

PLANNING AND ZONING
COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 11, 2015

AGENDA

1. **The Glens at Ballantrae** **5638 Cosgray Road**
15-001AFDP **Minor Text Modification (Approved 7 – 0)**
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)
2. **BSD Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Park and Ride** **Conditional Use**
15-049 CU **6801 & 6851 Village Parkway**
Conditional Use (Approved 7 – 0)
3. **BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Park and Ride** **Conditional Use**
15-050 CU **Dale Drive**
Waivers (Approved 7 – 0)
Conditional Use (Approved 7 – 0)
4. **BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park – Phase 1 (C Block)**
15-018DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive**
Site Plan Waivers (Approved 7 – 0)
Open Space Fee-in-lieu (Approved 7 – 0)
Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)
Parking Plan (Approved 7 – 0)
Second Tower (Approved 7 – 0)
Site Plan (Approved 7 – 0)
Conditional Use (Approved 7 – 0)
5. **BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park East – Section 1** **Final Plat**
15-019FP **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive**
Final Plat (Approved 7 – 0)
6. **BSD Commercial District – Home2 Hotel Architecture** **5000 Upper Metro Place**
15-045INF **Informal Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: City Council Representative Amy Salay and Commissioners Robert Miller, Steve Stidhem, and Cathy De Rosa, and Deborah Mitchell. City representatives present were: Phil Hartmann, Gary Gunderman, Alan Perkins, Claudia Husak, Jeff Tyler, Jennifer Rauch, Tammy Noble-Flading, Joanne Shelly, Rachel Ray, Devayani Puranik, Aaron Stanford, Katie Dodaro, Lia Yakumithis, Terry Foegler, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion. Ms. Salay seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown made a motion, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the May 7, 2015 meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approve 7 – 0)

Chair Newell said there were three cases eligible for the consent agenda this evening (Case 1, 2, and 3). She said they will take the cases in the published order. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**1. The Glens at Ballantrae
15-001AFDP**

**5638 Cosgray Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

Ms. Newell said the following is a request for review and approval of a modification to a previously approved final development plan for 63 detached, empty-nester condominium units and all associated site improvements,. She said the 17.5-acre site is located on the east side of Cosgray Road, north of Marmion Drive within Subarea R of the Ballantrae Planned Unit Development. She said the Commission is the final authority on the Amended Final Development Plan and the Minor Text Modification to the Residential Appearance Standards and swore in anyone who intended to address the Commission.

Tammy Noble-Flading said this is a consent case and asked if the Commission needed a full presentation.

Ms. Salay said there only a couple of questions and a presentation is not necessary.

Ms. Salay said that the materials indicated faux stone and was curious what it looked like.

Randall Woodings, Kontogiannis & Associates, said faux is an artificial stone and is a masonry material.

Ms. Salay asked if the shutters are wide enough to appear as though they are functional.

Mr. Woodings said they are not and agreed to find a manufacturer to supply a wider shutter.

Ms. Noble-Flading said the shutter width would be required by the Residential Appearance Code and they would need to meet the requirements.

Mr. Woodings agreed.

Ms. Salay said since the applicant agrees to the conditions that they are removing Unit #63.

Mr. Woodings agreed.

Ms. De Rosa said that Lot #63 was the lot that was agreed to be eliminated and suggested Lot #57 was interesting position on the layout and feels isolated within the development near the entrance.

Ms. Noble-Flading said they worked on the layout of Lot #57.

Mr. Woodings said they have reduced the density on the project and the original density was at 80 and they have reduced it to 62 and would like to have the entry of the project have a house on each side of the entrance.

Ms. Salay asked for the setbacks on Lot #57.

Mr. Woodings said there is a 35-foot setback from the property line and then the sidewalk and the tree lawn.

Ms. Salay asked about the side setback.

Mr. Woodings indicated the side back starts at 25-feet and slopes down to 20-feet along the side mounted garage and sidewalk. He said the established setback within the community is 10-feet.

Ms. De Rosa said that knowing this development had been reviewed by previous Commission members and wanted to verify the community preferred the proposed layout.

Mr. Woodings said they have met existing owners next to this development upon approximately 7 occasions and they have accommodated their requests for architecture and housing types of empty nester housing.

Ms. Newell asked if there were anyone from the public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve this Minor Text Modification to the Residential Appearance Standards allowing front loaded garage door openings to comprise not more than 40% of the linear distance of the front elevation of the home. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Newell said the Amended Final Development Plan has two conditions and asked if there is agreement to all the conditions:

- 1) That grading activities be restricted to the internal portions of the site and eliminated from public right-of-way, subject to approval by Engineering' and;
- 2) That Unit #63 be omitted based to create a better view shed into the entrance of the community.

Randall Woodings agreed.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with two conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

**2. BSD Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Park and Ride Conditional Use
15-049 CU 6801 & 6851 Village Parkway**

Ms. Newell said the following application is a request for review and approval of a temporary public park and ride for a parcel on the west side of Village Parkway, north of the intersection with Cooperstone Drive. She said the Commission is the final authority on this Conditional Use. She swore in anyone intending on addressing the Commission. She said this case was on the consent agenda and asked if anyone would like to speak on this case.

Mr. Miller asked what would happen if the use runs past the 12-month limitation. Phil Hartmann said the use would operate on a month-to-month basis. He said the timelines to complete the permanent site are upon the City of Dublin to complete.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Conditional Use application. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

**3. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Park and Ride Conditional Use
15-050 CU Dale Drive**

Ms. Newell said the following application is a request for a public park and ride for a vacant parcel on the east side of Dale Drive, north of the intersection with West Dublin Granville Road. She said the Commission is the final authority on this application. She swore in those who intended on addressing the Commission. She said this case was on the consent agenda and asked if anyone would like to speak on this case. [There were none.]

Ms. De Rosa asked if there were considerations for pedestrian and bike access to the facility. Ms. Rauch said there are proposed bike racks on the site and the site will connect with the public sidewalk system along the Dale/Tuller connector.

Ms. De Rosa encourage COTA to use technology at this location to communicate arrival times etc.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there would be charging stations for cars at this location. Ms. Rauch said charging stations are not part of the proposal.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the two Waivers to permit the proposed shelter to encroach into the 5-foot setback, and to permit the proposed sign to encroach into the 8-foot required setback. The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Conditional Use application. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

4. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park – Phase 1 (C Block) 15-18 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU Riverside Drive and Dale Drive Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews Conditional Use

Ms. Newell 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. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She 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.

Rachel Ray said this site is located on the east side of Riverside Drive. She summarized the past actions and provided an overview of the process and the project. She said this project includes 18 proposed Waivers.

Ms. Ray said since this was last brought to the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 7th there have not been any changes to the site plans, since the applicant is working very closely with staff to get ready for building permits since they are on an expedited timeframe. She said last month, the applicant received generally positive feedback from the Commission on the overall project and most of the architecture. She said there were a few modifications that the Commission had requested to buildings C1, C3, and the parking structure. She noted that a few minor modifications were made to the Waivers that were technical in nature, but the majority of the application remains the same as the May review.

Ms. Ray said there will be seven motions requested of the Commission, and all of them require a determination this evening, since application reviews in the Bridge Street District 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 on site; the (final) Development Plan Review; a Parking Plan; approval of a second tower as an architectural element; the (final) Site Plan Review; 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 the Preliminary Plat approval was granted by City Council in March 2015.

She said there are a few steps left over, including a required Master Sign Plan, which must be approved before any of the buildings are granted occupancy; and if there are any minor improvements to any of the buildings, they are eligible to go through Administrative Review Team review as Minor Projects.

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.

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, and 0.37-acres of open space scattered throughout the site with two larger pocket parks between the buildings. She said as part of this application, there is an Open Space Fee-in-lieu determination. She said there is an 869-space parking garage, 58 on-street parking spaces, and a requirement for 155 bicycle parking spaces.

Ms. Ray said building C1 is farthest north on Riverside Drive. She said since the May 7, 2015 meeting, the applicant has included some additional brick veneer on the building and switched out some of the fiber cement siding to metal panel. She said building C2 is located at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive and has had no changes since last meeting. She said building C3 is up the street along Bridge Park Avenue and the only change to this building was to the penthouse structure. She explained building C4 is the residential portion wrapping two of the sides of the parking structure and no changes were made to this portion of the building. She said the C5 portion of the same building is the parking structure portion with elevations facing Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive. She said the Commission had a lot of discussion about the design of the tower element at the northwest corner of the building.

Ms. Ray stated that concluded her overview of the project, and she invited the applicant forward to provide more information about the project updates.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place North, said there are three items that were specific comments from the last meeting that the applicant has addressed. He recalled the Commission was concerned with the amount of fiber cement siding used on building C1, so in order to create a varied landscape of buildings, their objective has been to use as many different materials as possible. He said since the May meeting, they have pulled the brick up and broken the top plane with additional brick detailing. He pointed out that they are also using metal panels in lieu of the fiber cement panels along Riverside Drive. He said they also pulled the brick pieces to the cornice of the ends of the buildings on the north and south sides of the buildings, allowing them to make sure that, as they transition from the metal panel to the smaller amounts of secondary fiber cement material, that it is never so close that they get confused and instead are placed to complement each other.

Mr. Hunter said on building C3, with respect to the rooftop penthouse, they decided to incorporate green screens to offer visual interest from the street, which also adds to the experience for the residents that will use the space. He said as people cross the pedestrian bridge they will see the garden on the rooftop.

Mr. Hunter said the last architectural item the applicant addressed is the tower element at the northwest corner of building C5, the parking garage. He said there are ways to make sure people understand there is a stair that is a secondary means of entry to the garage. He said they added an entry on the Tuller Ridge side of the tower, accented with a canopy, and they also replaced the stacked brick materials alternating on the floors like the rest of the garage façade with the same perforated metal panels that are used throughout the building from the ground floor to the top floor to better differentiate it from the rest of the parking garage façade.

Ms. Newell asked if there was anyone from the public that wished to speak regarding this case. [There were none.]

Ms. Salay asked about the cementitious siding treatment of the fiber board reveal system and why it was chosen.

Mr. Brown said the reveal is a rain screen open joint system. He said he prefers the open joint, but there are cases where the board and batten is fine, it just tends to get dirtier.

Ms. Salay agreed that it just does not age well.

Mr. Hunter said they looked at both systems and intended to use both types, but what was shown was an aesthetic choice by the architect.

Mr. Brown said he drove by the developer's project on Lane Avenue, and it seems to be a couple of years old and still looks good; however, he said it tends to depend upon the sealant used and whether it collects dirt and dust.

Ms. Newell said from a design standpoint, it does add a mix when they have both fiber cement and metal panel materials, and in her opinion, the durability in the long run will hold up better. She said she had seen an example of white fiber cement siding that is not holding up well since it has a lot of staining. She said she does not have an objection to the board and batten material being used on the building as long as it is used in combination with other systems to add to the variety and character of the overall neighborhood.

Mr. Hunter said the system they use is the cementitious system because they are detailed and offer a great warranty as long as it is installed correctly.

Mr. Brown said he likes the diversity of the different joinery because it adds variety.

Ms. Newell complimented the applicant on the changes that they have made on the buildings, especially those on building C1, which made for a much better looking building. She said she was pleased and likes the addition of the metal panel, which compliments the building and adds to the variety.

Ms. Salay asked if they knew the plant type that will be used on the penthouse green screen.

Mr. Hunter said the plant selection was not finalized yet.

Ms. Newell asked about the long-term maintenance of the green screen.

Mr. Hunter said they knew it was a lot of maintenance, and they will do their due diligence on selecting an appropriate planting. He committed to make sure it looks good long term.

Mr. Brown encouraged the applicant to keep bringing unique ideas forward to the Commission for the tops of the buildings on the remaining blocks to set apart this part of the Bridge Street District and allow it to be characterized by unique and interesting buildings.

Ms. Newell referred to the solution for the penthouse on building C3 and stated she thought the green screen was a creative idea to make a box an architectural element instead of eye sore.

Ms. Ray confirmed that the Commission agreed the green screen was a preferred solution for building C3. She said she would add it to the list of conditions, since the green screen was a new proposal after the report had been written.

Ms. Newell asked what was being done for the retail areas to get kitchen exhaust out of the restaurant environments through the residential units.

Mr. Hunter said it all goes through the roof.

Ms. Newell suggested that they consider putting scrubbers on the exhaust kitchen hoods.

Mr. Brown said there is also the occasion for grease coming off the exhaust and is not compatible with roof materials.

Ms. Ray confirmed the Commission members were ready to begin their review of the recommended actions on this application. She reiterated that there are going to be seven actions starting with the Site Plan Waivers. She said there are a total of 18, and 15 are related to building type Code requirements and the remaining three are related to site standards. She said the Administrative Review Team in their review recommended approval of all 18 Waivers.

Ms. Ray confirmed the Commissioners did not have any questions or concerns with the first waiver regarding parapet height.

Ms. Ray said Waiver #2 relates to the visible vents/AC units/other utility elements to be located on the street facing façades for buildings C1, C3, and C4/C5. She said these are four-sided buildings with streets on three sides resulting in no good places to “hide” these elements. She said the ART has recommended approval with the condition that they coordinate the color of the vents where they are visible to blend in as much as possible on the elevations.

Ms. Newell said she understands the constraints the applicant is working under with the vents coming out the walls. She asked how often the vents would be cleaned.

Mr. Hunter said this is not his area of expertise but as the owner and developer, he said if the vents do not look good, they would fix them.

Ms. Newell said she is concerned with regular maintenance with regard to the vents being on the front of the building. She pointed out that they will not be accessible from the interior of the units, and maintenance from the exterior will be challenging. She said however, due to their location and visibility, regular maintenance should be performed on these vents.

Ms. Ray reviewed Waivers 3 – 15, which were the rest of the Waivers to the Building Type Code requirements, and confirmed the Commission members had no additional questions or concerns.

Ms. Ray reported that the last three Waivers are Waivers to the Site Development Standards section of the BSD Code. She said the first one (Waiver #16) relates to the sizes of two of the open spaces. She said all the other open spaces meet both minimum and maximum sizes for open space, while these two located at the northeast corner of building C1 and in front of building C3 on Bridge Park Avenue are just a bit smaller than the minimum. She said these are designed to be informal seating areas, and Staff has been working with the applicant to program them and make the most of these small spaces. She said approval is recommended for this Waiver for the size of the two open spaces.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there were plans for artwork in the open spaces.

Ms. Ray said the applicant has made a great effort to establish a unique character to each of the spaces so they feel like they are part of the whole but each seating areas will still have its own identity with planting, art features, and plantings to add to the look and feel of the development as a whole.

Ms. Ray reviewed Waivers 17 and 18 and confirmed the Commissioners had no additional questions or concerns on these or any of the other Waivers.

Ms. Newell asked if anyone had any questions. [There were none.]

Ms. Ray referred to the next request as part of this application, which is the Open Space Fee-in-lieu determination. She said there is a requirement of 0.77-acre of open space for this project, and 0.39-acres is provided on-site. She said factored into the decision is the future riverfront park on the other side of

the street that is intended to meet the needs for open space for this project. She said the ART has recommended approval of the Open Space Fee-in-Lieu determination.

Ms. Ray said the third request is approval of the Development Plan. She said the Development Plan is the street network and block framework, and the ART has recommended approval to the Commission with three conditions.

Ms. Ray said the fourth request is the Parking Plan. She said this relates more to the Site Plan and the ART has recommended approval to the Commission for a parking plan that states that, while 964 spaces are required by Code, the applicant is providing 921 spaces on site and expects the entire Bridge Park development area to balance out as a whole in terms of overall parking need. She said the applicant has provided some Urban Land Institute (ULI) documentation based on the proposed mix of uses and development square footage, as well as projected am/pm peak parking demand, which all indicates that the 921 parking spaces will be sufficient.

Ms. De Rosa asked if it were appropriate to make a condition that the parking will be made up in future phases.

Mr. Brown said that would assume that Crawford Hoying would be the developer for future phases, which may not be the case.

Ms. Ray pointed out that an application for the next phase, B Block immediately to the south, was just filed and the parking is expected to be a little over the minimum required parking, so they are already starting to see how the overall site will balance, which is consistent with how parking is expected to work within an urban condition.

Ms. DeRosa stated that was helpful to understand. She said she just did not want a condition where people trying to visit the project are unable to find a parking space, which could turn them off from the project permanently, or otherwise leave them with a bad experience.

Ms. Ray said the fifth request relates to the proposal to include a second tower on the parking garage as an architectural feature, where only one tower is permitted per building by Code, unless otherwise approved the required reviewing body. She said the ART has recommended that that the second tower is appropriate on the parking structure.

Ms. Ray said the sixth request is for the Site Plan Review. She said the ART has recommended approval with 12 conditions, and the Planning and Zoning Commission members have added one additional condition to add a green screen to the penthouse on Building C3 on the south and west elevations, making it 13 conditions.

Ms. Ray said the seventh request is for the Conditional Use allowing a parking structure with frontage on public rights-of-way, for which the ART has recommended approval with three conditions.

Ms. Newell asked if there were any questions related to the 18 waivers:

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

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

[There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the 18 Site Plan Waivers with conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Open Space Fee-in-lieu of open space dedication for 0.39-acres of the required 0.77-acres of open space for this phase of the Bridge Park mixed-use development. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Newell stated the Development Plan has three conditions and confirmed the applicant agrees to all the conditions:

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

Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Development Plan with three conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Parking Plan allowing for a combined total of 921 parking spaces (garage and on-street) for Lots 4 and 5 where 964 spaces are required by Code. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Second Tower element on building C5 in accordance with the provisions of §153.062(D)(4)(a). The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Newell said the Site Plan has 13 conditions and asked if the applicant was in agreement with all 13 conditions:

- 1) That a Development Agreement be approved by City Council and approval is obtained from all impacted property owners prior to issuance of building permits for any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5);

- 2) That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy;
- 3) Building Type Conditions
 - a. That the applicant give additional consideration to the design of the resident/pedestrian bridges to address the ART's safety concerns and to incorporate greater architectural interest, and that they be modified subject to ART approval prior to building permitting;
 - b. That an aerial easement over the Longshore Street right-of-way for the resident/pedestrian bridge is approved by City Council prior to building permitting;
 - c. That the balconies at the southwest corner of building C2 are modified to provide the appropriate material transitions on the interior of the north walls of the balconies;
 - d. That the balconies are modified to provide a minimum depth of 5 ft. as measured from the façade to the inside of the railing;
 - e. That the windows installed within fiber cement panels are detailed with projecting sills to provide articulation along these portions of the building façades;
 - f. 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;
 - g. That the applicant modify the north and west elevations of the uppermost story of residential units facing the top open deck of the parking structure (building C4) to be clad with a permitted primary or secondary building material, subject to ART approval; and
 - h. That the applicant provide additional details for the canopies at the building entrances, including material, illumination, and mounting details, prior to building permitting and to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Master Sign Plan;
- 4) Open Space Conditions
 - a. That the applicant continue to work with the City (Planning, Parks, and Engineering) on the design details of the Pocket Plazas based on the discussion at the April 30, 2015 ART meeting; and
 - b. That the building permit plans and Final Plat include notes that state that the Pocket Parks and Pocket Plazas will be owned and maintained by the property owner, with public access easements.
 - c. That public access easements for the Pocket Plazas are dedicated to the City prior to the issuance of building permits.
- 5) Parking & Loading Conditions
 - a. That the Planning and Zoning Commission approve a parking plan for this phase of the development, allowing for a combined total of 921 parking spaces (garage and on-street) for Lots 4 and 5 where 964 spaces are required by Code;
 - b. That, as part of the parking plan, the applicant provides information about how the parking spaces within the garage are to be controlled and/or designated for resident use, valet use, etc. at building permitting;
 - c. That the applicant provide the cut sheets for the bicycle parking facilities (on-street and in the garages) at building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and
 - d. That the applicant provide stairs to a doorway at the tower in the northwest corner of the building and emphasize the main pedestrian entrance on Longshore Street through additional architectural detailing, at building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and
 - e. That loading spaces meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(B)(7) are identified on the plans at building permitting.
- 6) That the plans demonstrate compliance with the City of Dublin Stormwater Management Design Manual at building permitting, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
- 7) That the applicant addresses the Washington Township Fire comments in the attached report at building permitting;
- 8) That the applicant addresses Engineering comments in the attached report, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
- 9) Screening Conditions
 - a. That the parapets that exceed the maximum height of 6 feet are coordinated with the location of rooftop mechanical equipment to limit the need for additional rooftop mechanical screens; and

- b. That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner and meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(E)(3), subject to ART approval.
- 10) That the applicant provide fixture power and efficiency information at building permitting to verify that the exterior lighting requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(F) are met, subject to Planning approval;
- 11) That a Master Sign Plan be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5);
- 12) That the applicant continue to coordinate with the City on the public improvement plans and construction details, and that the City's comments are incorporated into the plans prior to issuance of permits; and
- 13) That building C3 include a green screen on the south and west elevations of the penthouse.

Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Site Plan with 13 conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Newell said the Conditional Use application has three conditions and asked if the applicant was in agreement with the three conditions:

- 1) That the parking structure design and interior circulation is modified to limit the entrance/exit on Tuller Ridge Drive to not more than 24 feet wide;
- 2) That the interior circulation plans are revised at building permitting to allow for adequate stacking space at each entry to the garage (building C4/C5); and
- 3) That the applicant verify whether cameras will monitor pedestrian activity in the parking garage from a remote location, or if other security measures will be taken, at building permitting.

Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. De Rosa moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Conditional Use application with three conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

5. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park East – Section 1 15-19 FP Riverside Drive and Dale Drive Final Plat

Ms. Newell 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. She 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 there are public access easements in the center where the mid-block pedestrian ways are for the pocket plazas, as well a condition related to language for stormwater easements to be provided prior to submitting to City Council for final review. She said this includes the existing Dale Drive right-of-way which is not ready to be vacated, which is a timing issue in the next couple of months and reflects current conditions and can be amended in the future, as well as an AEP easement that will need to be

released by AEP in the near future. 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 other conditions relate to when construction can begin, which is not until Dale Drive is vacated and the applicant submits a construction phasing plan coordinated with the improvements along Riverside Drive and the SR 161/Riverside roundabout. She said Planning recommends approval with seven conditions to City Council.

Ms. Newell asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to speak on this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Newell asked if any commissioners had any comments. [There were none.]

Ms. Newell asked if the applicant was in agreement with the seven conditions in the Planning Report:

- 1) That the applicant modifies the plat notes regarding right-of-way encroachments, public access easements, and stormwater easements, subject to approval by the Law Director and the City Engineer;
- 2) That this final plat not be recorded until a Development Agreement between the applicant/developer and the City of Dublin is approved by City Council;
- 3) That this final plat not be recorded until approved by all impacted owners encompassed within the final plat boundaries;
- 4) That construction on the public improvements does not commence until an Infrastructure Agreement is approved by City Council;
- 5) That construction on the public improvements does not commence until the existing east/west segment of Dale Drive is vacated through City Council action;
- 6) That construction on the public improvements does not commence until the applicant submits a construction phasing and sequencing plan to the satisfaction of the City Engineer; and
- 7) That the applicant ensures any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments are made prior to final review by City Council.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval of the Final Plat application. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

6. BSD Commercial District – Home2 Hotel Architecture 15-045INF

5000 Upper Metro Place Informal Review

Ms. Newell said the following application is a request for informal review and non-binding feedback on the architectural concepts for the proposed 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.

Devayani Puranik said this site is about 2.5-acres located on the southwest intersection of SR161 and Frantz Road. She said the first step for the Bridge Street District Review was the Basic Plan Review which was reviewed and approved on May 7th with conditions. She noted that one of the conditions focused on reconsidering architecture and materials for the proposed building. The applicant is requesting the informal review of the updated elevations and new proposed materials. She said this request is separate from the Bridge Street District Review process and depending on the feedback this application will move forward with the Final Plans Review.

Ms. Puranik presented the design updates, which include the introduction of Cornice with reduced width and noted the tower which is currently not visible will need to be reviewed closely at the final review. She

went through the major changes, which include change of materials replacing the fiber cement panels with thin brick in two colors. She said the base of the building will be in stone and all other elements including glass are not changed since the previous proposal in May. She said the cultured stone is introduced for the tower elevation facing Upper Metro Place. She pointed at the west elevation change, which is a physical change with wider windows.

Ms. Puranik said the applicant has enhanced renderings to share with the Commission.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said they have brought samples of the new materials. He went through the proposed materials; a stone base and thin brick for the upper stories. He said the proposed bands similar to the overhangs add to the layers of the building. He showed the pictures for the installation details including eight-inch and four-inch side profile offering appropriate width and design flexibility. He noted stone base is a manufactured veneer product giving the look and richness of the stone. He said they are struggling with the SR 161 elevation and asked for feedback. He asked for feedback regarding the green colored panels as well. He said they feel it is an appropriate use in a contemporary building to get some architectural interest. He said the use of the thin brick allows the ability to make this an iconic building.

Mr. Brown said the splash of green was discussed at length at the last meeting. He said it is similar to the branding colors used in other buildings and it is a creative way to incorporate a sign without lighting up a big sign. He appreciated that the elevations are an improvement with varying colors and layers. He did not support the porte cochere design stating it is not architecturally complementing the main entrance to the building.

Ms. Newell asked about the details for the louvers on the HVCA units.

Mr. Hunter said the louvers are integral to the window systems with same colors and will look as a single unit.

Ms. Newell suggested they investigate the architectural louver to screen the HVCA units for each room similar to the one at the Manor Care skilled nursing facility on West Dublin-Granville Road. She said the vertical elements that are meant to break up the massing of the building are competing with each other. She suggested looking at the components and the rhythm of the design elements and introducing random pattern will help the design of the building.

Ms. Mitchell asked if the green trim is a brand vocabulary for Home2.

Mr. Hunter said it is a preferred brand color but they also offer an orange. He mentioned that they can explore a different color.

Ms. De Rosa said the proposed elevations do not translate as a statement building for Dublin. She said the brick is a good option for materials. She mentioned that she is hopeful for the landscaping along SR 161 with the landscaping beds. She said they have made some improvements on the other elevations but the front elevations are not quite there.

Mr. Hunter said they focused on the Frantz Road elevations and materials but there is still work to be done with this building as it still looks heavy.

Ms. De Rosa said she is struggling with the landscaping as shown on the renderings making the building look bare.

Ms. Puranik said one of the earlier staff comments regarding elevations was that the building looked very institutional.

Ms. De Rosa said it does not feel like home away from home.

Ms. Salay said she likes the cornice and in her research she found an example of a Home2 Hotel with a clear tower element and thought a similar element would enhance this building making it a much more interesting building. She said incorporating cultured stone on the other façade would go a long way on the building. She asked that the Commissioners not approve the green color because this is a Home2 Hotel today and the color is a brand color but it is also a sign and the green color is not classic or architecturally pleasing to look at and consider revising the logo-centric element on the tower as this element may not stand the test of time. She also referred to the Manor Care building on SR 161 as being a good example of louvers well done. She noted that the canopy is an opportunity to do something that is unique statement enhancing the building entrance to the lobby. She reiterated that this is a gateway and there is an opportunity to do a statement building that is going to be gorgeous for this hotel and all others in the future.

Ms. Mitchell agreed with Ms. Salay and appreciated the branding, however, the color choice, and the logo of the sign for this location is not appropriate in her opinion.

Ms. Newell said they have had a number of applicants use the color of the logo on the building, which become a sign. She expressed that the proposed green color is inappropriate architecturally for this building.

Mr. Hunter asked for feedback on the brand color or any other color.

Mr. Brown said the logo is has been changed and seems awkward on the building. He suggested a clear element for the tower with color on the inside might be more appropriate for this building.

Ms. Newell said the signs would come back at a later date and asked if there has been any analysis on the height and size.

Ms. Puranik said it would be reviewed later, but it is larger than permitted by the Code. She said they would be permitted to have a building identification sign on SR 161 and one ground sign along upper Metro Place.

Mr. Miller agreed with Ms. Salay and stated that the proposed building does not feel like a signature Dublin building.

Mr. Stidhem agreed with Ms. Salay and stated the new building should stand the test of time given its key location.

Mr. Brown thanked the applicant for presenting the architectural renderings for an informal review and asked the applicant to push the envelope and bring back a unique proposal.

Mr. Hunter said they have heard many good comments. He said they only focused on a few details and will think through each side of the building and believes this can be a successful building for the market.

Ms. Salay thanked them for the material samples and stated it is very helpful for their review.

Communications

Ms. Husak said they had discussed maybe needing an additional meeting in July, but they do not anticipate needing the extra meeting and the July 9, 2015 meeting should be adequate.

Ms. Husak said they provided the next meeting packet has been distributed tonight with three cases on the agenda and one case does not have paper materials.

Ms. Husak introduced the newest members of the planning assistants Katie Dodaro and Lia Yakumithis who are graduate students also with Ohio State University. She said the previous planning assistant Katie Ashbaugh has accepted a position in Chicago and they are proud of her accomplishments.

Ms. Husak said Riviera was approved at City Council the previous Monday.

Ms. Husak reminded the Commissioners to get their travel expense reports turned into Flora Rogers as soon as possible.

Ms. Newell asked if there were any further comments. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 8:28 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on July 9, 2015.