

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 9, 2015

AGENDA

1. **Ballantrae Woods** **Cosgray Road**
15-004Z/PDP/PP **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**
Preliminary Plat (Approved 5 – 0)
2. **Dublin Jerome High School** **8300 Hyland Croy Road**
15-041AFDP **Amended Final Development (Approved 5 – 0)**
3. **Wexford Estates, Lot 14 – Remias Property** **6369 Angeles Drive**
15-058AFDP/FP **Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**
Final Plat (Approved 5 – 0)
4. **BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block** **Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue**
15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU **Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**
Open Space Fee-in-lieu (Approved 5 – 0)
Conditional Use (Approved 5 – 0)
Primary Materials (Approved 5 – 0)
Site Plan Waivers (Tabled 5 – 0)
Site Plan (Tabled 5 – 0)

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, Chris Brown, and Cathy De Rosa. Commissioners Steve Stidhem and Deborah Mitchell were absent. City representatives present were: Stephen Smith Jr., Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Gary Gunderman, Alan Perkins, Joanne Shelly, Rachel Ray, Devayani Puranik, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Michael Hendershot, Terry Foegler, Logan Stang, Dana McDaniel, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion. Mr. Brown seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the May 21, 2015 meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approve 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the June 11, 2015 meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approve 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the June 18, 2015 meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approve 5 – 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 order of Case 3, 2, 1 and 4. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. [The minutes will reflect the published order.]

**1. Ballantrae Woods
15-004Z/PDP/PP**

**Cosgray Road
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan
Preliminary Plat**

Ms. Newell said the following application is a request to rezone 49.6 acres from R, Rural District and PLR, Planned Low Density Residential District (Ballantrae, Subarea S) to PUD, Planned Unit Development District for the potential development of the site with up to 135 units and approximately 18 acres of open space. She said the site is located east of Cosgray Road and north of the Conrail railroad tracks and the application is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of Subdivision Regulations. She said the Commission will therefore need to make two motions.

Devayani Puranik said there was a copy of correspondence that was received from one of the neighbors distributed tonight on a green paper. She gave a quick update from the last review. She said the last review was on May 21st where the application was tabled. She said that Final Development and Final Plat will be the last step of the PUD rezoning process following this review.

Ms. Puranik said the parcels north of Rings Road are located within Washington Township (Amlin) and to the east of the site is Ballantrae development (Woodlands and Links). She said Churchman Road is a connector between Cosgray and Rings Road which is the eastern boundary of the site.

Ms. Puranik said the development text has been updated and reorganized with added details. She said many of the conditions are now resolved through the new development text including the Commissioner comments such as architectural elements, details, and materials. She added that the applicant has also provided illustrative examples of the details within the text. She said the Preliminary Development Plan and Plat have been updated to include the open space, maintenance responsibilities, setbacks and reserves information. She added that the tree survey is also updated to reflect the changes from the Churchman Road right-of-way project. She said the traffic study has been updated and the applicant is working with staff to address some of the additional comments received from the Franklin County Engineers office.

Ms. Puranik said there are no major updates regarding the Site Plan since the last review. She explained that the site is approximately 49 acres with the northern portion of the site proposed for 45 fee simple single family homes and the southern portion for 90 detached condominium units served by private drives. She said they are providing about 18 acres of open space out of which 11 acres will be dedicated to the City when they are required to provide approximately 8.4 acres.

Ms. Puranik said the comments from the last review focused on the architecture of the single family homes where the Commission wanted to see more details and materials and the revised development text includes those details. She added that the illustrative examples include details and elements of traditional architecture such as brackets, gable details, garage details, and the façade renderings show a lot of those details such as stone and planter boxes reflected as well. She said the text provides a list/menu of the details that will be handed to potential buyers with all the options for the windows, doors, stoops, porches, gables, and garages that they will be able to choose.

Ms. Puranik said there are no major updates regarding the architecture of the condominium units with it being the carpenter gothic farmhouse character which was appreciated during the last review. She added that the details are included in a similar list of details within the development text.

Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes, said the only remaining issues were the architectural details for the single family homes. He said that their updated text clearly includes all of the items that were illustrated on the drawings.

Ms. Puranik said based on the analysis the proposal meets the review criteria with nine conditions:

- 1) That the proximity to active railroad tracks is clearly stated in writing during the sales process and the options to install windows and exterior walls with higher STC levels than provided are explored for sound abatement prior to the final development plan;
- 2) That the two landmark trees between unit 78 and unit 79 within Subarea B are incorporated within appropriate open space reserve and maintenance responsibilities by appropriate home owners association;
- 3) That the traffic study is finalized to address additional staff and Franklin County Engineer's concerns prior to the City Council hearing;
- 4) That the infrastructure improvements and financial contributions to off-site improvements will be made based on the final traffic study and incorporated into the final development plan or a separate infrastructure agreement, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 5) That the proposed sidewalk connection to Cramer Street next to unit 82 is coordinated with the Franklin County Engineer's Office;
- 6) That the proposed mounding near the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road is modified to accommodate intersection sight visibility for the northern most site intersection;
- 7) That the windows with grids detail is incorporated within the development text;
- 8) That the decks are not permitted as an outdoor amenity for Subarea B; and
- 9) That the construction plans, right-of-way dedication, and responsibility for Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road project is finalized for the final development plan.

Ms. Puranik said the Plat now reflects all the setbacks, reserves and all the information that was missing before including a maintenance table. She said the application meets all the review criteria. She concluded by recommending approval for the Preliminary Plat with one condition:

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

Mr. Miller asked about the treatment between the alley and the property line.

Ms. Puranik said a fence was proposed in the first proposal which is now replaced with a landscape wall and the design will be finalized with the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Newell asked for public comment.

David Patch said he lives in One Miranova in Columbus, Ohio, but owns two lots and houses in Amlin. He mentioned that his mother lives at the corner of Churchman and Rings Road. He said he likes Amlin character and has only seen the revised plans for the proposed development that day and talked with staff and the applicant. He said that some of the issues are addressed but he has not seen any additional details. He added that the proposed development character looks beautiful. He said he owns two of the lots where units 75 or 76 are within the proposed development and has an interest in the property.

Mr. Brown said he read the letter that Mr. Patch sent and most of the concerns were addressed and he hoped he would be pleased with the revisions.

Ms. Newell said the architecture has changed especially for the single family residences with submission. She asked if these are the actual designs of the front of the buildings as shown on the new representations and pictures in the text.

Mr. Coppel clarified that the development text requires the incorporation of the design elements as illustrated.

Ms. Newell said the only comment she has is about the window placement on elevation F1 and the placement, windows, detailing, and structure over the garage, which can be improved, but thought the building elevations have improved overall.

Ms. De Rosa agreed with the improvements and appreciated the harmonious blending with the condominium architecture with improvements.

Ms. Newell said she likes the simplification of materials such as siding and stone on the collection of buildings which

Ms. Newell said this is a consent case and asked the applicant if they agreed to the following nine conditions:

- 1) That the proximity to active railroad tracks is clearly stated in writing during the sales process and the options to install windows and exterior walls with higher STC levels than provided are explored for sound abatement prior to the final development plan;
- 2) That the two landmark trees between unit 78 and unit 79 within Subarea B are incorporated within appropriate open space reserve and maintenance responsibilities by appropriate home owners association;
- 3) That the traffic study is finalized to address additional staff and Franklin County Engineer's concerns prior to the City Council hearing;
- 4) That the infrastructure improvements and financial contributions to off-site improvements will be made based on the final traffic study and incorporated into the final development plan or a separate infrastructure agreement, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 5) That the proposed sidewalk connection to Cramer Street next to unit 82 is coordinated with the Franklin County Engineer's Office;
- 6) That the proposed mounding near the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road is modified to accommodate intersection sight visibility for the northern most site intersection;
- 7) That the windows with grids detail is incorporated within the development text;
- 8) That the decks are not permitted as an outdoor amenity for Subarea B; and
- 9) That the construction plans, right-of-way dedication, and responsibility for Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road project is finalized for the final development plan.

Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes, agreed.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for this rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan application, with nine conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Ms. Newell said the Preliminary Plat has one condition and asked if there is agreement to the condition:

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

Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes, agreed.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for this Preliminary Plat with one condition. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**2. Dublin Jerome High School
15-041AFDP**

**8300 Hyland Croy Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

Ms. Newell said the following application is a request for the addition of eight modular classrooms in four mobile structures located on the northeast side of Jerome High School, located on the east side of Hyland Croy Road at the northeast corner of the intersection with Brand Road. This is a request for review and approval for an Amended Final Development Plan in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.050. The Commission is the final authority on this application and we will need to swear-in. 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.

Gary Gunderman said this is an application for an Amended Final Development Plan for four modular units with two classrooms in each structure to be located to the rear of the existing High School building. He presented basic drawings of the proposal. He said there are a lot of utilities going through the area and therefore there is one condition to have Engineering help with relocate foundation work if necessary. He said the units will be painted to match the existing trim on the high school.

Ms. De Rosa said she would like to know if the District is going to need modular units at any other locations in the school district.

Brion Deitsch, 5718 Strathmore Lane, Dublin, said he is the Chief Operating Officer for the schools and said they are not anticipating any modular units at their elementary buildings and they are building the 14 new classrooms that will be at the six different buildings and these will be open in the fall of 2016.

Ms. De Rosa asked if there was a time period that these modular units will be needed.

Mr. Deitsch said they will be there for as short of a time as possible because short term they are a good investment, but long term they are a horrible investment and his intention is for them to be here for as short of a term as possible.

Ms. De Rosa asked if building extensions on Jerome will make these modular units go away.

Mr. Deitsch agreed they will and said that when new additions are done on Jerome High School these will go away.

Ms. Salay confirmed that the addition at Jerome will be the determining factor.

Mr. Deitsch said they have almost 1,600 students at Jerome High School this fall and it was initially built for around 1,300 students.

Mr. Miller asked if all three high schools were at capacity.

Mr. Deitsch said Jerome and Coffman are at capacity and Scioto is slightly under capacity.

Mr. Miller said the redistricting will be a solution to this problem.

Mr. Deitsch said that is a potential solution to the problem but as they continue to grow they project 250 and 400 new students in K through 12, so there is a moving target, but agreed redistricting will be one solution.

Ms. De Rosa said there were meetings with neighbors but there was light attendance.

Mr. Deitsch said there were a couple different meetings with Belvidere homeowner's association officers for a site visit and a meeting with the community members and potential Jerome students with only two people attending.

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

Ms. Newell said this is a consent case and asked the applicant if they agreed to the following one condition:

- 1) That the footing for the structures be modified as necessary to avoid existing underground utility lines, subject to approval by Engineering.

Brion Deitsch, Chief Operating Officer, Dublin City Schools, agreed to the condition.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan application. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**3. Wexford Estates, Lot 14 – Remias Property 6369 Angeles Drive
15-058AFDP/FP Amended Final Development Plan/Final Plat**

Ms. Newell said the application is a request for modification to a platted no-build zone for a single-family property in the Wexford Estates Subdivision from 50 feet, at its widest point, to 25 feet. This is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under Zoning Code Section 153.050 and a review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a revised Final Plat under the provisions of Subdivision Regulations and will need to swear in. 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.]

Mr. Miller asked about the land directly behind this home, if it were parkland.

Logan Stang said it is developable vacant land and agreed it could potentially have homes developed sometime in the future.

Mr. Miller asked what the purpose of the request is.

Mr. Stang said it is to adjust the no build zone on the rear of the property that comes to an angle at 50 feet on the western edge of the property and 25 feet on the other. He said the property just to the west of this property, located on the corner of Tullymore and Angeles Drive does not have a no build zone on the rear property and most of the corner lots have two building lines. He said this is to adjust the line to make it more suitable to the property owner.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for this Final Plat application. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**4. BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block
15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU**

**Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue
Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews/
Conditional Use**

Ms. Newell said the following application is a request for a new mixed-use development, including four buildings with residential, office and restaurant uses and a parking structure on a 5.74-acre site. She said the proposal includes three new public streets and two blocks of development. The site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the intersection of (future) Bridge Park Avenue and is a request for review and approval of a Development Plan and Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236. 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.

Joanne Shelly presented Block B for Phase 1 of Bridge Park and showed the site, highlighting the two blocks for this application. She explained there will be six motions needed this evening. She said the Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan were approved in January, the Preliminary Plat in March and the Development Plan and Site Plan for Block C have also been approved.

Ms. Shelly said the Development Plan itself is consistent with the Basic Development Plan and grid network for the streets, adding three new streets (Banker Drive, Longshore Street, and Mooney Street). She pointed out that the shopping corridor runs along Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue.

Ms. Shelly said the Site Plan has two lots consisting of four mixed-use buildings, six open spaces (.33 acres), and parking spaces that also include bicycle racks in the garage and on the street. She explained the four mixed-use buildings are divided into 228 Dwelling Units, 42,644 square feet of Office space, 55,500 square feet of Restaurant/Retail, a 284,534 square-foot Parking Structure (850 spaces), and 18,141 square feet for Service areas.

Ms. Shelly presented building B1 as a mixed-use corridor building with the first floor as commercial, second floor as office, and the rest as residential. She presented building B2 as a mixed-use corridor building with the first floor as commercial, second floor as office, and the rest as residential. In addition, she said this is the primary building for the shopping corridor and positioned on the "Gateway" corner and vista from the future pedestrian bridge. The B3 building was presented rising up with the slope on Bridge Park Avenue consisting of mainly commercial on the first floor and residential above. She presented building B4, which is a wrap-around portion of the parking structure that is completely residential. However, she said there is a service component servicing all the buildings. She noted the parking structure faces Mooney Street and Banker Drive.

Ms. Shelly presented the areas of Open Space (1.08 acres are required) that include one Pocket Park (0.22 ac) and five Pocket Plazas (0.11 ac total). She said the applicant is requesting a Fee-In-Lieu with a supplemental from the Scioto Riverside Park (0.75 ac).

Ms. Shelly noted that the ART reviewed the Building Types and Architecture including the Terminal Vistas and Pedestrian Experience. She said they wanted to ensure the C1 building and the B2 building complimented each other as well as the plaza spaces below. She reported Staff worked with the applicant to find a good pedestrian scale and some of the details will be worked out with the streetscape. She said the applicant was advised to coordinate details through Building permitting, Master Sign Plan Reviews, and Waiver conditions as tenants build out. Resident bridges were also reviewed she said for how they would affect the spaces in character and the pedestrian experience. She noted a diversity of screening was discussed for safety and crime prevention.

Ms. Shelly said the ART reviewed the Open Spaces and concluded the types and distribution are appropriate but suitability is still being discussed as more seating may be needed, etc. She said the Shopping Corridors and Pedestrian-Oriented Streetscapes are in line with the guidelines. The site lighting she said is still being worked through to provide the best crime prevention.

Ms. Shelly summarized the ART's Review:

- Development Agreement
 - Fee-in-lieu for 0.75 acres of open space
 - Open space easements
 - Pedestrian bridge easements
- Coordination through Permitting
 - Open space design
 - Seating
 - Pervious surfaces
 - Streetscape furnishings coordination
 - Street / open space lighting
 - Parking facility operations & management
- Administrative Departures (8)
 - Elements that meet the intent of the Code and comply within 10% of the Code requirements.

Ms. Shelly concluded her portion of the presentation to turn it over to the applicant.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, thanked the Commission and Staff for their support and time through this process. He said the applicant is here tonight to continue the momentum and passion from Block C for the development of Block B. He explained the vision for Bridge Park is of a thriving modern neighborhood catering to everyone from young professionals to empty-nesters. He said tonight's development will complete the streetscape for the first two blocks of Bridge Park.

Mr. Hunter presented Block B and all of its buildings starting at Sawmill Road. He described the various buildings and how they were updated, showed the vista of the future pedestrian bridge, and noted the continuation of the resident bridges. He pointed out the change the applicant made to the Tower by adding outdoor balconies. He said building B2 is the gateway building and has the most outdoor space than any other building. He presented the various open spaces and how they were updated and places for public art noting the area called the "passage".

Mr. Hunter pointed out the changes made for more effective lighting. He showed where pervious surfaces replaced impervious surfaces and explained why the changes were being proposed. He presented a variety of bike racks.

Mr. Hunter discussed the addition of a pedestrian entry on the east façade of the garage along Mooney Street that is to provide to prevent pedestrians from walking in the drive aisle.

Mr. Hunter discussed the brick return detail on balconies proposed to offer more variety.

Amy Salay asked about the undersides of the balconies. Mr. Hunter said they are finished solid.

Victoria Newell inquired about wall sections.

Mr. Hunter provided composite metal panels and metal mesh material examples to discuss. He said the applicant would like as big of a palette of materials as appropriate.

Bob Miller asked which manufacturer these came from. Mr. Hunter answered Citadel. He said the metal mesh provides depth that cannot be achieved with many other materials.

Ms. Salay asked if the metal mesh proposed for the side of the parking structure will be illuminated. Mr. Hunter replied the mesh would be illuminated with brick behind it to provide depth.

The Chair invited public comment. [There were none.]

Ms. Shelly reiterated the six motions.

Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended for the Development Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That a Master Sign Plan is approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the shopping corridor segments prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (B2 and B3); and
- 2) That a Development Agreement must be approved by City Council and all affected property owners prior to issuance of building permit for buildings B1 – B4/B5 and before the Final Plat for Bridge Park, Phase 1 (B Block) can be recorded with the County.

Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended for Fee-in-Lieu for open space dedication of 0.75 acres of the required 1.08 acres for this phase of the Bridge Park mixed-use development.

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

- 1) That the interior circulation plans are revised at building permitting to allow for adequate stacking spaces at each entry to the garage between the right-of-way and the entry gate (building B4/B5)
- 2) That the applicant verify, through permitting process that cameras will monitor pedestrian activity in the parking structure from a remote location, or if other security measures will be taken; and
- 3) That the applicant enhances the Mooney Street pedestrian entrance with pedestrian scale features and protection from the adjacent vehicular entry.

Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended for two additional Primary Materials -

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

With one condition:

- 1) That the material selection and construction detailing be provided at the Site Plan Review.

Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended for 13 Site Plan Waivers with conditions associated with each:

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

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

One condition: That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.065€(3) subject to Planning approval prior to building permitting.

2. §153.062(E)(2)(a) Building Types, Materials, Façade Material Transitions

- a. Material transitions shall occur at an inside corner; A request to allow the materials to transition at the return of the primary material to the material on the balcony interior for buildings B1, B2, B3.

One condition: That the applicant provide plans detailing the material transitions on the balconies for buildings B1, B2, and B3 at building permitting, subject to Planning and Building Standards approval.

3. §153.062(N)(4)(a)5, Façade Requirements

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

One condition: That the materials and colors are selected to match building material colors, subject to Planning approval.

4. §153.062(O)(5) & (12) (1)a, Building Siting

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

One condition: That the applicant note encroachments on the Final Plat and/or obtain aerial easements, subject to Engineering approval.

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

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

One condition: That the applicant continue to work with Staff to improve the percentage of pervious coverage in the open spaces.

6. §153.062(O)(5)(d)1-2, Façade Requirements, Transparency

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

One condition: That the applicant continue to work with Planning to provide appropriate screening.

7. §153.062(O)(5)(d)3, Building Entrances

- a. *Principal Entrance Location, on primary street façade;* A request to allow building B2 entrance not on a PFS and building B3, primary entrance on the open space and not on the primary façade.
- b. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 ft.;* A request to allow the 2 lobbies for building B4 to substitute for the 4 required street entries.
- c. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 ft.;* A request to allow less than the required number of entries per street façade for building B5, east elevation 4 required, 1 provided; south elevation 3 required, 1 provided (through lobby); west elevation 1 required, 1 provided.

8. §153.062(O)(5)(d)4, Façade Divisions

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

9. §153.062(O)(5)(d)5, Façade Materials

- a. *Permitted Primary Material, Stone, Brick & Glass, min. 80%;* A request to allow façade materials to be less than 80% on the following elevations:
 1. B1 – east elevation, 71%
 2. B3 – north elevation, 56% & south elevations, 71%
 3. B4 – north elevation, 69% & east elevations, 69%
- b. *Permitted Secondary Façade Materials, max. 20%;* A request to allow secondary façade materials to exceed 20% on the following elevations:
 1. B2 – east elevation, 25%
 2. B4 – north elevation, 31%, east elevation, 31% & west elevation, 24%

10. §153.062(O)(12)(d)6, Parking Structure, Roof Types

- a. *Tower height/width, max. height may not exceed width;* A request to allow the height and width to exceed the allowable height of 14 ft. and width of 14 ft. for the tower on the following buildings:
 1. Tower height: B4/B5 16.88 ft.
 2. Tower width: B4 – south elevation 41.61 ft. & west elevations 27.15 ft. wide
 3. Tower width: B5 – north elevation 34.85 ft. & west elevations 48.18 ft. wide

11. §153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-A, Open Space Types

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

12. §153.065(B)(5)(a)-(d), Site Development Standards Parking Structure Design

- a. *Entrance/Exit, Number of Exits Lanes 5 required;* A request to allow one less (4) than the required entry/exit lanes.

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

13. §153.065(I)(2)(a), Walkability Standards

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

Ms. Shelly reiterated that there were 10 Building Type Site Plan Waivers and three Site Development Standard Site Plan Waivers. She said approval is recommended with conditions noted for the 13 Site Plan Waivers.

Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended for a Site Plan Review with the following 11 conditions:

- 1) That a Development Agreement be approved by City Council prior to issuance of building permits for any of the buildings (B1 – B4/B5), and that the agreement include the aerial easements for the pedestrian bridge encroachments;
- 2) That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy;
- 3) Building Type Conditions
 - a. That the applicant provide plans detailing the material transitions on the balconies for buildings B1, B2, and B3 at building permitting, subject to Planning and Building Standards approval;
 - b. That the applicant provide additional details for the canopies at the building entrances, including material, illumination, and mounting details, prior to building permitting and to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Master Sign Plan or by the ART through the Minor Project Review process, as applicable;
 - c. That the applicant continue to work with the City and the DAC as they develop the final elements for the building B2 and Bridge Park Avenue pocket plaza located at the terminal vista of the pedestrian bridge; and
 - d. That the applicant selects vents that are coordinated with the color of the adjacent exterior building finish materials, or that they are painted a coordinating color, subject to Planning approval.
- 4) Open Space Conditions:
 - a. That the applicant continue to work with ART to provide a variety of design and seating opportunities within the pocket plaza prior to building permitting, subject to Planning approval;
 - b. That the building permit plans and Final Plat include notes that state that the Pocket Parks and Pocket Plazas will be owned and maintained by the property owner, with public access easements; and
 - c. That the applicant continues to work with Staff to ensure that additional pervious pavement is provided within the open space, subject to Planning and Engineering approval at building permitting.

- 5) Parking & Loading Conditions:
 - a. That the applicant provides information about how the parking spaces within the garage are to be controlled and/or designated for resident use, valet use, etc. at building permitting; and
 - b. That the applicant provide the cut sheets for the bicycle parking facilities (on-street and in the garages) at building permitting, subject to Planning approval.
- 6) That the plans demonstrate compliance with the City of Dublin Stormwater Management Design Manual at building permitting, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
- 7) That the applicant addresses Engineering comments subject to approval by the City Engineer;
- 8) Screening Conditions: That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.065(E)(3) subject to Planning approval, prior to building permitting;
- 9) That the applicant revise the lighting plans and provide fixture power and efficiency information at building permitting to verify that the exterior lighting requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(F) and Engineering standards are met, subject to Engineering approval at building permitting;
- 10) That a Master Sign Plan be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the shopping corridor segments prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (B2 and B3); and
- 11) That the applicant addresses the comments in the "Additional Plan Review/Detail Comments" section of this report at building permitting.

Ms. Shelly concluded her recommendations by summarizing the six motions.

Chris Brown said he was a big supporter of this project overall and how he appreciated the applicant listening and responding to the Commission's comments all along. He referred to the building variety statement – "Each building has a unique character, which is expressed through a variety of material finishes and details particularly at pedestrian street level." He indicated the applicant did a good job at the street level. He said he liked the rhythm and scale of the buildings; streetscape; the warehouse feel of the B3 building; and the parking garage. He said he thought the variety for building materials were missed at the tops of buildings where he sees a field of cementitious panels with a little bit of composite metal panels used. He stated the City's investment in this site and producing a 'Class A' location, deserves a 'Class A' building with 'Class A' materials. He indicated he thought someone was doing a lot of value engineering on the backside of this project. He stated he is a fan of metal panels and represented the panel the applicant has specified during his career. Unfortunately, he said, this panel he would put on a lower class level (B or C). He indicated he did not mind less expensive materials on less prominent streets/secondary streets as opposed to Bridge Park Avenue. He said he likes the green screen on Block C but would like variety for Block B. He reiterated he likes the buildings overall; the ins/outs; the up/down; the plazas; the second floor terraces; and the balconies that are very dynamic. He reiterated his biggest objection was the materials and that prominent buildings should not be value engineered down to that extent.

Ms. Newell inquired about the opinion for fiber cement.

Mr. Brown said there are all sorts of panels on the market to which he is not opposed. He said there is no variety at the top of the buildings and the tops will be visible across the river as this is on a hillside.

Ms. Newell said she too found elements in Block B she had seen in Block C. She indicated she was fearful of continuing every building with cementitious siding. She said she liked the introduction of some of the new screening materials.

Mr. Brown referred to one of the earliest planned communities – Seaside, in Florida. He said it is all the same materials used in different methods and patterns and is phenomenally successful. He indicated he recognizes the 'sense of place'.

Ms. Newell said there are different types of siding materials and encouraged the applicant to play with the change of plane.

Cathy De Rosa concurred that it would be great to see alternatives to the tops of the buildings. She said she has been taken by the human scale of this project and how the applicant is trying to make the pedestrian experience a positive one. She encouraged the applicant to be artistic with the column and supports new primary materials. She indicated a surprise element is nice to have. She questioned where people are going to be sitting on the patios as she envisions the grill with one chair.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners said managing how the balconies/patios will be furnished will be an operational issue but no grills will be permitted on the patio; it will be a lease restriction. He said like their property on Lane Avenue, the color of chairs is controlled and Christmas lights or garland cannot be draped across the area. He indicated the best solution might not be the easiest solution, which is to "police" it. He suggested from an aesthetic standpoint, policing it in the lease restrictions could ensure compliance.

Ms. De Rosa asked what happens in the winter with the green screen/wall. Ms. Shelly responded the choice of plants has gone back and forth. She provided the example of clematis that climbs and looks beautiful in the summer but dies back in the winter. She said the trumpet creeper is a vine that will maintain a lot of its leaf structure and the vine structure is "twisted" and elegant, providing texture throughout the entire winter. She added trumpet creeper turns color in the fall and is one of the first plants to leaf out in the spring. She said the green screens will need to be pruned from time to time to give it some dimension and not turn weedy/messy.

Ms. De Rosa referred to pages L2 – 5 for Open Spaces. She indicated she liked the variety and incline and the edging that becomes seating. She said she found many phenomenal and interesting things on the web. She asked if there is an opportunity to use an alternative material to the cement benches.

Mr. Hunter indicated that was a conscious choice. He said many of the paver materials used that are either consistent with or complimentary to the public streetscape are a darker material. He said the applicant is using many different textures.

Ms. De Rosa encouraged providing surprises around the corner. She also suggested there be more opportunities for lighting. She said lighting does not have to be bright to create an interesting feel and lighting will have a bit of an impact on this project.

Mr. Hunter said it is a real balancing act in those two particular cases because there is residential so close.

Ms. Newell asked if the lights were dimmable because that can be easily achieved with LED lights.

Ms. Shelly said it is part of the conditions in the Waivers that the applicant continue to work with Staff on the lighting because there have been concerns with the lighting levels.

Ms. Newell said she is not a huge fan of streetlights and prefers lights that are down at the pedestrian level that are not brilliantly bright. She asked how the LED light is shielded, as they can be too intense.

Mr. Hunter said he will be conscious of the Commission's concerns as they work through the lighting plan.

Ms. Shelly said Staff is ensuring the applicant meets the City's dark sky initiatives.

Bob Miller said he loved Block C and likes Block B. He said the Staff's presentation was awesome and recognized the hard work that went into it. He said it appears the same design team is bringing out a similar architectural feel and it makes it feel a little bit more sterile. He said he is not sure Blocks C & B should be so similar in this district and said there should be more diversification. He noted that material is a big part of it. He stated he loved the brick returns and has no problem with the composite metal panels or the metal mesh materials. He indicated we seem to be leaning towards the lower end on the amount of parking spaces. He said he would hate to hear that people love this place but cannot find a place to park. He suggested the applicant err on the side of more parking spaces. He said overall, he liked a lot of what the applicant was proposing. He said he loves the outdoor tenant spaces. He indicated this application should have a little more zip to it and diversification from Block C. He said a lot of cementitious material was being used. He said he loves the parking garage as he was not crazy about the first one.

Ms. Salay said she agreed with Chris about the metal and cementitious siding. She said she struggled with the batten on the siding as they do not age well. She said she is not a fan of the two metal columns on building B1 but loves the building otherwise. She said she is concerned with the look after 15 years.

Mr. Hunter said with many of these products, they could be refinished and repainted.

Ms. Newell said that some metal panels fair better than others; it depends on the manufacturer and the quality of their detailing.

Mr. Brown said he wants this project to be successful. He said a couple of weeks ago when sign standards were discussed, Easton was brought up. He referred to a warehouse type structure in Easton where the brick goes all the way to the top.

Mr. Hunter said that building is four stories of brick and then it steps back.

Mr. Brown said with Block C, everyone ended up happy. He said if Block B was brought first, he probably would have said it looks great but when the two are combined, with the sheer quantity of the same design language, it becomes an issue. He said he agreed with Ms. Salay that the batten system is dirty and will detract from what we are trying to build here. He indicated when he looks at the competition in New Albany, Westerville, and Grandview Heights, Dublin is getting something less than they are in terms of materials, not design.

Mr. Yoder said this is a far superior project than the one in Grandview Heights and costs far more to create and build. He said this is a legacy project for Crawford Hoying Development Partners and understands it is a legacy project for the City as well.

Mr. Yoder explained as they approach these projects, they create variety by looking at the project holistically. He said building C3 is on the north side of Bridge Park Avenue and is quirky and funky and has brick that goes to the top story. He said across the street, the cementitious panels come down one level actually makes the difference. He noted the big focus is on the ground floor and they are spending millions of dollars in these open spaces to create an experience for the average Dublin resident, not for someone that lives here who is paying as much as a mortgage on a house but for an apartment that is not small. He indicated the apartments are so large that they are meeting with a feasibility consultant because of the amount of rent required for this size of units and the cost per square foot rent requirements are intense due to everything the Commission is asking for. He said they take this very personally; they are very passionate about what they are doing, they love what they do, and believe the project is headed in the right direction.

Mr. Yoder cautioned the Commission to not think for a minute that they are trying to be cheap. He said this is far superior to what you have in any of the communities mentioned as competition. He said it is hard to tell from the printed board images which are cartoon-like but it would be hard pressed to go through some of Paul Kelly's images and call them sterile or uninteresting. He indicated the applicant has

approached this from a design perspective trying to create lightness as you go up from the ground plane. He said as you walk down the street, you see extremely expensive high-end materials, how do you feel. He said people on the ground plane are 50 feet away from the materials we are talking about here.

Mr. Yoder said the applicant has been very cautious about what they do to ensure that the buildings will look good in the long term and can be very well maintained. He said if the applicant uses cementitious panels and they start to look bad, they are going to paint it; they do not want it to look any worse than the Commission does. He said he has a lot of his career left and envisions driving by this building in many years to come and it will still look fantastic. He said design is subjective and everyone has an opinion and a lot of what we talk about here, is subjective. He said our design solutions were developed for the most part by a Harvard grad, a Yale grad, and an MIT grad that came up with these concepts and then (the team) refined them with the Commission's input to get at something we all feel really good about. He said they are all based on opinions so we can sit here today and say boy that material in one particular spot looks bad and our design director will say it looks great and every Dubliner that walks down the street is going to have a different opinion as well.

Mr. Yoder said as we sit here and look holistically at the entire project he said, we do not have the benefit of just looking at how specifically the design is going to look; we have to think about how everything is coming together, facing the real realities of cost of construction and what the people who live in Dublin and want to live here can afford paying. He said they err whenever they can on the side of spending more than they probably should and more than anyone else has, all with the idea of creating a great project. He said he senses a bit of "you are value engineering", "you are cheapening the project" and he would adamantly say that is completely the opposite of what is going on with this project in general. He asked if there are issues with specific materials they want a very clear direction with what is required and the thoughts of the Commission to try to address these issues because the last thing he wants to do is have a series of subjective comments that they do not understand how to react to or what in fact to have on this project.

Mr. Brown said he did not mean to question the applicant's motives in any regard; he said he knows the applicant wants a high quality project and for this to be successful long-term. He said to please accept his comments as simply his comments. He said he has a problem with the batten and the method by which the composite panels are joined. He said dirt is being captured in a batten and it tends to create a dirty look and there is a way for a local fabricator to fabricate it making it less expensive and that is not necessarily a bad thing, but the skill of the fabricator comes into question. He is said it has been his experience that it is a mistake to get a local fabricator.

Mr. Brown said they went through this discussion with Block C and what would happen on Riverside versus Bridge Park Avenue as one is traveling up the hill. It may be okay to have lesser materials because there are different things there. He said it's the ponderous of the same material and the potential use of that particular panel system, to his way of thinking it is an inferior product with a plywood core that is not as stable particularly when the edge is not captured correctly; it is a great panel in the right application but does not deserve to be on Riverside Drive and on those buildings.

Ms. Newell said they do not have the ability to regulate the quality of the materials but it is a legitimate concern that they face Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside and there are other panels that are better quality. She likes the use of panels on the building and likes the introduction of metal panels. She said architecture is subjective and they are not always going to agree. She likes the tall elements on the building in the center and the play between the cementitious panel siding and the metal panels and would like to have relief from not every building having cementitious panels which is the purpose of the suggestion for the center building because it is a focus of making that building be different. She suggested the top looks like a glass top and to play with spandrel glass or tile to give the relief from every top of the buildings having cementitious panels across it.

Ms. Newell said the landscaped areas are wonderful and will be what makes this project and she is excited about the project and overall likes the buildings.

Ms. De Rosa said that the perspectives that it is very easy to look at these buildings at one or four at a time which has been the process they have gotten to review and the perspective as a whole is something they have not seen and requested some images from the view from across the river will help with their vision of the overall project in more context.

Mr. Miller said they had a standing ovation from C Block and did not get the same ovation but they are really close and the choice of the material is the biggest issue, but they are supportive of the project and the developers.

Ms. Salay said she appreciates the comments and looking at the flat one-dimensional elevations are not as appealing as the 2D drawings. She said she is not a fan of the Batten and does not know why it is being preferred and thought that the rain screen application is cleaner and wears better.

Teri Umbarger, 300 Spruce Street, Moody Noland Architects, said they are using both the reveal system and the board batten is on C1 and B1, but the rest are using the reveal system, which is the cleaner system that the Commission likes. She said they are using both systems for variations.

Ms. Salay said she can live with what is being proposed and will defer to her colleagues. She said the view from Riverside Drive and Riverside Park is what will help get the perspectives of Block B and C to see the streetscape and the tops of the buildings.

Mr. Hunter showed renderings of the blocks and said they have to deal with cost of constructions and there are things that are successful such as the building massing and the example of building B2 and the difference between renderings and the two-dimensional views will never be seen. He showed and explained building C3 with the brick that goes all the way up is across the street from the warehouse building to have the change of materials at the top story adds to the variety. He said building C1 has a similar look to B1 having complimentary buildings yet with different details using composite metal at the top with brick and stone at the base. He said the next building brings the brick to the building base and steps back at the top and is entirely of brick, metal panel and glass. He said as they get to the intersection of Riverside and Bridge Park where C2 and B2 are across from each other glass penetrated all five levels with brick that carries all the way down the building and then it is changed with five story brick and six story with composite metal panel coming all the way down with two story of stone which has not been introduced to this point in the buildings followed by three stories of brick and letting the composite metal panel waterfall down the building and stepping back. He said what they perceive walking down the street will be the two story piece and he would argue there is quite a bit of variety as they put the buildings side by side.

Ms. De Rosa said the explanation gives her a perspective that is helpful.

Mr. Hunter said they are working on a fly through putting the whole project together.

Mr. Yoder said they are working on the design of A Block which is next which will have the 150 key hotel which will take a very different look driven by the Brand and the corner is a pure office building which will be back to a C2 type building with a tower element. He said they are seeing only a piece of the puzzle and there is more variety coming beyond what they are able to show today.

Ms. Newell asked if anyone have any further comments. [There were none.] She asked the applicant how to proceed.

Mr. Yoder said based on the feedback there are reasonable clear direction and in a position to ask for approval with specific materials related to upper floors and work through the issues in the coming weeks or make a return trip with some tweaks to the plans with the next meeting.

Mr. Hunter said he is reluctant to change building B3 and that it would be a mistake also doing the same thing to building B1 and B2 would be a mistake. He said if they want to focus on one building that would be additive and good.

Ms. Salay said she would think B1 would need focus and that she really likes B2.

Ms. Newell said she likes B3 as a stand along building and was looking for a suggestion on breaking up the mass and picking another building she does not object.

Mr. Brown said he likes B2 and B3.

Ms. Shelly said there are quite a few broad conditions and as they are working through permitting for C Block they are still working on some similar conditions and thought they are getting closer but it is just not resolved. She suggested that the Development Plan, Open Space, Conditional Use and Primary Materials (Motions 1 – 5) can all be approved and they can return on August 6th review the rest of these and probably come back with a lot less conditions by then.

Ms. Salay agreed.

Ms. Newell said there is not a problem with the introduction of primary materials and wanted to know if the rest of the commission would entertain the materials as presented. [There was agreement.]

Ms. Newell said they will vote on the first four motions.

Mr. Yoder said knocking a few of these decisions out of the way now and coming back with elevations sounds good.

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

Russ Hunter agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Development Plan with two conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Open Space Fee-in-lieu of open space dedication for 0.75-acres of the required 1.08-acres of open space for this phase of the Bridge Park mixed-use development. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Ms. Newell said the Conditional Use application to allow parking structures visible from the right-of-way has three conditions and asked if the applicant was in agreement with the three conditions:

- 1) That the interior circulation plans are revised at building permitting to allow for adequate stacking space at each entry to the garage between the ROW and the entry gate (building B4/B5);
- 2) That the applicant verify whether cameras will monitor pedestrian activity in the parking garage from a remote location, or if other security measures will be taken, at building permitting; and

- 3) That the applicant enhance the pedestrian entrance along Mooney Street with pedestrian scale features such as brick paving wrapping into the garage; protective bollards or fencing to separate the vehicular space from the pedestrian walk and pedestrian scale canopy.

Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Victoria Newell moved, Cathy De Rosa seconded, to approve the following materials which have been submitted for use as primary materials, with one condition:

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

Condition: 1) That the material selection and construction detailing be provided at the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Hunter agreed to the condition.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Ms. Newell asked the applicant what they would like to do with the last two motions regarding the Site Plan Waivers and the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Hunter asked to table until the next meeting.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Mr. Brown seconded, to table the 13 Site Plan Waivers and the Site Plan Review at the request of the applicant. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0)

Communications

[There were none.]

Ms. Newell said if there were no further comments the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 6, 2015.