appreciated.

Vice Chair Brown adjourned the meeting at 10:42 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on June 11, 2015.