

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### MEETING MINUTES

**AUGUST 20, 2015**

#### AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block** **Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue**  
**15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU** **Site Plan Review (Approved 7 – 0)**
- 2. NE Quad, Subarea 4A & 4B – Estates at Scioto Crossing III**  
**15-061AFDP** **7850 Scioto Crossing Boulevard**  
**Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 0)**
- 3. Hoot Studio LLC – Fitness Use** **6365 Shier Rings Road, Suite D**  
**15-067CU** **Conditional Use (Approved 6 – 0)**
- 4. Bridge Park, Section 2** **Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue**  
**15-069FP** **Final Plat (Recommendation of Approval 7 – 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: Amy Salay, Robert Miller, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, and Stephen Stidhem. Christopher Brown was delayed. City representatives present were: Philip Hartmann, Steve Langworthy, Alan Perkins, Claudia Husak, Joanne Shelly, Marie Downie, Aaron Stanford, Donna Goss, Logan Stang, and Laurie Wright.

#### Administrative Business

##### Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said Case 3, Hoot Studio, LLC was eligible this evening for the consent agenda. She determined the cases would be heard in the following order: Case 3, 2, 1, then 4.

- 1. BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block** **Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue**  
**15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU** **Site Plan Review**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing residential; office; eating and drinking uses; and an 849-space parking structure on a 5.74-acre site. The site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the intersection of (future) Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for review and approval for a Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

The Chair swore in witnesses that intended to address the Commission regarding this case.

Joanne Shelly said there are four motions for the Commission this evening:

1. Primary materials review;
2. Secondary materials review;
3. Site Plan Waivers (13 requested); and
4. Site Plan Review

Ms. Shelly reiterated the previously approved applications:

1. Basic Development Plan – City Council (January 20, 2015)
2. Basic Site Plan – City Council (January 20, 2015)
3. Preliminary Plat – PZC and City Council (March 9, 2015)
4. Final Development Plan, Conditional Use, and Fee-in-Lieu (The Site Plan was tabled) – PZC (July 9, 2015)

Ms. Shelly presented the Bridge Park site along Riverside Drive in context with surrounding areas (Dublin Village Center, Wendy's International, Historic Dublin, and OCLC). She noted the dirt that has been moved on the site in preparation for development. She highlighted Block B as it appears in the proposed plan in the entire site. She said the proposal includes Lot 3 and Lot 4:

4 Mixed-Use Buildings & 1 Parking Structure

- B1 – Commercial / Residential
- B2 – Commercial / Residential
- B3 – Commercial / Residential
- B4 – Residential / Service
- B5 – Parking Structure

6 Open Spaces

- 1 Pocket Park
- 5 Pocket Plazas

Proposed Parking

- 850 garage spaces
- 44 on-street spaces
- 138 garage bicycle racks
- 30 on-street bicycle racks

Ms. Shelly presented the site plan overview of the four Mixed-Use Buildings distinguishing between the various areas:

- 228 Dwelling Units
- 42,644 square feet of Office space
- 55,500 square feet of Restaurant/Retail space
- 284,534 square feet for a Parking Structure (850 spaces)
- 18,141 square feet of Service areas
- 0.33 acres of Open Space

Ms. Shelly presented each of the buildings included in this Site Plan proposal, their locations in relation to the site, and the buildings they are adjacent to. She said for building B1, the applicant has added brick (Thin Brick) on the upper stories instead of the use of cementitious siding at the request of the Commission and they replaced the siding with composite metal panels. She noted that no changes have been made since the previous review to buildings B2, B3, B4, or B5.

Ms. Shelly presented the open spaces, how they are designated, their size, and location.

Ms. Shelly reported the ART did not conduct a new review so she restated a summary of the prior review from July 1, 2015, and included detailed illustrations.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, Dublin, said he was excited to be here again. He said he visited the site on the way to this meeting and noted the progress that was being made.

Mr. Hunter said he returned tonight to discuss much of what has been discussed in the past, including several of the buildings but focusing on material changes. He noted there was a change to building B2; the fiber cement on the tower is now a composite metal panel but it looks the same on the elevation. He said they just received information about a product and confirmed they would like to use it on building B3. He pointed out where composite metal panels have replaced the fiber cement panels on both locations of building B1. He indicated that pedestrians will see that detail. He said by adding the thin brick to reach up to the sky and also wrap the building helped with the massing. He explained full-depth brick cannot be used at that height for that building type. He said the Thin Brick provides shadow lines and returns in the windows; it is cut from the bricks used on the rest of the building so they are all going to match. He presented the before and after renderings to highlight the changes.

Mr. Hunter proposed a new ribbed aluminum metal panel system for building B3 that can be installed vertically or horizontally, is a concealed fastener, comes with a 30-year warranty, and it is not outrageously expensive. He said this information was not provided in the packets and not even presented to Staff yet as he was just informed of this yesterday. He said they have absolutely fallen in love with this product, it adds another material to the building, and it enhances the warehouse in an industrial contemporary way.

Mr. Hunter discussed bike racks, introducing more whimsy. He said they have introduced more wood style benches in addition to some of the Adirondack chairs. He presented the different bike rack designs as well as the new benches, both to be used throughout the open spaces.

Mr. Hunter presented the composite views of B1/B4, C2/B1, and C3/B3 to compare the various buildings. He concluded that the design team has "captured it" and agreed with the Commission that "they had not been there" before.

The Chair invited questions or comments.

Bob Miller inquired about colors of brick as they appear to have been changed. Mr. Hunter confirmed that the brick colors have not changed and explained that different applications used to create the images can change a color, which is not intended.

Amy Salay approved of the colors.

Cathy De Rosa asked if landscaping was part of this proposal this evening. She commended the applicant on their updates to the benches and bike racks. Ms. Shelly confirmed there have been no changes to the landscaping, itself. She said that through the permitting process there will be another scrutiny of the landscape material and plant selections.

Ms. Salay questioned the ivory and gray tones on building B2; her concern was whether these colors were going to clash or work well together.

Miguel Gonzales, Moody Nolan, 2501 Bristol Road, Upper Arlington, said the palette for B2 is warm and the colors all coordinate. He said for the images created with Revit, the color is hard to control.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Newell said she really liked the improvements to the elevations and they looked really nice. She said the Thin Brick will add to the building and is supportive of the materials proposed.

Ms. Salay agreed with her comments.

Chris Brown said he also agreed and was glad the brick reaches to the top of the buildings. He said kudos to the horizontal corrugated panels. He indicated the proposal is nice but not perfect.

Steve Langworthy said Staff does not have anything in the record about that latest material, just what was included in the applicant's presentation this evening. He confirmed that Staff had not seen this material before tonight. He said that specific language should be incorporated into the determination.

Ms. Newell asked if this would change Staff's calculations, which could affect the proposal this evening.

Ms. Shelly said Thin Brick is being requested for a secondary material and added into the other secondary material calculations as a second approved material for this project; the calculations would be wrong but would not significantly change the percentage. She said the Waivers are for 80% less of the primary material, that would not change.

Mr. Brown confirmed Thin Brick could be approved for building B1 and not the whole block. He said he did not want to see the applicant "handcuffed"; we do not want monotony as this project builds out.

Mr. Langworthy suggested this be dealt with tonight and when the next blocks come forward, we will explore options for a broader palette of materials.

Mr. Brown said other materials are good and said it was exciting that the applicant researched this product for it to be brought forward. He said that corrugated material lends itself dynamically to the urban environment to provide contrasting materials.

Ms. De Rosa said this proposal is great. She thanked the applicant for providing a landscape view and composite view because the images helped her to put the project together and in perspective and encouraged the applicant to continue to do that with future proposals. She said she liked the benches and racks and encouraged the applicant to push that envelope for design.

Ms. De Rosa asked Staff if some of these whimsical bike racks could be incorporated into the Park and Ride project. Ms. Shelly said COTA has some interesting options within their standards.

Steve Stidhem asked Staff what the speed limit will be on Riverside Drive. Aaron Stanford answered there is no proposed change to the speed limit. He said a speed study will be conducted and certain statutes will need to be met to change the speed limit. Ms. Salay said City Council is also interested in speed limits.

Mr. Stidhem said he is a huge fan of the whimsical side of this project.

Mr. Hunter said they would love for the Tim Horton's restaurant to be demolished sooner than later but the issue has been Columbia Gas. He said they need to disconnect it and remove the meters, which is two separate processes. Ms. Shelly confirmed the ART approved the demolition of Tim Horton's today.

Deborah Mitchell indicated her fellow Commissioners had already stated what she was thinking. She said she loved the whimsical bike racks and the benches are more sophisticated, which is really great and much desired.

Mr. Miller indicated that Nelson Yoder was frustrated at the last meeting and rightfully so. He said it is an example of the process working well and a credit to Crawford Hoying because even though they were frustrated, they returned with a better product.

The Chair said there will be four motions, the first being the approval of primary materials:

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

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell made a motion, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the primary materials as stated. The vote was as follows: 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**

Ms. Newell made a motion, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the secondary materials:

1. Thin Brick
2. Profile Metal Horizontal Panel, smooth and not embossed, 032 thickness or equal

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**

Ms. Newell made a motion, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve 13 Site Plan Waivers as presented:

- 1) §153.062(D)(1)(a)-(c), Parapet Roof Type
  - a. *Parapet roof height shall be between 2 – 6 feet in height;* A request to allow the height of parapets to drop below the minimum height of 2 feet 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.
- 2) §153.062(N)(4)(a)5, Façade Requirements
  - a. *Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements;* these elements are not permitted to be part of any street-facing façade, unless permitted for individual building types. A request to allow dryer vents, range vents and fresh air intake vents located on street-facing facades of buildings B1, B2, B3, and B4.

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

- a. *Front Required Building Zone, 0 - 15 feet;* A request to allow building B1 to have 128 feet 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 feet;* A request to allow building B5 (parking garage) to encroach on the RBZ below the minimum 5-foot requirement.
- c. *Right-of-Way Encroachments, none allowed;* A request to allow the pedestrian bridge to encroach over the public right-of-way of Longshore Street to building B5.

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

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

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

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

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

- a. *Principal Entrance Location, on primary street façade;* A request to allow building B2 entrance not on a PFS and building B3, primary entrance on the open space and not on the primary façade.
- b. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 feet;* 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 feet;* 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.

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

- a. *Vertical Increments Divisions, no greater than 45 feet;* A request to allow the following deviations, which are greater than the 45-foot maximum due to variations in the overall building design.
  1. B1 – west, south & north elevations at parapet
  2. B2 – west elevation at parapet

3. B3 – north, south, east & west elevations at parapet
  4. B4 – northwest section adjacent to building tower
  5. B5 – east & south elevations over garage vehicle access points
- b. *Horizontal Façade Divisions, within 3 feet 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.
- 8) §153.062(O)(5)(d)5, Façade Materials
- a. *Permitted Primary Material, Stone, Brick & Glass, minimum 80%;* A request to allow façade materials to be less than 80% on the following elevations:
    1. B1 – east elevation, 71%
    2. B3 – north elevation, 56% & south elevation, 71%
    3. B4 – north elevation, 69% & east elevation, 69%
  - b. *Permitted Secondary Façade Materials, maximum 20%;* A request to allow secondary façade materials to exceed 20% on the following elevations:
    1. B2 – east elevation, 25%
    2. B4 – north elevation, 31%, east elevation, 31% & west elevation, 24%
- 9) §153.062(O)(12)(d)6, Parking Structure, Roof Types
- a. *Tower height/width, maximum height may not exceed width;* A request to allow the height and width to exceed the allowable height of 14 feet and width of 14 feet for the tower on the following buildings:
    1. Tower height: B4/B5 16.88 feet
    2. Tower width: B4 – south elevation 41.61 feet & west elevation 27.15 feet
    3. Tower width: B5 – north elevation 34.85 feet & west elevation 48.18 feet
- 10) §153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-A, Open Space Types
- a. *Pocket Plazas, minimum 300 square feet/maximum 1,200 square feet;* A request to allow The “Plaza” – pocket plaza to exceed the size requirements for pocket plazas.
- 11) §153.065(B)(5)(a)-(d), Site Development Standards Parking Structure Design
- a. *Entrance/Exit, Number of Exits Lanes 5 required;* A request to allow one less (4) than the required entry/exit lanes.
  - b. *Stacking Spaces, two 20-foot stacking spaces to be provided between right-of-way and entry gate;* A request to allow the stacking to occur interior to the structure.
  - c. *Interior Circulation, Ceiling Clearance, 12 feet required.;* A request to allow the Mooney Street entry to be 10.66 feet, which is less than the minimum requirement.
  - d. *Pedestrian Safety/Circulation – Maximum distance to nearest exit 200 feet;* A request to allow the maximum distance to the nearest exit to be exceeded by 60 feet.

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

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

13) §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.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell made a motion, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve this application for Site Plan Review with 11 conditions as presented:

- 1) That the Development Agreement that includes the aerial easements for the pedestrian bridge encroachments be enabled through the permitting process and infrastructure agreements;
- 2) That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy.
- 3) Building Type Conditions
  - a. That the balconies are modified to provide the required material transitions on the interior of the corner of the balconies;
  - b. That the applicant provide additional details for the canopies at the building entrances, including material, illumination, and mounting details, prior to building permitting and to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Master Sign Plan or by the ART through the Minor Project Review process, as applicable;
  - c. That the applicant continue to work with the City and the Dublin Arts Council 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) 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.

The Chair asked the applicant if they agreed with the conditions. Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively.

The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

The Chair thanked the applicant for being so patient as this has been a long process.

## **2. NE Quad, Subarea 4A & 4B – Estates at Scioto Crossing III**

**15-061AFDP**

**7850 Scioto Crossing Boulevard  
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a revision to the approved Final Development Plan to permit 43 detached, single-family condominiums with associated site improvements within Subarea 4, Sections 4A and 4B, of the NE Quad Planned Unit Development. The site is on the west side of Sawmill Road, north of the intersection with Emerald Parkway. She said this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan and three Minor Text Modifications under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in witnesses that intended to address the Commission regarding this case.

Marie Downie presented an aerial view of the site located just east of Emerald Fields Park and west of the existing multi-family units. She noted the site contains portions of Sections 4A and 4B. She said Section 4C is located north of the site and was previously approved for an Amended Final Development Plan to change unit types from multi-family to single-family. She said Section 4A is approved for a total of 144 multi-family units within 15 buildings and Section 4B is approved for 72 multi-family units within 10

buildings. She explained that 80 units within 8 buildings in Section 4A and 24 units within 3 buildings in Section 4B remain to be built today.

Ms. Downie said there has been some correspondence with the neighbors surrounding the site regarding the connection of Aideen Court and Adare Court, which would provide vehicular access between Sections 4B and 4C. This was discussed with previous approvals; however, due to resident concerns the connection was never pursued and is not included in the current proposal.

Ms. Downie stated the proposal today includes 43 single-family units, which is 61 units less than currently approved. She noted that the proposed layout utilizes the private drives that were originally approved for the site. She said two pedestrian connections to Emerald Fields are being shown as part of this proposal and these connections lead to a vehicular access drive for the park. She reported that Planning is asking the applicant to work with Staff to coordinate these connections. She said pedestrian paths are being shown throughout the site and Staff is asking the applicant to provide cross-street connections at the park access points and at the intersections of the private drives. She indicated there is a low point along the path that connects the two sections and Staff is asking the applicant to modify the grading in order to eliminate this issue.

Ms. Downie stated on-street parking is not required as part of this application, but the parking areas for the approved multi-family units have already been put into place. She explained the majority of these will be removed with this application; however, there are 21 spaces remaining as noted on the plans. She said five spaces are located at the intersection of Scioto Crossing Boulevard and Gabrielle Drive that Staff is asking to be relocated or removed to avoid any conflicts at the intersection.

Ms. Downie said in order to provide for ample outdoor space, Staff has asked the applicant to expand the patio spaces where possible. She explained this would permit the patio areas to be the width of the unit and a maximum of 15 feet deep up to 1 foot from the rear property line; corner lots would be required to be 5 feet from all property lines, which is consistent with the previously approved Section 4C.

Ms. Downie said an entry feature sign and landscaping is proposed at the entrance along Wyandotte Woods Boulevard; the sign will be required to meet all of the Code requirements at the time of sign permitting.

Ms. Downie presented four elevations that the applicant provided with a number of styles for each.

Ms. Downie indicated the development text for Subarea 4 contains very few architecture requirements. She said diversity standards were approved for Section 4C and Staff recommends these be carried over to this proposal:

#### Elevations

1. No house of the same elevation shall be sited adjacent (to the left or right) of the same house style.
2. No house shall be sited directly across the street from that same type of house elevation.

#### Siding Colors

1. In any group of five homes on the same side of the street, at least three primary siding colors must be used.
2. The same primary siding color may never be used on two consecutive homes.
3. At any cross street intersection, at least two primary siding colors must be used. Same colors may only be used diagonally across the street.
4. Homes with intersecting 'lot lines' across the street from each other, i.e. homes offset from each other across the street must use different primary siding colors.

Brick and Stone

1. The same brick or stone may be used on homes side by side or across the street.

Ms. Downie said there are three Minor Text Modifications included with this application. She said Code limits front loaded garage door openings to be a maximum of 35% of the front elevation. She indicated in the past, particularly in Section 4C, the PZC has approved single-family condominiums units up to 50% and the applicant is asking for a text modification that would permit the garage door width to be 57.1% of the front elevation. She presented five of the nine elevation styles proposed that do not meet the 50% requirement. She said Staff is supportive of an increase from 35% to 50% to ensure that the garage is proportionally sized.

Ms. Downie presented Figure 18A that is included in the development text. She indicated it represents the typical multi-family character. She explained that due to the change in unit type, the figure no longer applies. She said the second text modification is to modify the required architectural style to match the submitted elevations. She stated the last text modification is to include stone and cementitious materials as permitted materials; this would be in addition to brick, stucco and natural wood highlights.

Ms. Downie noted the three text modifications are consistent with what was previously approved for Section 4C and they meet all of the appropriate provisions. She said approval is recommended for the three Minor Text Modifications to the development text with the changes noted for the garage door width:

- 1) To permit front loaded garage doors comprised of no more than 50% of the linear distance of the front elevation;
- 2) To permit a modification of the previously approved architectural styles to the submitted architectural elevations; and
- 3) To permit a modification to the exterior façade materials specified in the development text allowing for stone and cementitious as permitted materials for the proposed single-family units.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for the Amended Final Development Plan Review with eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant coordinates with the Engineering and Parks Departments to finalize the park connection paths;
- 2) That the applicant work with Planning and Engineering to modify the sidewalk details and grading issues;
- 3) That the five parking spaces located at the intersection of Scioto Crossing Boulevard and Gabrielle Drive be relocated or removed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 4) That the plans be revised with the sign permit to ensure the sign meets Code;
- 5) That the applicant works with Engineering to meet all stormwater management requirements;
- 6) That the applicant works with Planning to provide additional rear patio and deck spaces as outlined in this report;
- 7) That the diversity standards listed in the architecture section in this report be met; and
- 8) That the garage door widths should be a maximum of 50% of the front elevation.

Ron Sabatino, T&R Properties, 3895 Stoneridge Lane, said they agree with almost all of the Staff's recommendations and understands their technical objection to the one issue as it relates to the garages.

Mr. Sabatino said this 70-acre site was zoned in the 90s for ±800 apartments. He said T&R Properties bought it in 2002 and proceeded to change the design from 800 apartments to a variety of communities that included the Residence of Scioto Crossing (180 apartments) and changed the balance of the site to condominiums (attached and detached). He said the last ten acres is zoned for 104 condominium apartments attached with 104 garages. He said he thought the applicant did a good job at reducing the impact of what was planned. He presented what is there and more of what can be built. He said the garages on the approved units far exceed 50%. He said the applicant agrees with the technical objection for a home but as condominiums he said they should be reviewed as a community. He indicated about half of these homes are far less than 50%.

Ms. Salay asked what Staff is recommending. Ms. Downie said Staff is recommending approval of up to 50% and the applicant is requesting 57.1%.

Mr. Sabatino said they were not really requesting 57.1% but reiterated that this proposal be reviewed as a community because the frontage of the garages is only 46%, if they average all of the homes that are going to be built. He said this is truly an enhancement and asked the Commission to find a way to get around this technical issue. He reported that 75% of the homeowners signed a petition and each of the three neighborhood boards voted to pass this change in unit type.

Steve Stidhem asked if the homes have been determined to be built for each lot. Mr. Sabatino said they were.

Jim Olin, Ryan Homes, 7077 Sandimark Place, Westerville, OH, said they took the existing community (Scioto Crossing) and pre-programmed all of their homes into this site, including four different house types with multiple elevations for each. He said there is one house where the garage is 40%, another is 42%, and the two that are in question are at 53% and 57%.

Mr. Stidhem confirmed they were over, two by style.

Mr. Olin said by count, 27 of the 43 units would be over 50%.

Victoria Newell requested the applicant highlight, which two are over the 50% requirement.

Mr. Olin said the Chantilly Place model is a 40-foot wide product so that one falls within 40%, the Venice model is 38-foot wide, and the Misthaven and Ferncliff models are over the 50% requirement.

Ms. Salay asked for the widths of the Misthaven and Ferncliff elevations. Mr. Olin said Misthaven is 30 feet wide and the Ferncliff is 28 feet wide.

Cathy De Rosa asked why these are being called condominiums because they appear to be stand-alone houses.

Mr. Olin explained they are detached condominiums so land ownership is condominium subsidized but act like a single-family home.

Ms. De Rosa asked for the square footage of these compared to the homes in Subarea 4C.

Mr. Olin said the Ferncliff is 1,700 square feet compared to the Sienna style at 1,680 square feet; the Misthaven is 2,100 square feet (as a base) so it can range from 2,145 – 2,500 square feet. He said the

Venice style is 2,200 square feet, and the Chantilly Place, which was also built in the other section, is 2,054 square feet.

Bob Miller asked why the applicant is not able to hit the 50% requirement.

Mr. Olin explained that roads are already established and to hit the 50% mark, the houses would need to be reduced to next to nothing; there is only a certain amount of width to work with. He said in order to get any type of density to make this site work, the applicant needed to bring a different/new product to fit within this boundary. He explained the site itself is deeper so deeper homes were designed so that the square footage is relatively the same, but he does not have the width to work with in order to get the number of units required.

Ms. Newell confirmed these are all two-car garages. She asked for the width of the garage door. Mr. Olin answered 16 feet.

Mr. Stidhem noted the road is there in complete disarray, has been there for quite some time, and has not been kept up. He said it will take significant work to bring the road up to standard. He asked if there was a possibility of changing the road layout.

Mr. Sabatino said most of the utilities are in, but there are some slight changes the engineer is making. He said water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewers are all in and designed so the applicant is fixed with this layout.

Ms. De Rosa asked how many homes would need to be realigned to meet the 50% requirement. Mr. Sabatino answered 34 homes.

The Chair invited public comment.

Michael Madsen, 7774 Essex Gate Drive, South, Dublin, OH 43016, said he is the president of the Reserves of Scioto Crossing Homeowner's Association and also president of the Scioto Crossing Park Association. He explained that the park association manages the clubhouse, gym, and the pool.

Mr. Madsen indicated when Mr. Sabatino first approached them with this idea, one of the issues they had was whether to have this new development access the clubhouse, gym, and pool. He said in order to do that, they had to amend their declarations because of some clerical errors and the initial set up about the acreage and what is included. He said when Mr. Sabatino talks about the 75 units that approved the zoning change, this was more of the three associations approving the amendment to allow the applicant to use the park association. He indicated they would rather have these 43 units than the approved units. He emphasized they did not approve a zoning change, just approved changing the declarations.

The Chair invited further public comment. [Hearing none.] She closed the public portion of the meeting and invited comments from her fellow Commissioners.

Ms. Salay asked if the homes in Section 4C where built on wider lots to contain wider homes, which Ms. Downie confirmed. Ms. Salay asked Staff is there are any solutions to meet the 50% requirement. Ms. Downie said a possible solution would be to widen the front façade, which would then require fire rating for those portions of the homes extending within the 10-foot minimum distance between structures.

Ms. Newell said an option to consider would be to eliminate units to gain the width that is needed. Ms. Salay said the applicant would have to eliminate nine units, which appears to be a lot.

Ms. Newell said 16 feet is common for a double garage door. She said she really liked the elevations and it is a real improvement over what was previously approved on this site.

Deborah Mitchell asked if anyone did an analysis of the attractiveness of these homes that they have 1.5-car garages instead of 2-car garages. She said the assumption seems to be that all of the homes should have a 2-car garage but she said she knows a lot of people that prefer condominium living because part of the appeal is that they do not use their cars as much as they are downsizing.

Mr. Olin said he has been in the homebuilding industry for 19 years. He said Ryan Homes has found that 1.5-car garages are not attractive to buyers when they have done it in the past. He said from a resale standpoint, it needs to be a 2-car garage.

Ms. De Rosa asked if some of the garages could be attached to each other. Mr. Olin said from a community standpoint, they wanted to maintain what was done in the adjacent community. He said the homeowners in the other section do not like having a common wall between so they did whatever they could to maintain that.

The Chair requested the eight conditions for the Amended Final Development Plan. She asked the applicant if they were in agreement with conditions 1 – 7 but not condition 8 (That the garage door widths should be a maximum of 50% of the front elevation).

Ms. Newell said she was prepared to approve the elevations as presented and the additional width given the street layout on this particular site. She said if the applicant builds 1.5-car garages, then there will constantly be a second car in the driveway and that is more unsightly to her. She said she thought the proportions on the elevations looked nice.

Ms. Salay agreed; she would support the exception in this case. She thanked Staff for trying to hold to the standard. She said since this is such a substantial reduction in the number of units, she would support these more attractive individual homes within these surrounding communities. She emphasized the Commission is not setting a precedent. She added the exception is being supported because of the unique size of these lots, the types of units, and the street layout already established.

Ms. Newell agreed. She said she would usually hold to that 50% requirement of the Zoning Code and would expect cases coming forward to be held to that standard. She restated there are some very unique constraints with this particular project and the applicant is making a definite improvement over what was previously approved.

Ms. De Rosa asked if there are other situations that have been approved in the City that would fit this same circumstance. Ms. Downie said the maximum that has been approved to her knowledge is 50%.

Ms. De Rosa said there was quite a bit of correspondence from the public about the connector and confirmed with Staff that a connector will not occur. Ms. Downie confirmed it is not part of this application.

Mr. Miller said the street layout was not clear to him. Ms. Downie clarified the area the residents were concerned with as far as a possible connector. Ms. Salay asked if there was a possibility that it would ever connect to which Ms. Downie said it would not be likely.

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell made a motion, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Minor Text Modifications to the development text with the changes noted for the garage door width:

- 1) To permit front loaded garage doors comprised of no more than 57.1% of the linear distance of the front elevation;

- 2) To permit a modification of the previously approved architectural styles to the submitted architectural elevations; and
- 3) To permit a modification to the exterior façade materials specified in the development text allowing for stone and cementitious as permitted materials for the proposed single-family units.

The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

#### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell made a motion, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve this application for an Amended Final Development Plan with seven conditions:

- 1) That the applicant coordinates with the Engineering and Parks Departments to finalize the park connection paths;
- 2) That the applicant work with Planning and Engineering to modify the sidewalk details and grading issues;
- 3) That the five parking spaces located at the intersection of Scioto Crossing Boulevard and Gabrielle Drive be relocated or removed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 4) That the plans be revised with the sign permit to ensure the sign meets Code;
- 5) That the applicant works with Engineering to meet all stormwater management requirements;
- 6) That the applicant works with Planning to provide additional rear patio and deck spaces as outlined in this report; and
- 7) That the diversity standards listed in the architecture section in this report be met.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

### **3. Hoot Studio LLC – Fitness Use 15-067CU**

### **6365 Shier Rings Road, Suite D Conditional Use**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for an indoor recreational use on a site zoned TF, Technology Flex District. The site is on the south side of Shier Rings Road, approximately 315 feet east of Avery Muirfield Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.236.

The Chair swore in witnesses that intended to address the Commission regarding this case.

Logan Stang confirmed there was someone present to represent the applicant.

George Lewis said he owns the building on 6365 Shier Rings Road.

Mr. Stang added that the applicant, the owner of the studio will be late.

The Chair asked if the case should be delayed as it is on the Consent Agenda and will need consent by the applicant. Claudia Husak said if there were any questions, Mr. Lewis would be able to answer them.

The Chair said a formal presentation was not necessary and since there were no conditions on the case, she would call for a motion of approval.

Steve Stidhem said he assumed that other residents in the building are not opposing this.

Mr. Lewis said there are three individual tenants in the building and it is his understanding that they have not complained at all. He said one is an insurance agent, one is a chiropractor, and the other is a copier company. He confirmed that all the tenants have been informed.

Mr. Stang announced the owner of the studio just arrived.

Anna Brown provided her address for the record: 1169 Mulford Road, Grandview Heights, Ohio 43212.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the Conditional Use with no conditions and a parking alteration from 32 to 16 spaces for the recreational use.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell made a motion, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve this application for Conditional Use with no conditions and a parking alteration from 32 to 16 spaces for the recreational use. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

#### **4. Bridge Park, Section 2 15-069FP**

#### **Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue Final Plat**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a subdivision of 5.241 acres into two lots for development and create rights-of-way for portions of Mooney Street, Banker Drive and Longshore Street. Portions of Dale Drive will be vacated with this proposal. The site is north of SR161 and east of Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Joanne Shelly presented a current aerial view of the location and noted the area that was included in the Preliminary Plat that was approved and highlighted the location of Block B Lots 2 & 3 in relation to the whole site. She said with the Final Plat there is the vacation of the existing Dale Drive and release of public easements; three new public streets (Longshore Street, Mooney Street, and Banker Drive); two lots (3 & 4); and public access easements for pocket parks and plazas that include the stormwater facility and the pedestrian bridge.

Ms. Shelly said the Final Plat has met all of the criteria. She said approval is recommended to City Council of this request for a Final Plat with five conditions:

- 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 the applicant ensures that any technical adjustments are made prior to City Council submittal;
- 3) That construction on the public improvements does not commence until an Infrastructure Agreement is approved by City Council;
- 4) That construction on the public improvements does not commence until the existing east/west segment of Dale Drive is vacated through City Council action; and

- 5) 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.

The Chair asked the applicant if they had a presentation. Russ Hunter answered he did not.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Chris Brown offered some trivia. He said the name Dale Drive comes from a combination of Dave Thomas and Len Immke that developed that corner.

The Chair noted that none of the Commissioners had any questions or comments to discuss with regard to this case.

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell made a motion, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for this application for a Final Plat with five conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Newell. (Approved 7 - 0)

Mr. Hunter thanked the Commission for “sticking it out” with them and thanked Staff as well.

Mr. Stidhem asked when this project is expected to be completed. Mr. Hunter responded by the end of the summer of 2016; changes will be noticeable in the spring; and in late summer/early fall, people will start to move into the housing units and restaurants will start to open. He reported that leasing is going really well. He indicated this project is inspiring other projects and will put Dublin on the map like we all envisioned.

Mr. Brown encouraged the applicant to continue to design per all of the suggestions made by the Commissioners. He said this Commission allows latitude towards dynamic design. He asked the applicant to keep an open mind like the Commission does.

### **Communications**

Steve Langworthy said he was privileged to introduce the new Development Director, Donna Goss.

Steve Stidhem asked if it was possible to receive Staff's presentations in advance of the meeting like they receive other meeting materials because they are more easily deciphered than what is provided in the drop box.

Staff explained that those presentations often times are not ready for distribution until just prior to the meeting.

Claudia Husak explained that the materials provided about the BSD Sign Guidelines are meant for the meeting on September 3, 2015. She explained that while Rachel Ray has transitioned to Economic Development, she is shepherding this project through to the end and was able to complete the materials in advance.

Cathy De Rosa asked how streets get named in the City. Ms. Husak replied street names come to Planning from development applications, usually and then Planning works with Engineering, Streets, and Fire and Police to decide on names. She said sometimes there is a theme to the development or history is considered.

Mr. Langworthy said Planning received a list of names that have been previously selected.

Joanne Shelly said she had to give credit to Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners for the names in the BSD because he researched Dublin's history and these are actual names of historic Dublin figures and names were considered for about a month after meeting each week.

Mr. Langworthy said it is important that the dispatchers approve as they are the ones that need to easily identify or pronounce names and make sure they are different from other street names that may be close.

Ms. De Rosa said, as exciting as buildings C1 and C2 are, she asked if they will have names. Ms. Shelly said they will need to meet building number needs so it will be 1200 Bridge Park Avenue, for example. She said the Master Sign Plan is close to completion which will reveal tenants and they will have some interesting signs. She indicated this will eventually lead to nicknames for building identification purposes.

Mr. Stidhem asked if the residential units are apartments or condominiums. Ms. Newell said they were apartments.

The Chair said the new Planning Director contacted her and asked to meet with her. She said he will introduce himself and talk about the Commission September 22<sup>nd</sup> for any priority dates we have. She asked her fellow Commissioners to let her know if they had anything they would like her to share with him.

Chris Brown said the Commission touched on trees the other day; the trees specified along Frantz Road by the Home2 Hotel. He said he planted four of them at 7-inch caliper and they top out about 15 feet. He noted in Del Rey Beach, they have this great urban, walkable, restaurant lined streetscape and the width of the walkways with some outdoor dining from building to curb was 14 feet. He indicated that was not very wide. He remarked it is a very lively area and you do not always want too much room. He said the bottom of the tree canopy was always at about 11 - 13 feet unless there were the taller palm trees. He asked what we are trying to accomplish at Home2 Hotel. He noted a recent drive down Wyandotte Woods Boulevard which felt like a super highway because it is a really wide road with very short street trees on it, more ornamental in nature than tall deciduous trees. He said looking at the older neighborhoods in Dublin with nice tree canopies, he would hate to see a nice new development not get that same feeling especially with that wide swath of asphalt. He suggested the Commission refocus on the width of streets and the use of street trees. He said he understands planting ornamental trees under power lines but he is seeing it all over the City where there are no power lines. He indicated that did not lead to the character of Dublin.

Ms. Newell said when all the Ash trees came down in her neighborhood, they were replaced with ornamental trees and they do not provide the same canopy, besides being planted at the smallest caliper.

Ms. Salay said our forester and Fred Hahn used to talk about street trees where they are limited to just three varieties because of the heat of the sidewalk, the debris that fall from trees, and the salt in the winter. She agreed that our canopies are so important and would pass that along to City Council.

Mr. Brown said we do have some great lines of Ash trees that we are injecting and keeping alive but at some point, you take down every third tree and get something else started there. He said large caliper trees are being replaced with a little wilted one-inch caliper tree. He asked if that was the best Dublin could do.

Ms. Salay said John Reiner has shared before that planting a smaller tree at the beginning is better because it will grow more and it will transplant more effectively; if you transplant a big tree, the shock is such that it will take years for it to catch up.

The Chair emphasized that her opinion is not any more important than anyone else's so if the other Commissioners had something to share, to please let her know.

Ms. De Rosa recalled a conversation last week about less focus on materials and more focus on quality and would like that emphasized.

Ms. Salay reported that she mentioned that we need new IT equipment in Council Chambers at the Capital Improvement process the other night.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:24 p.m.

**As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 17, 2015.**