

City of Dublin

15-052SP-BSD/DP-BSD/CU
Final Site and Development Plan/Conditional Use
Bridge Park Phase 2 - Block B
Riverside Drive and Dale Drive

0 150 300
Feet

N

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

JULY 1, 2015

The Administrative Review Team made the following determination at this meeting:

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

Proposal:	The second phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 213 dwelling units, 61,800 square feet of office uses, 36,000 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 849-space parking structure on a 4.17-acre site. 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.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).
Applicant:	Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.
Planning Contact:	Joanne Shelly, AICP, RLA, LEED BD+C, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; (614) 410-4677; jshelly@dublin.oh.us

REQUEST 1: FEE-IN-LIEU OF OPEN SPACE
Request to pay a fee in lieu of open space dedication for 0.75-acres of the required 1.08-acres of open space for this phase of the Bridge Park mixed-use development.

Determination: The Open Space Fee-in-Lieu request was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

REQUEST 2: ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTURES
Request for approval of 8 Administrative Departures:

1) Balcony Dimensions – Code Section 153.062(I) – requiring a 6 ft. depth for balconies. Allow the balconies on buildings B1 & B2 to range in depth from a 5.5 feet minimum while maintaining a minimum of 30 square feet on all balconies.

2) Front Property Line Coverage – Section 153.062(O)(5)(a)1 – Allow the front property line coverage to be 89% for building B5, where the requirement is 90%.

3) Story height – Section 153.062(O)(5)(b) – 12 ft. maximum upper story height permitted. Allow building B5 to have a 12.5 ft. upper story height.

DRAFT

4) Transparency – Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)1 – Allow the following:
   a. B1 – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on west, Longshore Street elevation;
   b. B2 – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on the 3rd, 4th & 5th story of the west elevation (Riverside Drive); 29% on 6th story of the north elevation (Bridge Park Avenue); 29% on the 6th story of the east elevation (Longshore Street).

5) Vertical Increments Require – Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4 – No greater than 45 ft. Allow the following:
   a. B1 – 47.33 ft. on the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 46.62 ft. on the north elevation (open space).
   b. B4 – 45.60 ft. on the west elevation (Longshore Street); 48.93 ft. on the north elevation (open space).

6) Primary Façade Materials – Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)5 – 80% permitted primary materials required. Allow the following:
   a. B1 –78% primary on the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 74% primary on the north (open space) elevation, 72% primary on the south (Banker Drive) elevation.
   b. B2 –75% primary on the east (Longshore) elevation.
   c. B3 –72% primary on the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 78% primary on the east (Longshore) elevation.
   d. B4 – 76% on the west elevation (Longshore Street).

7) Tower Height – Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)6 – Allow the tower height to be 13.04 ft., where the maximum permitted height is 12 ft.

8) Mid-Building Pedestrianways - Section 153.065(I)(2)(b) Walkability Standards – Requiring a mid-building pedestrian way on buildings over 250 ft. in length. Not requiring a mid-building pedestrian way for building B1 (255 ft. building length).

Determination: Eight Administrative Departures were approved by the ART.

REQUEST 3: DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Request for recommendation of approval of the Development Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the following two conditions:

1. That a Development and Infrastructure Agreement (as applicable) be approved by City Council and all impacted property owners prior to issuance of building permit (buildings B1 – B4/B5) and recording of the Final Plat for Bridge Park, Phase 1 (B Block); and

2. That a Master Sign Plan is approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the shopping corridor segments prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (B2 and B3).

Determination: The Development Plan was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 2 conditions.

DRAFT

REQUEST 4: PRIMARY MATERIALS
Code Section 153.062(E)(1)(c) states that "permitted primary building materials shall be high quality, durable materials including but not limited to stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick and glass."

The Administrative Review Team recommends approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the following materials which have been submitted for use as primary materials:

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

Determination: These materials (CMP and MMP) were recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

REQUEST 5: WAIVERS
Request for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 13 Site Plan Waivers:

1. Code Section 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.

2. Code Section 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. Code Section 153.062(O)(5) & (12) (1)a Building Siting
   a. *Front Required Building Zone, 0-15 ft.;* A request to allow building B1 to have 128 ft. of the building façade outside of the RBZ due to a recess in the building centered on the façade to create a large entry and private patio. A large stair case enhances the public streetscape and accommodates some change in grade.

   b. *Corner Side RBZ, 5-25 ft.;* A request to allow building B5 (parking garage) to encroach on the RBZ below the min. 5 ft. requirement.

   c. *Right-of-Way Encroachments, none allowed;* a request to allow the pedestrian bridge to encroach over the public ROW of Longshore Street to building B5.

4. Code Section 153.062(O)(5)&(12) (a)(2) Buildable Area
   a. *Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage, 80%;* A request to allow 98% impervious lot coverage for:
      a. Lot 3 – buildings B1 & B2; and

b. Lot 4 – buildings B3 & B4/B5

5. Code Section 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 B5 (south 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.

6. Code Section 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.

7. Code Section 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.

8. §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:

DRAFT

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
   Towers Height & Width, allowable height 14 ft.; allowable width 14 ft.
   a. *Tower height / width, max. height may not exceed width;* A request to allow the height and width to exceed the allowable height (14 ft.) and width (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

10. §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.

11. §153.065(B)(5)(a)-(d), Site Development Standards Parking Structure Design
    a. *Entrance/Exit, Number of Exits Lanes 5 required;* A request to allow one less (4) than the required entry / exit lanes.

    b. *Stacking Spaces, two 20 ft. stacking spaces to be provided between ROW and entry gate;* A request to allow the stacking to occur interior to the structure.

    c. *Interior Circulation, Ceiling Clearance, 12 ft. req.;* A request to allow the Mooney Street entry to be 10.66 ft. which is less than the minimum requirement.

    d. *Pedestrian Safety / Circulation – Maximum distance to nearest exit 200 ft.*; A request to allow the maximum distance to the nearest exit to be exceeded by 60 ft.

12. §153.065(I)(2)(a) Walkability Standards
    a. *Mid-Building Pedestrianways, Requiring a mid-building pedestrianway on buildings over 250 ft. in length*; A request to allow the following: B4 – 291.48 ft. building length without a mid-building pedestrianway.

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.

Determination: The 13 Site Plan Waivers were recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the conditions noted as part of the Site Plan Review.

REQUEST 6: SITE PLAN REVIEW

Request for a recommendation of approval of the Site Plan Review to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the following 11 conditions:

1. That a Development Agreement be approved by City Council prior to issuance of building permits for any of the buildings (B1 – B4/B5), and that the agreement include the aerial easements for the pedestrian bridge encroachments;

2. That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy.

3. Building Type Conditions

    a. That the 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 with in 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 continue 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 address 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.

Determination: The Site Plan was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 11 conditions.

REQUEST 7: CONDITIONAL USE

Recommendation of approval of the Conditional Use to the Planning and Zoning Commission to allow parking structures visible from the right-of-way with 3 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.

Determination: The Conditional Use was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 3 conditions.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

_____

Steve Langworthy, Planning Director

DRAFT

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 1, 2015

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

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

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

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

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

DETERMINATIONS

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

Rachel Ray said the applicant is not present.

Lia Yakumithis said this is a request for installation of a new 20-square-foot wall sign for a tenant in the Dublin Village Center shopping center on the west side of Dublin Center Drive, east of Village Parkway (northeast of the movie theater). She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Yakumithis said the proposed sign is consistent with the dimensional and design requirements for signs in the Bridge Street District and meets all the review criteria. She said approval is recommended with no conditions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTURES

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

1) Balcony Dimensions – Code Section 153.062(I) – requiring a 6 ft. depth for balconies. Allow the balconies on buildings B1 & B2 to range in depth from a 5.5 feet minimum while maintaining a minimum of 30 square feet on all balconies.

2) Front Property Line Coverage – Section 153.062(O)(5)(a)1 – Allow the front property line coverage to be 89% for building B5, where the requirement is 90%.

3) Story height – Section 153.062(O)(5)(b) – 12 ft. maximum upper story height permitted. Allow building B5 to have a 12.5 ft. upper story height.

4) Transparency – Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)1 – Allow the following:

    a. B1 – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on west, Longshore Street elevation;
    b. B2 – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on the 3rd, 4th & 5th story of the west elevation (Riverside Drive); 29% on 6th story of the north elevation (Bridge Park Avenue); 29% on the 6th story of the east elevation (Longshore Street).

5) Vertical Increments Require – Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4 – No greater than 45 ft. Allow the following:

a. B1 – 47.33 ft. on the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 46.62 ft. on the north elevation (open space).
b. B4 – 45.60 ft. on the west elevation (Longshore Street); 48.93 ft. on the north elevation (open space).

6) Primary Façade Materials – Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)5 – 80% permitted primary materials required. Allow the following:
   a. B1 –78% primary on the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 74% primary on the north (open space) elevation, 72% primary on the south (Banker Drive) elevation.
   b. B2 –75% primary on the east (Longshore) elevation.
   c. B3 –72% primary on the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 78% primary on the east (Longshore) elevation.
   d. B4 – 76% on the west elevation (Longshore Street).

7) Tower Height – Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)6 – Allow the tower height to be 13.04 ft., where the maximum permitted height is 12 ft.

8) Mid-Building Pedestrianways - Section 153.065(I)(2)(b) Walkability Standards – Requiring a mid-building pedestrian way on buildings over 250 ft. in length. Not requiring a mid-building pedestrian way for building B1 (255 ft. building length).

Jeff Tyler asked about the mechanical screening on the roof.

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

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

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

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to the eight Administrative Departures [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the 8 Administrative Departures.

PRIMARY MATERIALS
Ms. Shelly said Code Section 153.062(E)(1)(c) states that "permitted primary building materials shall be high quality, durable materials including but not limited to stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick and glass." She noted that the ART had previously discussed other materials that may be considered primary materials for this particular project to enhance the variety of materials used throughout the project, and at the same time encourage a variety of architectural character. She specified that composite metal panels and stainless steel metal mesh panels were under consideration for this particular project, and not for broader application throughout the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Shelly stated that there is a recommendation for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the following materials, which have been submitted for use as primary materials:

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

Ms. Ray said if these materials are not approved to be considered as primary materials for this project, then this will result in an additional Waiver request. She clarified that either way, they are not

recommending any changes to the buildings; this is primarily a question of how these materials are processed.

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

Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's recommendation of the proposal to consider CMP and MMP as permitted primary materials.

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

WAIVERS
Ms. Shelly said the next item for ART discussion is the Site Plan Waivers. She stated that there are 12 Waivers, for which approval is recommended (some with conditions) to the Planning and Zoning Commission. She began by summarizing each of the Waivers.

1. Code Section 153.062(D)(1)(a)-(c) Parapet Roof Type
   a. *Parapet roof height shall be between 2 ft. – 6 ft. in height*; A request to allow the height of parapets to drop below the minimum height of 2 ft. in numerous locations on buildings B1, B2, B3 & B4 as the roofline jogs in height across the elevations.

   b. *Parapets shall wrap around all sides of the building*; A request to allow parapets which are not continuous. Parapets are present on portions of the front and side facades of all buildings, but as the roofline jogs up and down along the elevation, the parapet is not continuous.

   c. *Horizontal Shadow Lines:* Encouraged to distinguish parapets from upper stories and to define the top of the parapet. Horizontal shadow lines have been incorporated to define the tops of some parapets, but not always between the upper story and the bottom of the parapet.

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

Ms. Shelly continued:

2. Code Section 153.062(N)(4)(a)5 Façade Requirements
   a. *Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements*; these elements are not permitted to be part of any street-facing façade, unless permitted for individual building types. A request to allow dryer vents, range vents and fresh air intake vents located on street facing facades of buildings B1, B2, B3, and B4.

Mr. Hahn asked if this Waiver should be considered for a potential Code amendment, since this question is likely to come up with most other buildings that are sited in the same manner, with streets on 3 sides.

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

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

Ms. Shelly continued:

3. Code Section 153.062(O)(5) & (12) (1)a Building Siting
   a. *Front Required Building Zone, 0-15 ft.;* A request to allow building B1 to have 128 ft. of the building façade outside of the RBZ due to a recess in the building centered on the façade to create a large entry and private patio. A large stair case enhances the public streetscape and accommodates some change in grade.

   b. *Corner Side RBZ, 5-25 ft.;* A request to allow building B5 (parking garage) to encroach on the RBZ below the min. 5 ft. requirement.

   c. *Right-of-Way Encroachments, none allowed;* a request to allow the pedestrian bridge to encroach over the public ROW of Longshore Street to building B5.

Mr. Langworthy asked Ms. Shelly to explain 3a.

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

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

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

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

Ms. Shelly continued:

4. Code Section 153.062(O)(5)&(12) (a)(2) Buildable Area
   a. *Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage, 80%;* A request to allow 98% impervious lot coverage for:
      a. Lot 3 – buildings B1 & B2; and
      b. Lot 4 – buildings B3 & B4/B5

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

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

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

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to this Waiver. Mr. Hahn pointed out that this was an issue with C Block as well, and asked the applicant to think about this requirement for the future

DRAFT

development blocks and try to meet the requirement from the start as part of the initial site planning, rather than asking for a Waiver for each block.

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

Ms. Shelly continued:

5. Code Section 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 B5 (south 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.

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

Ms. Shelly continued:

6. Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)3, Building Entrances
   a. *Principal Entrance Location, on primary street façade;* A request to allow building B2 entrance not on a PFS and building B3, primary entrance on the open space and not on the primary façade.
   b. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 ft.;* A request to allow the 2 lobbies for building B4 to substitute for the 4 required street entries.
   c. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 ft.;* A request to allow less than the required number of entries per street façade for building B5, east elevation 4 required, 1 provided; south elevation 3 required, 1 provided (through lobby); west elevation 1 required, 1 provided.

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

Ms. Shelly continued:

7. Code Section 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.

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

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

Ms. Shelly continued:

   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%

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

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

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

Ms. Shelly continued:

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

Mr. Hahn asked about the intent of this requirement.

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

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

Ms. Shelly continued:

10. §153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-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.

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

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

Ms. Shelly continued:

11. §153.065(B)(5)(a)-(d), Site Development Standards Parking Structure Design
    a. *Entrance/Exit, Number of Exits Lanes 5 required;* A request to allow one less (4) than the required entry / exit lanes.

DRAFT

b. *Stacking Spaces, two 20 ft. stacking spaces to be provided between ROW and entry gate;* A request to allow the stacking to occur interior to the structure.

c. *Interior Circulation, Ceiling Clearance, 12 ft. req.;* A request to allow the Mooney Street entry to be 10.66 ft. which is less than the minimum requirement.

d. *Pedestrian Safety / Circulation – Maximum distance to nearest exit 200 ft.*; A request to allow the maximum distance to the nearest exit to be exceeded by 60 ft.

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Shelly continued:

12. §153.065(I)(2)(a) Walkability Standards
    a. *Mid-Building Pedestrianways, Requiring a mid-building pedestrianway on buildings over 250 ft. in length*; A request to allow the following: B4 – 291.48 ft. building length without a mid-building pedestrianway.

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

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

1. That a Development Agreement be approved by City Council prior to issuance of building permits for any of the buildings (B1 – B4/B5), and that the agreement include the aerial easements for the pedestrian bridge encroachments;

2. That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy.

3. Building Type Conditions

    a. That the balconies are modified to provide the required material transitions on the interior of the corner of the balconies;
    b. That the applicant provide additional details for the canopies at the building entrances, including material, illumination, and mounting details, prior to building permitting and to be

reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Master Sign Plan or by the ART through the Minor Project Review process, as applicable;

c. That the applicant continue to work with the City and the DAC as they develop the final elements for the building B2 and Bridge Park Avenue pocket plaza located at the terminal vista of the pedestrian bridge; and
d. That the applicant selects vents that are coordinated with the color of the adjacent exterior building finish materials, or that they are painted a coordinating color, subject to Planning approval.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Shelly continued with the conditions:

4. Open Space Conditions

a. That the applicant continue to work with ART to provide a variety of design and seating opportunities with in 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 continue 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 address Engineering comments subject to approval by the City Engineer;

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

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

9. That the applicant revise the lighting plans and provide fixture power and efficiency information at building permitting to verify that the exterior lighting requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(F) and Engineering standards are met, subject to Engineering approval at building permitting;

10. That a Master Sign Plan be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the shopping corridor segments prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (B2 and B3); and

11. That the applicant addresses the comments in the "Additional Plan Review/Detail Comments" section of this report at building permitting.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the applicant was in agreement with the conditions. Mr. Hunter agreed.

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

CONDITIONAL USE
Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Conditional Use to allow parking structures visible from the right-of-way, with 3 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);

DRAFT

2. That the applicant verify whether cameras will monitor pedestrian activity in the parking garage from a remote location, or if other security measures will be taken, at building permitting; and

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

Mr. Langworthy asked if the applicant was in agreement with the conditions. Mr. Hunter agreed.

Mr. Langworthy said this was discussed during the case review and asked if there were any issues related to the Conditional Use. [There were none.] He confirmed that the Conditional Use was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 3 conditions.

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

Mr. Langworthy said it is preferred to have open space over the fees.

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

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

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

DEVELOPMENT PLAN
Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan with the following two conditions:

1. That a Development and Infrastructure Agreement (as applicable) be approved by City Council and all impacted property owners prior to issuance of building permit (buildings B1 – B4/B5) and recording of the Final Plat for Bridge Park, Phase 1 (B Block); and

2. That a Master Sign Plan is approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the shopping corridor segments prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (B2 and B3).

Mr. Langworthy confirmed Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.
Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues related to the Development Plan. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan with 2 conditions.

DRAFT

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

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

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

DRAFT

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JUNE 11, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

Proposal:	The first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 153 dwelling units, approximately 81,500 square feet of office uses, approximately 47,500 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant, personal services) uses, and an 869-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. The proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. The site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive.
Request:	Review and approval of a Development Plan for the first phase of the Bridge Park development and a Site Plan for the building and site details in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.066(E)-(F). This is also a request for review and approval for Site Plan Waivers under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(I), a request for an Open Space Fee-in-Lieu in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.064(D)-(E), and a request for review and approval of a Conditional Use for the parking structures under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.
Applicant:	Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II; (614) 410-4656, rray@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #1: Victoria Newell moved, Steve Stidhem seconded, to approve Site Plan Waivers with conditions of the following 18 Site Plan Waivers:

1. Parapet Height & Façade Wrapping – Code Section 153.062(D)(1)(a)-(b)
2. Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements – Code Section 153.062(N)(4)(a)5
3. Right-of-Way Encroachment – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)1)
4. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(a)1)
5. Transparency – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)1-2)
6. Principal Entrance Location – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)3)
7. Vertical Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)4)
8. Primary Façade Materials – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)5)
9. Upper Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))
10. Occupation of Corner – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(a)1)
11. Ground Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))
12. Blank Wall Limitations – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)2)
13. Number of Street Façade Entrances – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)3 and 153.062(O)(12)(d)3)
14. Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4)
15. Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (153.062(O)(12)(d)4)
16. Open Space Types – Pocket Plazas – Code Section 153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-A
17. Parking Structure Design - Pedestrian Circulation – Code Section 153.065(B)(5)(d)
18. Mid-Block Pedestrianways – Code Section 153.065(I)(2)(a)

VOTE: 7 – 0.

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JUNE 11, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

RESULT: The Site Plan Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Bob Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Steve Stidhem	Yes

MOTION #2: Chris Brown moved, Amy Salay seconded, to approve the Open Space Fee-in-lieu of open space dedication for 0.39-acres of the required 0.77-acres of open space for this phase of the Bridge Park mixed-use development.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Open Space Fee-in-Lieu Determination was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Bob Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Steve Stidhem	Yes

MOTION #3: Victoria Newell moved, Cathy De Rosa seconded, to approve the Development Plan because the proposal meets all applicable review criteria, with three conditions:

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

*Russ Hunter agreed to the above conditions.

DRAFT

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JUNE 11, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Bob Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Steve Stidhem	Yes

MOTION #4: Chris Brown moved, Amy Salay seconded, to approve the Parking Plan allowing for a combined total of 921 parking spaces (garage and on-street) for Lots 4 and 5 where 964 spaces are required by Code.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Parking Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Bob Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Steve Stidhem	Yes

MOTION #5: Chris Brown moved, Amy Salay seconded, to approve the Second Tower element on building C5 in accordance with the provisions of §153.062(D)(4)(a).

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Second Tower was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Bob Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Steve Stidhem	Yes

DRAFT

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JUNE 11, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

MOTION #6: Victoria Newell moved, Cathy De Rosa seconded, to approve the Site Plan because the proposal meets all applicable review criteria, with 13 conditions:

1) That a Development Agreement be approved by City Council and approval is obtained from all impacted property owners prior to issuance of building permits for any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5);
2) That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy;
3) Building Type Conditions
   a. That the applicant give additional consideration to the design of the resident/pedestrian bridges to address the ART's safety concerns and to incorporate greater architectural interest, and that they be modified subject to ART approval prior to building permitting;
   b. That an aerial easement over the Longshore Street right-of-way for the resident/pedestrian bridge is approved by City Council prior to building permitting;
   c. That the balconies at the southwest corner of building C2 are modified to provide the appropriate material transitions on the interior of the north walls of the balconies;
   d. That the balconies are modified to provide a minimum depth of 5 ft. as measured from the façade to the inside of the railing;
   e. That the windows installed within fiber cement panels are detailed with projecting sills to provide articulation along these portions of the building façades;
   f. That the applicant selects vents that are coordinated with the color of the adjacent exterior building finish materials, or that they are painted a coordinating color, subject to Planning approval;
   g. That the applicant modify the north and west elevations of the uppermost story of residential units facing the top open deck of the parking structure (building C4) to be clad with a permitted primary or secondary building material, subject to ART approval; and
   h. That the applicant provide additional details for the canopies at the building entrances, including material, illumination, and mounting details, prior to building permitting and to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Master Sign Plan;
4) Open Space Conditions
   a. That the applicant continue to work with the City (Planning, Parks, and Engineering) on the design details of the Pocket Plazas based on the discussion at the April 30, 2015 ART meeting; and
   b. That the building permit plans and Final Plat include notes that state that the Pocket Parks and Pocket Plazas will be owned and maintained by the property owner, with public access easements.
   c. That public access easements for the Pocket Plazas are dedicated to the City prior to the issuance of building permits.
5) Parking & Loading Conditions
   a. That the Planning and Zoning Commission approve a parking plan for this phase of the development, allowing for a combined total of 921 parking spaces (garage and on-street) for Lots 4 and 5 where 964 spaces are required by Code;

DRAFT

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JUNE 11, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

b. That, as part of the parking plan, the applicant provides information about how the parking spaces within the garage are to be controlled and/or designated for resident use, valet use, etc. at building permitting;
c. That the applicant provide the cut sheets for the bicycle parking facilities (on-street and in the garages) at building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and
d. That the applicant provide stairs to a doorway at the tower in the northwest corner of the building and emphasize the main pedestrian entrance on Longshore Street through additional architectural detailing, at building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and
e. That loading spaces meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(B)(7) are identified on the plans at building permitting.

6) That the plans demonstrate compliance with the City of Dublin Stormwater Management Design Manual at building permitting, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
7) That the applicant addresses the Washington Township Fire comments in the attached report at building permitting;
8) That the applicant addresses Engineering comments in the attached report, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
9) Screening Conditions
   a. That the parapets that exceed the maximum height of 6 feet are coordinated with the location of rooftop mechanical equipment to limit the need for additional rooftop mechanical screens; and
   b. That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner and meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(E)(3), subject to ART approval.
10) That the applicant provide fixture power and efficiency information at building permitting to verify that the exterior lighting requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(F) are met, subject to Planning approval;
11) That a Master Sign Plan be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5);
12) That the applicant continue to coordinate with the City on the public improvement plans and construction details, and that the City's comments are incorporated into the plans prior to issuance of permits; and
13) That building C3 include a green screen on the south and west elevations of the penthouse.

*Russ Hunter agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Site Plan was approved.

DRAFT

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JUNE 11, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Bob Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Steve Stidhem	Yes

MOTION #7: Cathy De Rosa moved, Deborah Mitchell seconded, to approve the Conditional Use because the proposal meets all applicable review criteria, with three conditions:

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

*Russ Hunter agreed with the above conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Conditional Use was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Bob Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Steve Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

_____
Rachel S. Ray, AICP
Planner II

DRAFT

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Newell said the following application is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 153 dwelling units, approximately 81,500 square feet of office uses, approximately 47,500 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant, personal services) uses, and an 869-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She explained that the Commission is the final authority on this entire application and swore in anyone that had intended to address the Commission on this application.

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

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

Ms. Ray said there will be seven motions requested of the Commission, and all of them require a determination this evening, since application reviews in the Bridge Street District are time-limited. She said there are Site Plan Waivers; a request for Open Space Fee-in-Lieu determination, which means the applicant is requesting to not have to provide all the required open space on site; the (final) Development Plan Review; a Parking Plan; approval of a second tower as an architectural element; the (final) Site Plan Review; and then the Conditional Use for the parking structures since they are visible from the right-of-way.

Ms. Ray said the Basic Development Plan and the Basic Site Plan were reviewed and approved by City Council in January 2015 and the Preliminary Plat approval was granted by City Council in March 2015.

DRAFT

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

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

Ms. Ray said the Site Plan focuses on the two lots for development. She said there are four mixed-use buildings containing 153 dwelling units, approximately 81,500 square feet of office uses, approximately 47,500 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant, personal services) uses, and 0.37-acres of open space scattered throughout the site with two larger pocket parks between the buildings. She said as part of this application, there is an Open Space Fee-in-lieu determination. She said there is an 869-space parking garage, 58 on-street parking spaces, and a requirement for 155 bicycle parking spaces.

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

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

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Hunter said it all goes through the roof.

DRAFT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

[There were none.]

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

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

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

Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.

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

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

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

Ms. Newell said the Site Plan has 13 conditions and asked if the applicant was in agreement with all 13 conditions:
1) That a Development Agreement be approved by City Council and approval is obtained from all impacted property owners prior to issuance of building permits for any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5);

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

b. That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner and meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(E)(3), subject to ART approval.

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

Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.

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

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

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

Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.

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

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

Joanne Shelly said this is a request for the second phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 213 dwelling units, 61,800 square feet of office uses, 36,000 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 849-space parking structure on a 4.17-acre site. She said the proposal includes three new public streets, two blocks of development, and pocket parks and open spaces with the use of additional space being calculated from the riverfront park to meet the open space requirement. She said 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 recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Shelly asked the applicants to identify a single contact person for this application.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the contact person is Brian Quackenbush with EMH&T.

Ms. Shelly said the application submittal seems to be fairly complete and will be forwarding comments soon.

Rachel Ray asked if the applicant had incorporated the Planning and Zoning Commission's comments from the C Block review, since some of the architectural comments will likely apply to this block as well.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said they did make changes to building materials based on comments and incorporated metal panels to the penthouses and topped buildings B1 and B2 with a green screen as well, which is what they are proposing to use on the penthouse on building C3. She said they submitted a summary of the Waivers that are being requested.

Gary Gunderman asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He said the target date for ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission is July 2, 2015, for the PZC meeting on July 9, 2015.

PRE-APPLICATION

6. Ohio University Heritage College of Medicine – Parking Lot Expansion
6775 Bobcat Way
Pre-Application Review

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for informal review and feedback on a 227-space parking lot expansion for the Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine located south of Post Road on the east side of Bobcat Way. She said this is pre-application review is prior to the submission of a formal application for a project in the West Innovation District.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, introduced Thomas Raabe with Ohio University and Ben Farrell with EMH&T.

Mr. Raabe said when the new building was proposed, they did not have all of the space occupied in this building. He said they now know that Columbus State will be occupying the third floor. He said Ohio University's parking ratio is 4.6 spaces per 1,000 square feet, and Columbus State's ratio is over 7 spaces per 1,000 square feet, resulting in the need for an additional 200-plus spaces. He said they are proposing 227 spaces with this new layout. He said their Master Planner has seen the design and

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone: 614.410.4600
fax: 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

MAY 7, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

Proposal:	The first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 153 dwelling units, approximately 81,500 square feet of office uses, approximately 47,500 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant, personal services) uses, and an 869-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. The proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. The site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive.
Request:	Review and approval of a Development Plan for the first phase of the Bridge Park development and a Site Plan for the building and site details in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.066(E)-(F). This is also a request for review and approval for Site Plan Waivers under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(I), a request for an Open Space Fee-in-Lieu in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.064(D)-(E), and a request for review and approval of a Conditional Use for the parking structures under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.
Applicant:	Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II; (614) 410-4656, rray@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Chris Brown moved, Amy Salay seconded, to table this Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews/Site Plan Waivers/Conditional Use application at the request of the applicant.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: The Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews/Site Plan Waivers/Conditional Use application was tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Absent
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Bob Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Steve Stidham	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Rachel S. Ray, AICP
Planner II

Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions.

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

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

The meeting resumed at 8:21 pm.

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

Vice Chair Brown said the following application is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 153 dwelling units, approximately 81,500 square feet of office uses, approximately 47,500 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant, personal services) uses, and an 869-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. He said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. He said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. He explained that the Commission is the final authority on this entire application and swore in anyone that had intended to address the Commission on this application.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Ray said the Site Plan focuses on the two lots for development. She said there are four mixed-use buildings containing 153 dwelling units, approximately 81,500 square feet of office uses, approximately 47,500 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant, personal services) uses, 0.37-acres of open space scattered throughout the site with two larger pocket parks between the buildings. She explained that Staff had worked with the applicant to get five smaller pocket plazas along the streetscape. She said there is an 869-space parking garage, 58 on-street parking spaces, and a requirement for 155 bicycle parking spaces.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Salay agreed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Hunter asked that this application be tabled.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

City of Dublin

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

APRIL 30, 2015

The Administrative Review Team made the following determinations at this meeting.

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

Proposal:	The first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 153 dwelling units, approximately 81,500 square feet of office uses, approximately 47,500 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant, personal services) uses, and an 869-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. The proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. The site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan for the first phase of the Bridge Park development and a Site Plan for the building and site details in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.066(E)-(F). This is also a request for review and approval for Site Plan Waivers under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(I), a request for an Open Space Fee-in-Lieu in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.064(D)-(E), and a request for review and approval of a Conditional Use for the parking structures under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.
Applicant:	Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II; (614) 410-4656; rray@dublin.oh.us

REQUEST 1: WAIVERS
Request for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 18 Site Plan Waivers:

1. Parapet Height & Façade Wrapping – Code Section 153.062(D)(1)(a)-(b)
2. Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements – Code Section 153.062(N)(4)(a)5
3. Right-of-Way Encroachment – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)1)
4. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(a)1)
5. Transparency – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)1-2)
6. Principal Entrance Location – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)3)
7. Vertical Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)4)
8. Primary Façade Materials – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)5)

9. Upper Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))

10. Occupation of Corner – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(a)1)

11. Ground Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))

12. Blank Wall Limitations – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)2)

13. Number of Street Façade Entrances – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)3) and 153.062(O)(12)(d)3)

14. Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4)

15. Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (153.062(O)(12)(d)4)

16. Open Space Types – Pocket Plazas – Code Section 153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-A

17. Parking Structure Design - Pedestrian Circulation – Code Section 153.065(B)(5)(d)

18. Mid-Block Pedestrianways – Code Section 153.065(I)(2)(a)

Determination: The 18 Site Plan Waivers were recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

REQUEST 2: FEE-IN-LIEU OF OPEN SPACE
Request for a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a request for payment of a fee in lieu of open space dedication for 0.39-acres of the required 0.77-acres of open space for this phase of the Bridge Park mixed-use development.

Determination: The Open Space Fee-in-Lieu request was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

REQUEST 3: ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTURES
Request for approval of 5 Administrative Departures:

1) Balcony Dimensions – Code Section 153.062(I) – Allowing several buildings C1, C2, and C3 balconies to range in depth from 5 feet to 5.8 feet (minimum 30 square feet is maintained on all balconies).

2) Transparency – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)1 – Allowing the following:

   a. C1 – Ground Story Street Façade Transparency (70% required): 66% on north (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation; Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on east (Longshore Street) elevation, 5th story.
   b. C3 – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on south (Bridge Park) elevation, 5th story
   c. C4 (Corridor Building) – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 28% on east (Mooney Street) elevation, 5th story and 29% on north (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, 5th story; Non-Street Façade Transparency (15% required): 14% on south ("Mews" open space) elevation, ground story.

3) Primary Façade Materials – Code Section 153.062(O)(6)(d)5 – Allowing the following:

   a. C2 – 72% permitted primary materials on the north ("Pavilion" open space) elevation, 72% on the east (Longshore) elevation, 73% on the south (Bridge Park) elevation, and 77% on the west (Riverside Drive) elevation.
   b. C3 – 78% permitted primary materials on the east (Mooney) elevation and 77% on the south (Bridge Park) elevation.
   c. C4 (Corridor Building) – 75% permitted primary materials on the north (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation and 77% permitted primary materials on the east (Mooney Street) elevation.

4) Tower Height – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)6 – Allowing the tower height to be 15.71 feet for building C2, where the maximum is 14 feet.

5) Parking Structure Ceiling Clearance – Code Section 153.065(B)(5)(c) – Allowing 11.5-feet ceiling height on the ground story on Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive, where the minimum clearance is 12 feet.

Determination: Five Administrative Departures were approved by the ART.

REQUEST 4: DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Request for recommendation of approval of the Development Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the following three conditions:

1) That a Development and Infrastructure Agreement (as applicable) be approved by City Council and all impacted property owners prior to issuance of building permit (buildings C1 – C4/C5) and recording of the Final Plat for Bridge Park, Section 1;

2) That the streetscape exhibits are modified to show the 12 feet of clear area along the entire length of the designated Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive shopping corridor, and each patio space, when installed, should provide the minimum 12 feet of clear area; and

3) That a Master Sign Plan is approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5).

Determination: The Development Plan was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 3 conditions.

REQUEST 5: PARKING PLAN

Request for a recommendation of approval of a Parking Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission allowing for a combined total of 921 parking spaces (garage and on-street) for Lots 4 and 5 where 964 spaces are required by Code.

Determination: A Parking Plan was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

REQUEST 6: SECOND TOWER
Request for a recommendation of approval for a second tower element on building C5 in accordance with the provisions of §153.062(D)(4)(a).

Determination: Recommendation for approval for a second tower element on building C5.

REQUEST 7: SITE PLAN REVIEW
Request for a recommendation of approval of the Site Plan Review to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the following 12 conditions:

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

2. That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy.

3. Building Type Conditions

    a. That the applicant give additional consideration to the design of the resident/pedestrian bridges to address the ART's safety concerns and to incorporate greater architectural interest, and that they be modified subject to ART approval prior to building permitting;
    b. That the balconies at the southwest corner of building C2 are modified to provide the appropriate material transitions on the interior of the north walls of the balconies;
    c. That the balconies are modified to provide a minimum depth of 5 ft. as measured from the façade to the inside of the railing;
    d. That the windows installed within fiber cement panels are detailed with projecting sills to provide articulation along these portions of the building façades;
    e. 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;
    f. That the applicant modify the north and west elevations of the uppermost story of residential units facing the top open deck of the parking structure (building C4) to be clad with a permitted primary or secondary building material, subject to ART approval; and
    g. That the applicant provide additional details for the canopies at the building entrances, including material, illumination, and mounting details, prior to building permitting and to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Master Sign Plan.

4. Open Space Conditions

    a. That the applicant continue to work with the City (Planning, Parks, and Engineering) on the design details of the Pocket Plazas based on the discussion at the April 30, 2015 ART meeting; and
    b. That the building permit plans and Final Plat include notes that state that the Pocket Parks and Pocket Plazas will be owned and maintained by the property owner, with public access easements.

5. Parking & Loading Conditions

    a. That the Planning and Zoning Commission approve a parking plan for this phase of the development, allowing for a combined total of 921 parking spaces (garage and on-street) for Lots 4 and 5 where 964 spaces are required by Code;
    b. That, as part of the parking plan, the applicant provides information about how the parking spaces within the garage are to be controlled and/or designated for resident use, valet use, etc. at building permitting;
    c. That the applicant provide the cut sheets for the bicycle parking facilities (on-street and in the garages) at building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and
    d. That the applicant provide stairs to a doorway at the tower in the northwest corner of the building and emphasize the main pedestrian entrance on Longshore Street through additional architectural detailing, at building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and
    e. That loading spaces meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(B)(7) are identified on the plans at building permitting.

6. That the plans demonstrate compliance with the City of Dublin Stormwater Management Design Manual at building permitting, subject to approval by the City Engineer.

7. That the applicant addresses the Washington Township Fire comments in the attached report at building permitting.

8. That the applicant addresses Engineering comments in the attached report, subject to approval by the City Engineer.

9. Screening Conditions

    a. That the parapets that exceed the maximum height of 6 feet are coordinated with the location of rooftop mechanical equipment to limit the need for additional rooftop mechanical screens; and
    b. That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner and meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(E)(3), subject to ART approval.

10. That the applicant provide fixture power and efficiency information at building permitting to verify that the exterior lighting requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(F) are met, subject to Planning approval.

11. That a Master Sign Plan be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5).

12. That the applicant continue to coordinate with the City on the public improvement plans and construction details, and that the City's comments are incorporated into the plans prior to issuance of permits.

Determination: The Site Plan was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 12 conditions.

REQUEST 8: PARKING STRUCTURE CONDITIONAL USE

Recommendation of approval of the Conditional Use for a parking structure with non-occupied space in accordance with the provisions of §153.059(C)(3)(g) to the Planning and Zoning Commission with four conditions:

1) That the parking structure design and interior circulation is modified to limit the entrance/exit on Tuller Ridge Drive to not more than 24 feet wide;

2) That the interior circulation plans are revised at building permitting to allow for adequate stacking space at each entry to the garage (building C4/C5);

3) That the applicant verify whether cameras will monitor pedestrian activity in the parking garage from a remote location, or if other security measures will be taken, at building permitting; and

4) That the applicant provide stairs to a doorway at the tower in the northwest corner of the building and emphasize the main pedestrian entrance on Longshore Street through additional architectural detailing, at building permitting, subject to Planning approval.

Determination: Conditional Use was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with four conditions.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Steve Langworthy

Steve Langworthy, Planning Director

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

Rachel Ray said this is a request for review and approval of the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 153 dwelling units, approximately 81,500 square feet of office uses, approximately 47,500 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant, personal services) uses, and an 869-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan for the first phase of the Bridge Park development and a Site Plan for the building and site details in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.066(E)-(F). She said this is also a request for review and approval for Site Plan Waivers under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(I), a request for an Open Space Fee-in-Lieu in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.064(D)-(E), and a request for review and approval of a Conditional Use for the parking structures under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.

Steve Langworthy said the goal of today's meeting is to work through a number of items so a positive recommendation can be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said this would require cooperation from both the applicant's team and the ART members, although some items might be left to work through next week and following the Planning and Zoning Commission's review.

Ms. Ray presented an overview of the site. She said six actions were presented to the ART today:

1) Site Plan Waivers (19 proposed)
2) Open Space Fee-in-Lieu Determination
3) Administrative Departures (5 proposed)
4) Development Plan
5) Site Plan
6) Conditional Use

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for all 19 Site Plan Waivers, the Open Space Fee-in-Lieu, all five Administrative Departures, and the Conditional Use request.

Ms. Ray said overall, Staff is supportive of the project, but they have some issues with the plan detail and the implementation of those details. She explained that this project is the most complex project that Staff and the ART have had to respond to. She said collaboratively, it is well done. She stated the number one concern is when this plan proceeds to construction and ensuring that all details come together. She noted that this project represents a significant investment on behalf of the applicant and the City, and everyone wants to ensure that it will be constructed to the City's high standards. She indicated that detailed comments have been included in the Planning Report. She said Planning has noted issues with open space and Jeff Tyler has commented on some of the building plans. She stated that the objective for today's ART meeting is to review Staff's comments and concerns so that a resolution can be achieved and recommendations of approval can be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Langworthy said as this is the first phase, Block C will be an example for going forward, and Staff would prefer not to run into similar issues for the upcoming blocks.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the same teams working on Block C will also work on the subsequent blocks, so they will take the comments into consideration.

Parking Structure Design

Ms. Ray stated she wanted to discuss some of the changes that have been made to the parking structure since the plans were previously submitted to the ART. She noted that the ART has discussed their support for the architectural character of buildings C1, C2, and C3, but there had been some changes to the parking structure (building C4/C5) that seem to be a step backward. Previously, she said there was a glass corner for C4/5 at the northwest intersection at Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive, which contained an elevator and stairwell. She said the elevator has since been removed and is now an open brick feature, similar to the rest of the parking garage architecture. She said Staff preferred the previous glass tower, which mirrored the main public lobby in the base of the glass tower at the southwest corner of the site near Longshore Street and Bridge Park Avenue. She noted the difficulties with pedestrian entry on the west elevation. She said now there is a condition that a man door be provided in the tower.

Dan Phillabaum said the changes to the pedestrian circulation resulting from the eliminated glass tower and doorway at the base of the tower created the need for Waivers. He said the purpose of the design requirements for parking structures is to funnel pedestrians to prominent entryways to assist with wayfinding, safety and visibility, etc. He said the glass tower accomplished this more effectively than the revised brick design.

Mr. Hunter said he was under the impression that towers were not permitted, but this addresses that issue and eliminates the need for a Waiver for the second tower.

Ms. Ray said that was not the case. She stated that the required reviewing body has the option of approving more than one tower per building, if it is determined to be architecturally appropriate (much like the discussion on the towers for the Home-2 Hotel). She said the ART supported the second tower on this parking structure because they believed it to be architecturally appropriate.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said they were trying to eliminate as many Waivers as possible. Ms. Ray said Staff had stated their support for the second tower.

Mr. Hunter asked Ms. Umbarger if the tower has to remain open and since she answered it did not, he said the applicant could work on this. Ms. Ray invited feedback from the ART on this.

Colleen Gilger asked if a Waiver would still be necessary. The ART determined that a second tower could be approved if “architecturally appropriate” by the required reviewing body, but it would not be processed as a Waiver.

Fred Hahn inquired about the functionality of that tower. Ms. Ray said a pedestrian cannot enter from the street under the current condition. She acknowledged there were grade issues, and previously, there had been a problem with the door on the glass tower encroaching in the right-of-way. She pointed out where the new entrance was placed in the center of the Longshore Street elevation. She recommended that the glass tower element be reinstated, with a doorway opening. She noted that there would be stairs required, but since there was no longer an elevator in that tower, the accessibility of that entrance was no longer a building code issue.

Mr. Hunter said the tower design was changed because of the five-foot setback required along Tuller Ridge Drive, and that is why they scaled down the tower element, removed the ramp, and moved the accessible entrance to the center of the Longshore Street elevation. He asked if adding stairs would be a possible solution.

Mr. Langworthy said the idea is to provide a door and steps to make it a usable entry. Mr. Hahn asked if the entry would be visible.

Mr. Langworthy invited a response for the ART about the preferred tower design to recommend to the Planning and Zoning Commission, to which the ART stated an entrance with stairs was desired, with the glass tower element in lieu of an open brick tower. Ms. Ray said conditions to that effect were included in the ART Report.

Mr. Tyler suggested that the ADA accessible entrance on Longshore Street be better articulated so it is more visible. Ms. Ray said there is also a condition for that in the ART Report as well.

Ms. Ray said the parking garage material had changed from the last submittal as well, with a lighter shade of brick on the upper stories, and a darker shade along the lower stories, which is in lieu of the masonry cladding. She said in some ways, the different shades of brick help articulate the lower portion of the building from the upper stories, so it is not necessarily a negative change, but she wanted to point it out to the ART members.

Mr. Phillabaum inquired about the changes made to the east and south elevations that mainly focused on a five-foot shift. He said since that relates more to the building placement, he asked what drove the change to the cladding scheme. He explained that before, the application of materials on the residential portions of the building helped it to read with a base, middle, and cap in terms of its architectural composition, but now the sections are not as clear with the more varied application of color.

Ms. Umbarger answered it was to create verticality on the east side and to help address the blank wall requirements. Mr. Phillabaum said if there is no change in the recesses or projections, a color change alone does not help the issue of the blank wall.

Ms. Ray said the applicant may present it to the Commission as it is to obtain their feedback at this point, but she wanted the ART to discuss the modifications to the parking structure.

Waiver Review
Ms. Ray stated she would like to address the 19 proposed Waivers; she went through each one. The numbers below correspond with the Waiver of the same number.

<u>Waiver 1: Parapet Height & Façade Wrapping – Code Section 153.062(D)(1)(a)-(b)</u>
Ms. Ray said the shifts in parapet height result from the applicant's efforts to create visual interest by staggering the roofline around the buildings without inappropriately increasing the height of the parapet consistent with the modern architectural character of these buildings, as well as (in some areas) screening mechanicals in an architecturally appropriate manner (rather than installing separate mechanical screens).

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

<u>Waiver 2: Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements – Code Section 153.062(N)(4)(a)5</u>
Ms. Ray said this Waiver affects the buildings with residential units on upper stories. She said the intent of this requirement is to minimize views of all vents, air conditioners and other utility elements on non-street facing building façades; however, due to the site arrangement with streets on three of the four building elevations for all of the impacted buildings, there is no way to conceal these fixtures and continue to meet Building Code requirements for venting. She recommended approval with a condition that the vents be painted to match the color of the adjacent exterior building finish.

Mr. Tyler asked if flaking was a problem. Mr. Hunter said flaking had not been a problem yet, but they will try and find a color closer to the building materials to minimize the need for painting.

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

Waiver 3: Right-of-Way Encroachment – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)1)
Ms. Ray said Code does not address pedestrian bridge connections between buildings over right-of-ways so this is considered a technical Waiver.

Aaron Stanford said this would require an aerial easement per Legal.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T asked how to best address this since it is not on the plat. Mr. Stanford said he was amenable either way; it comes down to timing and has to have Council approval.

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

Waiver 4: Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(a)1)
Ms. Ray said Lots/Blocks 4 & 5 are at the center of activity in the Bridge Park mixed-use development, centrally located in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District. She said since these buildings are sited along the shopping corridor on Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive, development intensities are expected to be higher on this site than anywhere else in the Bridge Park development.

Mr. Hunter said it fits the desired urban environment. Ms. Shelly suggested green roofs would help this number and encouraged the applicant to consider with the next application. She said it will be worse the next time without green open spaces between buildings. Mr. Hunter noted the roof top terrace but understands they are not green roofs. Ms. Shelly said the key is to process stormwater.

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

Waiver 5: Transparency – Building Type Table (Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)1-2)
Ms. Ray said since the Basic Site Plan Review, the applicant has made great efforts to increase the building transparency on all floors of all elevations while ensuring the buildings remain architecturally appropriate in terms of window placement, overall material composition, etc. She said generally, where blank walls remain, or where the transparency is more than a few percentage points less than the minimum requirement, there are conditions present that warrant Waiver consideration, such as grade issues, utility locations adjacent to the open spaces (with blank walls to be screened by amenities such as screens, landscaping, and other vertical elements within the open spaces).

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

Waiver 6: Principal Entrance Location – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)3)
Ms. Ray said the applicant is proposing to site these lobby entrances along the side streets, which is convenient for visitors and residents arriving and parking in the parking garage, and to prioritize active uses such as restaurant and retail uses along the shopping corridors/PFS – Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. She said building C1 &3 lobby access to residential units on secondary stories, approximate to the parking structure instead of the street.

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

Waiver 7: Vertical Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)4)
Ms. Ray said a couple of elevations exceed the vertical façade division requirement just a bit on buildings C1, 3, and 5. She explained this was an aesthetic choice by the architect, consistent with the architectural character of the buildings.

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

Waiver 8: Primary Façade Materials – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)5)
Ms. Ray said the applicant is proposing to use a variety of materials to accent and provide visual interest in character with the modern architectural style of these buildings. In many cases, alternative materials including composite metal panels and fiber cement panels are proposed on the top-most stories of buildings to define the top of the buildings, lighten the overall building mass, and from a technical standpoint, provide a material that can be applied at higher building heights. She said that this request considers fiber cement panels as secondary materials, rather than a Waiver to consider them to be primary materials. The ART would like the Commission to consider the use of this material.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they felt limited on the selection of primary materials and Mr. Hunter responded it does become limiting when they are limited to brick, stone, and glass. He added that when an applicant wants to create something different, there needs to be a different palette.

Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to show compelling pictures to support the use of this material. Mr. Hunter said fiber cement can be well done and they will produce examples of where they have used it on actual buildings for other projects.

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

Waiver 9: Upper Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))
Ms. Ray said building C2 serves, in part, as a gateway to the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, and the overall architectural composition, including a top story that is slightly greater in height than the lower stories, is appropriate for the building in this location. She added the height maximizes natural light into the building and opens up views of the Scioto River and a future park and pedestrian bridge.

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

Waiver 10: Ground Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))
Ms. Ray said building C4 is just below the minimum requirement. She explained the applicant is proposing to locate residential uses along the ground floor of this building type that is generally intended for commercial uses, although it allows residential uses on the ground floor (provided they are not sited within a shopping corridor). Further she said, the height of the ground story is coordinated with the height of the parking structure, which is wrapped by these residential uses. She stated the upper stories meet the minimum and maximum height requirements.

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

Waiver 11: Blank Wall Limitations – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)2)
Ms. Ray stated that, as noted previously, all of these buildings have four prominent elevations, with streets lining three of the elevations, and open spaces along the fourth. She said as such, siting elevators, utilities, and other building functions is challenging. She said while these functions take place along the open space elevation for building C4, the blank walls are behind electrical transformers, which are in turn screened by a decorative metal screen that serves as an amenity and interesting vertical element in these open spaces.

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

Waiver 12: Number of Street Façade Entrances – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)3) and 153.062(O)(12)(d)3)
Ms. Ray stated the parking structure entrance requirements are better suited to parking structures with commercial uses lining the buildings. She said parking structures in this configuration benefit from concentrating pedestrian access points to relatively limited locations to facilitate improved safety and surveillance, as well as enhance wayfinding for visitors. She said the applicant has agreed to provide stairs to a doorway at the tower in the northwest corner of the building and emphasize the main pedestrian entrance on Longshore Street through additional architectural detailing.

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

Waiver 13: Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4)
She said the ART has previously discussed that the "stepped" horizontal façade divisions are architecturally appropriate and are in keeping with the intent of the regulation to break down the vertical massing of the building.

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

Waiver 14: Corner Side RBZ – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(12)(a)1)
Ms. Ray said the proposed parking structure configuration is intended to maximize parking for this phase of the development and achieve an efficient layout. She said the intent of the 5 to 25-foot corner side RBZ requirement is to provide a buffer between the edge of the parking structure to soften the edges, screen vents and other mechanical elements, and provide space for stacking. She said the building has been designed with planters along the ground story to soften the edge of the parking structure.

Mr. Hunter said the planters would be integrated architecturally into the building. Ms. Ray encouraged the applicant to ensure there are adequate stacking spaces for the garage, as conditioned.

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

Waiver 15: Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (153.062(O)(12)(d)4)
Ms. Ray explained this Waiver for building C5 is caused by a grade change, and the applicant has incorporated architectural features including a brick reveal at the top of the second story, which is an architecturally appropriate application of this detail.

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

Waiver 16: Towers – Building Type Table (153.062(O)(12)(d)6)
In the opinion of the ART, the tower element is appropriately sited, and the dimensions are architecturally appropriate and asked that this now be removed from the Waiver list. Ms. Ray stated that a recommendation would be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission that the second tower on building C5 should be permitted.

Waiver 17: Open Space Types – Pocket Plazas – Code Section 153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-A
Ms. Ray said the applicant has worked closely with the Administrative Review Team to identify locations where smaller, intimate gathering spaces can be provided throughout the Bridge Park public realm. She said the applicant has provided five other open spaces that meet the dimensional requirements, while these additional two spaces are provided to enhance the public realm and provide additional public spaces, while the open space fee-in-lieu request continues to be required. She said if the ART does not approve this Waiver, the fee-in-lieu amount increases.

Ms. Shelly encouraged the applicant to look at planting details to make the most of these areas. Mr. Hahn inquired about meeting the maximum for patios, if there would be leftover space. Mr. Hunter said they

expect the complete opposite to be true, he said tenants will be clamoring for table space. He said he is comfortable with the locations for pocket plazas given the tenants that are interested in those adjacent spaces.

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

Waiver 18: Parking Structure Design - Pedestrian Circulation – Code Section 153.065(B)(5)(d)
Ms. Ray stated that, based on the size and dimensions of the parking structure, there are some instances where the maximum distance is exceeded by 57 feet. She said this could be addressed by adding an additional elevator; however, Code only requires one elevator to serve parking structures. She said providing a man door at the northwest corner could meet the intent.

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

Waiver 19: Mid-Block Pedestrianways – Code Section 153.065(I)(2)(a)
Ms. Ray stated that the location of the mid-block pedestrianway is a result of the configuration of the front property line along Bridge Park Avenue, and the three corner side property lines along the remaining three streets. She said the mid-block pedestrianway is intended to facilitate pedestrian access throughout the site. She noted that most visitors will be arriving to the site and parking in the garage, and therefore will be minimally affected by the mid-block pedestrianway being located slightly outside of the middle third of the block. She added the open spaces have been designed well to appropriately funnel people where they need to go.

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

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 18 Site Plan Waivers:

1. Parapet Height & Façade Wrapping – Code Section 153.062(D)(1)(a)-(b)

2. Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements – Code Section 153.062(N)(4)(a)5

3. Right-of-Way Encroachment – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)1)

4. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(a)1)

5. Transparency – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)1-2)

6. Principal Entrance Location – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)3)

7. Vertical Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)4)

8. Primary Façade Materials – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)5)

9. Upper Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))

10. Occupation of Corner – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(a)1)

11. Ground Story Height – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b))

12. Blank Wall Limitations – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)2)

13. Number of Street Façade Entrances – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)3) and 153.062(O)(12)(d)3)

14. Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4)

15. Horizontal Façade Divisions – Building Type Table (153.062(O)(12)(d)4)

16. Open Space Types – Pocket Plazas – Code Section 153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-A

17. Parking Structure Design - Pedestrian Circulation – Code Section 153.065(B)(5)(d)

18. Mid-Block Pedestrianways – Code Section 153.065(I)(2)(a)

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for Open Space Fee-in-Lieu request for open space dedication for 0.39-acres of the required 0.77-acres of open space for this phase of the Bridge Park mixed-use development.

Ms. Ray said five Administrative Departures were recommended for approval and went through each one. Since there was no discussion needed for any of the departures, Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART approved the five Administrative Departures:

1) Balcony Dimensions – Code Section 153.062(I) – Allowing several buildings C1, C2, and C3 balconies to range in depth from 5 feet to 5.8 feet (minimum 30 square feet is maintained on all balconies).

2) Transparency – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)-(6)(d)1 – Allowing the following:

    a. C1 – Ground Story Street Façade Transparency (70% required): 66% on north (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation; Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on east (Longshore Street) elevation, 5th story.
    b. C3 – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 29% on south (Bridge Park) elevation, 5th story
    c. C4 (Corridor Building) – Upper Story Street Façade Transparency (30% required): 28% on east (Mooney Street) elevation, 5th story and 29% on north (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, 5th story; Non-Street Façade Transparency (15% required): 14% on south ("Mews" open space) elevation, ground story.

3) Primary Façade Materials – Code Section 153.062(O)(6)(d)5 – Allowing the following:

    a. C2 – 72% permitted primary materials on the north ("Pavilion" open space) elevation, 72% on the east (Longshore) elevation, 73% on the south (Bridge Park) elevation, and 77% on the west (Riverside Drive) elevation.
    b. C3 – 78% permitted primary materials on the east (Mooney) elevation and 77% on the south (Bridge Park) elevation.
    c. C4 (Corridor Building) – 75% permitted primary materials on the north (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation and 77% permitted primary materials on the east (Mooney Street) elevation.

4) Tower Height – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)6 – Allowing the tower height to be 15.71 feet for building C2, where the maximum is 14 feet.

5) Parking Structure Ceiling Clearance – Code Section 153.065(B)(5)(c) – Allowing 11.5-feet ceiling height on the ground story on Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive, where the minimum clearance is 12 feet.

Ms. Ray asked the ART to provide comments on the Development Plan and Site Plan, and concerns with the plan details as noted in the ART Report.

Ms. Shelly said it is very apparent that the plans are not well-coordinated between all plans from all of the different applicant consultant teams, which causes Staff to be in the position of quality checking and finding these errors, which in turn causes concern over the overall plan quality and whether the proposed project can be implemented as shown.

Ms. Shelly said Staff met with the applicant several weeks ago specifically to coordinate the streetscape plans with the project plans to determine where the planters should be placed etc., and these comments were never addressed. She said there have not been any changes as a result of that meeting. She said places for future amenities such as bike racks, trash receptacles, benches, etc. that have to be part of the streetscape per the BSD Streetscape Design Guidelines have not been determined.

Mr. Tyler reported he finished the Building Code review for the Site Plan for four buildings and it took twice the amount of time than it should have based on the lack of coordination and the need for quality control. He said that Building Standards had also previously had meetings with the applicant where they went sheet by sheet to help determine what was necessary, and a lot was not taken care of, which resulted in a 25 page correction list. He stated that the ART believed that Staff is satisfied with the design direction, and a relatively small number of Waivers, but the attention to detail is a concern.

Ms. Shelly said because of her experience implementing these types of projects in the field, she is familiar with what can go wrong, and she wanted to raise these concerns. She said quality of the details is important because it is directly related to the longevity of the project.

Mr. Tyler stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission should only have to focus on final, well planned out packages of materials that the ART is comfortable recommending. He said projects should be evaluated based on the merits of their design, not with construction details that can be approved at the building permit stage.

Mr. Quackenbush admitted plans have not been coordinated as well as they should have. He said they are in the process of pursuing a building permit at the same time, and this process is moving fast. He said he believed the ART is also approving the overall concept of the project. He said he was not under the impression that they are at the construction document level of detail in terms of the submittal requirements. He said he believed that the applicant team is pretty well coordinated given how fast this is moving. He said some of the plans are not perfect, mainly because changes are being made daily. He said he thought perhaps too much detail was given to the ART and for the PZC review than is appropriate at this stage.

Ms. Gilger asked what level of detail should be expected for projects in the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Shelly said the main concern is that this project involves a high degree of coordination between the public and private realms. She said when she sees details that are not drawn correctly, it raises a red flag for her that the process is not orderly. She said she understands the speed at which this is moving, but reiterated the importance of collaboration among the applicant team and Staff.

Mr. Langworthy said it appears that quality control has been done by Staff and it should have been done by the applicant. He said the ART expects some level of quality review before the ART is asked to review and make determinations on plans.
Darren Meyer, MKSK, said he struggles with the level of detail needed for the project at this stage of review. He said he was sure that this could be a well-coordinated project as this moves forward.

Ms. Gilger asked if a lot of these details and concerns raised by Staff should happen at the building permitting stage.

Ms. Ray said typically, the answer is yes – however, since there is so much "overlap" between the public improvements and the private project elements, the ART has a responsibility to ensure that this project can be built as shown on the plans.

Mr. Tyler asked the applicant to understand this is the first big project in the BSD and for the ART. He said the ART is working their way through this process just as much as the applicant. He acknowledged that the BSD has many details and nuances that have to be guaranteed correct and appropriate before they are forwarded to the Commission. He said Staff is responsible for checking on details, and if there are problems with coordination, that needs to be brought to the applicant's attention.

Mr. Langworthy concluded that the ART has reviewed and is comfortable with the Waivers and Administrative Departures. He asked to review the issues listed in the ART Report to see if as many of them can be resolved as possible today to get to an approval recommendation.

Mr. Langworthy referred to the Additional Plan Review/Detail Comments on page 18 of the ART Report:

1. The plans should be modified to demonstrate better coordination:
   a. Tree, light pole, and utility locations still to be in conflict with each other and other site furnishings, as well as the street layout.
   b. Where placed within the streetscape, bike racks should be sited and aligned within the furnishings zone.

Ms. Shelly said this was a coordination issue and the placements should be included in the streetscape as what is shown on the plans is not what was agreed to. She suggested another meeting to ensure everyone was in agreement.

Mr. Quackenbush agreed they should all meet again. Ms. Shelly brought up the example of tree grates where detail is needed. Mr. Tyler said this level needs to be with the building permit process. Ms. Shelly said street trees on each block need to be coordinated with the building placement, parking, streetscape, etc., requiring individual coordination per block.

Mr. Langworthy suggested a condition that these be addressed to the City's satisfaction prior to building permitting.

Mr. Langworthy referred to the second comment:

2. Reconsider the following design details:
   a. Select an alternative material for the "Pavilion" canopy (corrugated polycarbonate is not recommended). Further, western red cedar will weather to gray if not sealed or stained annually. The applicant should specify the maintenance schedule on the permit plans.
   b. Verify the boulder installation details, including cutting and anchoring, subject to Planning and Engineering approval.
   c. Provide an appropriate detail for the structural soils in the street section details.
   d. Modify the on-street ADA parking space detail subject to Planning and Engineering approval.
   e. Verify the finish of the concrete walls.
   f. The brick paver detail should not have weep holes.
   g. An "isolation joint" should be provided between the building and the brick walk (similar to between detail of the brick walk and the concrete wall).

The Pavilion canopy material and the treatment of red cedar were discussed. Mr. Langworthy said with the exception of d, all others are a question of maintenance and constructability. Mr. Meyer said the cedar was expected to turn gray over time, and that was an intentional selection.

The ART members discussed the ADA spaces and configuration on the on-street parking spaces, which, as shown, are not preferred. Ms. Shelly suggested that the ADA spaces also be discussed at the upcoming meeting to finalize these streetscape details.

Mr. Langworthy referred to the third and fourth sets of comments:

3. Site Design
    a. The Pocket Plaza at the Riverside Drive/Bridge Park Avenue intersection of building C2 should better relate to the design of the adjacent streetscape, subject to Planning and Parks approval.
    b. The Pocket Plaza at the Riverside Drive entry to building C2 should be modified to better enhance the seating and landscaping opportunities, subject to Planning and Parks approval.
    c. The open space between building C4 & C3 does not have sufficient path lighting.
    d. Details for all tree grates and permeable pavers need to be provided.
    e. All of the pre-cast concrete curbs and seating walls should be designed to deter skateboard gliding.

4. Landscaping
    a. The applicant should specify a minimum size boulder. The plans show minimum 30”-72”width; however, 30 inches is small for a seat and may become a trip hazard. The applicant should consider 48 inches in width as a minimum.
    b. For the bio-retention area, the applicant should consider reinforcing the stormwater with rebar embedded down into the footer as ice pressure will crack non-reinforced concrete.
    c. Label the Eastern Redbud locations on the planting plans (seemed to have been an omission).

Mr. Langworthy asked how many of these items could be addressed now, or in the next week prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Ms. Shelly stated that the same thoughtful planning that went into the designs on the larger pocket parks between the buildings needed to put into the pocket plazas along the streetscape. She said the spaces were on the right track and appropriately placed, but the details need to be thought out a bit more. She referred to the need for ADA accessibility, appropriate plant materials, and installation details to ensure that the plan can be constructed.

Mr. Meyer asked what level of detail is appropriate for this stage of review. He said typically, what they have shown is enough for this phase, which is nowhere near construction document level of design.

Mr. Hahn stated that design feasibility needed to be determined at this stage, and so enough detail needs to be provided to ensure the designs can be implemented, with attention to details for ADA accessibility, and that the 12-foot clear walkway area is provided, etc.

Mr. Meyer asked what information the Planning and Zoning Commission will be looking for in their review. He said he would be fine with working with Staff next week to resolve any remaining concerns and revise plans prior to the Commission meeting next Thursday.

Ms. Shelly said PZC will not look at the illustrative drawings and see the grade change that has a critical impact on the designs of some of these spaces, unless they reference a number of different plans.

Ms. Ray said at this point, the applicant needs to be able to communicate a clear idea of what these spaces are going to be, and that they can actually be installed as shown, with an understanding that

there are many more details to be determined through the permitting and construction stages. She said since the Commissioners are getting plans this evening, and the report is going out tomorrow, there is no more time to make revisions. She said the applicant should be prepared to get feedback from the Commission on the open spaces and the architecture before any more changes are made anyway.

Mr. Meyer said the applicant's objective was to leave today's meeting with the ART's recommendation of approval, so they would like to understand what needs to happen from a timeline perspective for this to be a possibility.

Ms. Ray stated that based on the discussion, she thought the ART would be receptive to moving this forward with a recommendation of approval, and Staff would be open to meeting with the applicant next week prior to the Commission meeting to work through the details.

Mr. Tyler emphasized that accessibility is an issue.

Mr. Hahn reiterated the importance of the minimum 12 feet of clear walkway.

Mr. Langworthy stated that the ART would like to leave the ART meeting with a level of comfort that the issues noted in the report will be able to be addressed. He commented that many of the items listed under 3 and 4 on the comment list are details and corrections, and suggested a reworded condition "that the applicant and Staff continue to work through the details of the open space designs".

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the Development Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission with three conditions:

1) That a Development and Infrastructure Agreement (as applicable) be approved by City Council and all impacted property owners prior to issuance of building permit (buildings C1 – C4/C5) and recording of the Final Plat for Bridge Park, Section 1;

2) That the streetscape exhibits are modified to show the 12 feet of clear area along the entire length of the designated Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive shopping corridor, and each patio space, when installed, should provide the minimum 12 feet of clear area; and

3) That a Master Sign Plan is approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5).

Ms. Ray stated that there is a recommendation of approval for a Parking Plan allowing for a combined total of 921 parking spaces (garage and on-street) for Lots 4 and 5 where 964 spaces are required by Code.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the Parking Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Ray stated that approval for a second tower element on building C5 is recommended in accordance with the provisions of §153.062(D)(4)(a).

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the second tower element for the parking garage, as it was determined to be architecturally appropriate.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART and the applicant if any more of the Site Plan conditions needed to be discussed. Ms. Ray stated that condition 12 should be modified to indicate that the public improvements should be modified through coordination with the City.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they agreed to the Site Plan conditions. Mr. Hunter agreed to the conditions:

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

2. That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy.

3. Building Type Conditions

    a. That the applicant give additional consideration to the design of the resident/pedestrian bridges to address the ART's safety concerns and to incorporate greater architectural interest, and that they be modified subject to ART approval prior to building permitting;
    b. That the balconies at the southwest corner of building C2 are modified to provide the appropriate material transitions on the interior of the north walls of the balconies;
    c. That the balconies are modified to provide a minimum depth of 5 ft. as measured from the façade to the inside of the railing;
    d. That the windows installed within fiber cement panels are detailed with projecting sills to provide articulation along these portions of the building façades;
    e. 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;
    f. That the applicant modify the north and west elevations of the uppermost story of residential units facing the top open deck of the parking structure (building C4) to be clad with a permitted primary or secondary building material, subject to ART approval; and
    g. That the applicant provide additional details for the canopies at the building entrances, including material, illumination, and mounting details, prior to building permitting and to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Master Sign Plan.

4. Open Space Conditions

    a. That the applicant continue to work with the City (Planning, Parks, and Engineering) on the design details of the Pocket Plazas based on the discussion at the April 30, 2015 ART meeting; and
    b. That the building permit plans and Final Plat includes notes that state that the Pocket Parks and Pocket Plazas will be owned and maintained by the property owner, with public access easements.

5. Parking & Loading Conditions

    a. That the Planning and Zoning Commission approve a parking plan for this phase of the development, allowing for a combined total of 921 parking spaces (garage and on-street) for Lots 4 and 5 where 964 spaces are required by Code;
    b. That, as part of the parking plan, the applicant provides information about how the parking spaces within the garage are to be controlled and/or designated for resident use, valet use, etc. at building permitting;
    c. That the applicant provide the cut sheets for the bicycle parking facilities (on-street and in the garages) at building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and
    d. That the applicant provide stairs to a doorway at the tower in the northwest corner of the building and emphasize the main pedestrian entrance on Longshore Street through additional architectural detailing, at building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and

e. That loading spaces meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(B)(7) are identified on the plans at building permitting.

6. That the plans demonstrate compliance with the City of Dublin Stormwater Management Design Manual at building permitting, subject to approval by the City Engineer.

7. That the applicant addresses the Washington Township Fire comments in the attached report at building permitting.

8. That the applicant addresses Engineering comments in the attached report, subject to approval by the City Engineer.

9. Screening Conditions

   a. That the parapets that exceed the maximum height of 6 feet are coordinated with the location of rooftop mechanical equipment to limit the need for additional rooftop mechanical screens; and
   b. That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner and meeting the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(E)(3), subject to ART approval.

10. That the applicant provide fixture power and efficiency information at building permitting to verify that the exterior lighting requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(F) are met, subject to Planning approval.

11. That a Master Sign Plan be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (C1 – C4/C5).

12. That the applicant continues to coordinate with the City on the public improvement plans and construction details, and that the City's comments are incorporated into the plans prior to issuance of permits.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the Conditional Use for a parking structure with non-occupied space in accordance with the provisions of §153.059(C)(3)(g) to the Planning and Zoning Commission with four conditions:

1) That the parking structure design and interior circulation is modified to limit the entrance/exit on Tuller Ridge Drive to not more than 24 feet wide;

2) That the interior circulation plans are revised at building permitting to allow for adequate stacking space at each entry to the garage (building C4/C5);

3) That the applicant verify whether cameras will monitor pedestrian activity in the parking garage from a remote location, or if other security measures will be taken, at building permitting; and
4) That the applicant provide stairs to a doorway at the tower in the northwest corner of the building and emphasize the main pedestrian entrance on Longshore Street through additional architectural detailing, at building permitting, subject to Planning approval.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if he agreed to the four conditions.

Mr. Hunter asked where #3 comes from. Ms. Ray said it is a Code requirement. Mr. Hunter said he agreed to the four conditions as part of the Conditional Use request.

Mr. Langworthy summarized the seven actions that were taken during the meeting:

18 Waivers – Recommended for approval.
Development Plan – Recommended for approval with three conditions.
Parking Plan – Recommended for approval.
Administrative Departures – Approved.
Conditional Use – Recommended for approval with four conditions.
Site Plan – Recommended for approval with 12 conditions.
Open fee-in-lieu – Recommended for approval.

Mr. Langworthy said Ms. Ray would modify her Planning Report accordingly. He concluded by stating that all the actions were approved or recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Mr. Quackenbush asked Ms. Ray about scheduling coordination meetings with Staff early next week.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's recommendations of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the May 7, 2015 Commission meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

Mr. Langworthy adjourned the meeting at 5:12 pm.

The Administrative Review Team approved the minutes May 7, 2015.

City of Dublin

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 23, 2015

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

Other Staff: Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Michael Hendershot, Civil Engineer, II; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Nelson Yoder and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Darren Meyer and John Woods, MKSK; James Peltier and Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan.

Others Present: Dan Phillabaum, dp planning & design, LLC, consultant to the ART.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the April 16, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

CASE REVIEW

1. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park – Phase 1 (C Block)

15-018 DP-BSD/SP-BSD — **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 149 dwelling units, 98,700 square feet of office uses, 48,900 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 864-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Ray reported the determination had been postponed on this application so the applicant could make changes and the revised plans have been submitted today. She explained the purpose for today's review was to discuss the aforementioned changes and ways to possibly eliminate more of the Waivers that had previously been identified. The was to allow sufficient time to provide a recommendation at next week's ART meeting for the PZC meeting on May 7, 2015. The application to the PZC will include the Final Plat.

Steve Langworthy asked if a separate recommendation was needed for a parking plan. He asked if there are to be any Administrative Departures. Ms. Ray indicated there may be a few but would know better next week.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, referred to her Summary of Changes exhibit that she sent to Ms. Ray just prior to the meeting:

Building C1

a) Parapets on all sides of the building have been reduced with the exception of the middle portion of the north elevation where the elevator shaft is located. The height at this location is determined by the overrun required for the elevator. (Waiver 1)
b) EIFS has been removed entirely from the building and has been replaced with a fiber cement reveal system and board and batten system. (Waiver2) The facade material chart has been modified to reflect this.
c) Metal panels on the corner elements have been modified to fiber cement with the reveal system.
d) Vents will be a standard color of brown when they are on brick and white when they are on fiber cement. (Waiver 4)

Building C2

a) Metal panels on the building became a fiber cement reveal system except for the roof cantilever façade.

Building C3

a) Parapets on all sides of the building have been reduced. (Waiver 1)
b) EIFS has been removed entirely from the building and has been replaced with a fiber cement reveal system. The facade material charts have modified to reflect this.
c) Metal panels on the corner elements have been modified to fiber cement with the reveal system.
d) Vents will be a standard color of brown when they are on brick and white when they are on fiber cement. (Waiver 4)
e) The pedestrian bridge between C4/C5 and C3 has changed in design from the pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street. (Waiver 5)

Buildings C4 and C5

a) Parapets on all sides of the building have been reduced. (Waiver 1)
b) EIFS has been removed entirely from the building and has been replaced with a fiber cement reveal system. The facade material charts have modified to reflect this.
c) Metal panels on the corner elements have been modified to fiber cement with the reveal system.
d) The northwest stair exit door has been removed and therefore no longer in the right-of-way. (Waiver 3)
e) The northwest stair has been modified to tie more into the rest of the garage façade. (Waivers 3, 5 and 19)
f) Vents will be a standard color of brown when they are on brick and white when they are on fiber cement. (Waiver 4)
g) The pedestrian bridge between C4/C5 and C3 has changed in design from the pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street. (Waiver 5)
h) The parking layouts have been modified due to the change in stair #4 and the removal of stair #3.
i) The north side of C5/C4 is currently 5 feet away from the property line on Tuller Ridge Drive and landscape will be placed between the building and the sidewalk. (Waiver 6)
j) The southwest lobby has been modified, but the basic elements of the façade are still the same.
k) The calcium silicate was removed from buildings C4 and C5 and replaced with brick along the base of the building on all facades.

Parking

a) Parking counts have increased from 864 to 869, due to the design of the northwest corner.

Material Sheets

a) EIFS has been removed.
b) Fiber cement has been added.

Colleen Gilger asked if fiber cement was a permitted material. Ms. Ray said fiber cement is permitted as a secondary material, limited to 20% of the facade.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, referred the modified tower on the parking structure. He said even though the tower is now open to the elements, it still has a roof over it. Ms. Umbarger explained the tower is open but perforated panels will be used to enclose the tower. She added since the building has now been set back to meet the RBZ requirement, the door has been removed due to grade issues.

Mr. Langworthy asked if cars will be visible in the parking garages. Ms. Umbarger said the tops of some cars may be visible but the applicant tried to cover them up with an upturned beam, which serves as a crash rail. She said they also buffered the view with planters on the west side and where it is higher on the north side, cars may not be visible. She explained the applicant added five feet of landscaping along the Tuller Ridge Road frontage.

Mr. Langworthy noted that the parking counts had increased by five parking spaces and asked where those five spaces had come from. Mr. Hunter explained that more internal bollards were in the plan than were necessary for circulation, and when many of those bollards were removed there was more space for parking.

Ms. Ray requested permit-level drawings to which Ms. Umbarger responded were available and would be sent.

Ms. Ray recalled the ART's prior comments on open pedestrian bridges to C4 and asked the applicant to summarize their response to that comment.

Ms. Umbarger explained the applicant tried to distinguish between the various pedestrian bridges so they would tie into the individual buildings' aesthetics. She said they already raised the guardrail to four feet and offered to raise it to five feet, which she thought would be higher than necessary or practical.

Mr. Hunter added C Block will have two different styles of pedestrian bridges to be consistent. He said the pedestrian bridges are still left open but the applicant feels very strongly about that. He said the applicant would like to take this plan to the PZC to see where they stand.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant if they were keeping the arch design on the pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street. Ms. Umbarger replied the applicant was keeping that design.

Ms. Ray inquired about transparency and whether those percentage calculations had changed with the revisions. Ms. Umbarger said transparency has stayed the same. She noted the applicant had already opened up the windows with the previous submittal to increase transparency. Mr. Hunter said transparency only changed for the garage.

Dan Phillabaum inquired about the move of the tower five feet away from Tuller Ridge Drive and whether it had a domino effect on the loss of parking spaces. Ms. Umbarger explained the right-of-way angles on the northeast side versus the corner on the northwest side and the size of the tower decreased by five feet allowed for some flexibility to keep the number of parking spaces. Ms. Ray said a Waiver is still needed on the Longshore Street elevation for the corner side setback.

Ms. Umbarger summarized the three Waivers that had been eliminated and said the applicant did the best they could about transparency but keeping the units private above was an issue. She said they enlarged the windows to gain transparency but still have a few areas that do not meet the transparency requirement by 1 – 2%.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the applicant addressed and eliminated the issues the Commission seemed to be most concerned about as stated at prior meetings, including no longer using metal panels.

Mr. Phillabaum inquired about a change to the access for Building C4, where the tower was eliminated and a less prominent entrance was relocated to the center of the elevation on Longshore Street. He explained the intent of the provision is to try to steer pedestrians to certain points of a building for access. He asked if the planter introduced is going to be an issue and if an additional break is necessary.

Mr. Hunter added grade was an issue. He said an accessible entry on that corner is impossible, now that the tower has been reduced and moved to the south. He noted the applicant is trying to make the garage as accessible as possible, and the new entry is adjacent to the ADA spaces.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, confirmed that corner is the location of an ADA space.

Mr. Langworthy said he wanted to talk about the architecture. He said he had heard from Council that the architecture had not gone far enough, and so the applicant will need to be prepared to talk about the character and longevity of these buildings, and what they tried to achieve as opposed to what they were trying to avoid.

Jeff Tyler suggested that material choices are included in that discussion. He said there are legal requirements per Code but they can still have opinions on whether the architecture is or is not appropriate for this area.

Mr. Hunter indicated he thought that approach was almost more important than going through descriptions of each building one by one.

Mr. Yoder requested the ART's support for the applicant's direction as the Commission relies on the ART and Staff's recommendations.

Mr. Langworthy said he anticipates most of the comments to be geared towards the corner building and how it will be viewed by pedestrians approaching the building from the pedestrian bridge. He asked if addressing all those past comments had been accomplished.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the architecture planned for the future hotel and office space.

Mr. Yoder stated the hotel will be different, given its location at the roundabout.

Mr. Hunter indicated the ART knows what Block B looks like and with the hotel at the end with the roundabout serving as a gateway; the buildings will need to fit the neighborhood by threading all the elements together but also feel special.

Mr. Langworthy said he thought the parking garage has been disguised really well.

Ms. Gilger noted a typo on page one of the plat that states that Angel Mumma is the acting City Manager, which is incorrect.

John Woods, MKSK, said a round of revisions had been made to the pocket plazas in addition to plant beds and planters on the west side of Building C4. He noted: they added more detail to the plans for the pocket plazas; materials are shown on the perimeter spaces; Bridge Park/Riverside Drive intersection has more detail for the corner; there are granite stairs at the corner of building C2 at the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue; and there are areas preserved for potential art work.

Darren Meyer, MKSK, presented the landscape plans and material palette for the main spaces to the pocket parks surrounding buildings C1, C2, & C3. He explained the right-of-way line will not appear as shown from the pedestrian's standpoint. He pointed out various details regarding the plans, including:

- The locations at some entrances that a granite pavement would be used, which is a charcoal gray
- Locations for the brick pavement that will be laid in a herringbone pattern and is the color of Dark and Manganese ironspot blend for the main areas and eating areas
- Café enclosures that are a modular and metal post and rail systems for infill
- Granite seat walls (18 inches high, 24 inches wide, and ±20 linear feet) that are charcoal gray for various places
- Granite treads (7 inches high and 15 inches wide) in charcoal gray at the corner entrance of building C2
- Precast concrete seat walls (18 inches high, 18 inches wide, and varied lengths)
- Granite planter curbs shown around building C3
- Salvaged boulders
- Ornamental plantings consisting of large masses of understory plants
- Architectural planters that are fiberglass reinforced plastic planters with an integral drainage system
- Precast concrete ornamental planters
- Areas preserved for potential art work

Mr. Meyer showed various examples of café enclosures with varying materials and colors that could be created for different tenants. He said the landscape plan is their "intent" but with the salvaged boulders, it will depend on what they find, etc.

Mr. Tyler inquired about the granite steps and monument stairs since no ADA entrance was shown. He said currently the main doors are not ADA accessible and disabled people cannot be routed around a building to a different entrance. Mr. Tyler assumed the main door would be at the front entrance. Ms. Umbarger said there is no front and back delineated entrances; they are dependent on the potential tenant's needs. Mr. Tyler said that does not matter; they need ADA accessible entrances at the perceived main front entrances.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they know currently enough about the tenant. Mr. Yoder responded they will engage the tenants quickly but it is speculative at this point in regards to table and chairs as they will need to reflect the tenant's character.

Ms. Ray asked how and when public art is determined or obtained, generally. She said right-of-way encroachment could be an issue.

Fred Hahn said art work can be handled in a number of different ways; it is not a one size fits all process.

Mr. Hunter said the applicant will not be looking into art work for about a year as occupancy will trigger what happens.

Ms. Ray said the intent for art work needs to be written into the report.

Mr. Tyler asked if the public art process could be written in the development agreement moving it out of the regulatory process.

Mr. Hahn asked when the design would be reviewed that works with or without art to ensure it would not interfere with the clear zone by reserving a space. He said then the applicant does not have to agree to some condition they may not be able to comply with.

Mr. Meyer said the pocket parks will have a pattern, and lobby entrances are good for that because they are fixed to the character of the tenant.

Mr. Langworthy asked whether the applicant might consider interior gathering spaces as there has been some discussion as to whether this could count towards open space if the public could congregate there. He explained that currently that is not written into the Code but Staff is discussing that change, especially for projects of this size. He gave an example of an atrium in between buildings that would be open 24 hours a day. Mr. Tyler provided an example of the Old Galleria space.

Mr. Hunter said they always envisioned a gallery in the theater space but otherwise he is a having hard time scaling and envisioning such a space. Mr. Langworthy suggested the applicant keep interior gathering spaces in mind if they are short on open space but reiterated this provision does not exist today.

Ms. Ray confirmed the other green spaces that the ART requested along Bridge Park Avenue have been added.

Mr. Meyer pointed out the transformers that will be screened with metal.

Mr. Hahn inquired about an area designated as a pocket plaza on the Riverside Drive elevation of building C2. He asked if it was an architectural enhancement and not an open space; it does not meet any definition. Mr. Langworthy inquired about the required size and dimensions. Ms. Ray said the smallest permitted size is 300 square feet. She asked if it will read like a public space. Mr. Meyer said pocket parks have to be logical resting spaces.

Ms. Ray confirmed that none of these patios were being proposed on day one. She said that separate Minor Project Reviews will be required for each tenant to review the patio placement. She noted that the graphic is shown with what might be considered a “worst case scenario” to show how much patio space could be envisioned, and how that would interact with the dedicated public open spaces and the pedestrian realm.

Mr. Meyer said ferns will be planted in deeply shaded areas. Ms. Ray confirmed the ferns would partially block the vent on the north elevation of the parking garage.

Mr. Hunter said open air garage exhaust will be screened with bulbs and ferns.

Mr. Langworthy asked if tree types had been selected. Mr. Meyer reported an updated plant selection list was reviewed by Brian Martin and Joanne Shelly.

Mr. Woods added trees with higher canopies will be used in areas where pedestrians will be underneath. He said only a few trees will be growing out of pavement areas.

Ms. Ray inquired about stacking spaces for the garage as two spaces are required. Mr. Quackenbush said they met the requirement at the exit but the entry has only about 1.5 car length stacking spaces. Actually, he said he was not quite sure where the stacking is figured; he thinks the layout may be fine.

Mr. Langworthy said Staff assumed there would be some sort of control at the entrances/exits if it was a paid lot. Mr. Hunter said they would just have to be careful about where they place the gate in the future if it is controlled.

Mr. Hahn asked about the size of the cycle track icons placed in the pavement and how many are planned for one block. Mr. Quackenbush answered the inlays occur approximately every 40 feet.

Ms. Ray asked how the intersections were being treated with respect to the cycle tracks. Mr. Quackenbush said the ramp is wider, they plan to have a different style of crosswalk, and the intention is for the cycle track to share the space.

Mr. Hahn indicated that the design of the cycle track icons are not meant for just one block but will be repeated elsewhere in the Bridge Street District, so we should make sure we are in favor of the proposed symbol.

Ms. Ray asked if the circle shape would cause a problem with the brick cuts. She asked if there would be arrows to denote that these cycle tracks are one-way. She pointed out that there is a potential here of having way too much stuff incorporated into the streetscape.

Mr. Langworthy suggested waiting to see how it operates before determining the need for additional signs or identification.

After a brief discussion, it was decided to have the cycle track icons in a shape of a diamond as opposed to a circle to make installation easier. Chevrons within the diamonds to indicate direction were also suggested. Mr. Meyer said both feasibility and cost had to be considered. Mr. Quackenbush suggested defining the path at both ends as opposed to placing an icon every 40 feet.

Alan Perkins said the FDC for building C1 located in the private patio has a landscape planter in the way and having it moved to the corner still did not provide access. He said this needed to be evaluated more.

Mr. Tyler cautioned the applicant to make sure all outdoor balconies have covers underneath so no wood is exposed.

Mr. Phillabaum asked if there were alternatives for the roof vents that were just proposed in white or brown. He said previously the plans stated the vents would be painted to match. He expressed his concern about the stark white color and would prefer that the vents coordinate with the building materials and not stand out. Ms. Umbarger responded that white and brown were the standard colors that they planned to use because paint chips but offered to look into this matter further.

Mr. Langworthy noted that some of the Waivers may become Administrative Departures if they fell within the requirements for a Departure.

Ms. Ray concluded that with an ART determination scheduled for April 30, to be forwarded to PZC on May 7, 2015, the final materials would need to be submitted at the ART meeting on Thursday to go out in the Commission packets on Friday.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or comments. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:20 pm.

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 26, 2015

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

Rachel Ray said this is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 149 dwelling units, 98,700 square feet of office uses, 48,900 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 864-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Ray complimented the applicant for their efforts thus far that included the elimination of some of the Waivers and said Staff would continue to review the details of the plans as they are updated.

Ms. Ray stated there was an issue with the number of entrances for Building C4 residential elevations on Mooney Street. She noted that she had discussed with the applicant potentially allowing direct connections to the street from the at-grade resident patios. Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said the applicant had concerns about the public coming onto the patios on the ground floor levels and said she did not want to introduce entrances per the privacy issue. Ms. Ray asked if gates could be considered. Ms. Umbarger stated that the applicant elected not to provide any access.

Ms. Ray said the designs proposed for the pedestrian bridges were not acceptable to Staff. She explained that this issue had been discussed previously, and the designs have not evolved in the same manner as the buildings. She said the bridges needed to be eye-catching and prohibit activity such as throwing debris or the ability for pedestrians to fall or jump.

Ms. Umbarger said the railing on the pedestrian bridges was raised 48 inches to prevent falls, which is higher than what is required by the Building Code. She said the applicant does not want to enclose the bridges as it would prevent engagement with any street activity below.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, added they do not want glass boxes and losing the connectivity with the activity below would be the worst case scenario.

Ms. Ray emphasized that the pedestrian bridges cross the City's rights-of-way. She said 48 inches for railing height is high but not high enough. She indicated Staff had trouble envisioning how the design would relate to the open space below from a character perspective. She said elements like transformers were being screened and asked if similar design approaches could be considered for the pedestrian bridges. She stated that functionality and aesthetics were the issues here and restated that the designs have not come far enough.

Steve Langworthy asked if the applicant had information on the history of communities where debris being tossed off similar bridges was an issue. Ms. Umbarger responded she had no such information.

Mr. Hunter stated that the people that will be using the pedestrian bridges are the same people that are residents in those buildings, since they are secure and not accessible to the general public. He said residents

could do just as much harm from their own balconies. He added that key cards were needed to gain access to the bridges. Ms. Ray indicated there were numerous scenarios where a person may gain access, even if they do not reside on the premises.

Ms. Umbarger said the applicant wants to keep the open air effect for the pedestrian bridges, and a chain-link fence would not be an option like they are used for overpasses.
Mr. Hunter indicated that if the bridges were screened like the transformers, they may appear acceptable when up close but in the air would look like boxes.

Ms. Ray suggested the applicant consider another type of bridge that could be artful and light. She indicated there are hundreds of examples to be found.

Claudia Husak said the pedestrian bridges would not just be seen by the users but from everyone visiting the Bridge Park development from the open space below.
Colleen Gilger asked if proposed materials were the issue for the pedestrian bridges or the design itself, from Planning's perspective. Ms. Ray answered it was the design – both functionally and aesthetically.

Joanne Shelly emphasized that the bridges will be visible to everyone in the street. She said not enough has been done on the applicant's part to review the aesthetics of the bridges. She asked if the intent was for all the bridges to be the same.

Ms. Umbarger said all the bridges would be the same as they would be iconic to Bridge Park; the applicant did not want five different types of bridges.

Jeff Tyler suggested the applicant provide images of similar bridges where they have been successful noting both the function and the location with the images. Ms. Umbarger reiterated she thought these bridges fit in with the Bridge Park appearance.

Mr. Tyler suggested that subtle changes could be made from bridge to bridge, keeping the same overall iconic structure. He asked how the bridges would be finished underneath. Ms. Umbarger explained that linear lights were proposed to be installed underneath the bridges as well as on the ceilings inside.

Since lighting was involved, Mr. Tyler suggested the applicant demonstrate both the experience during daylight as well as at night.

Ms. Shelly asked the applicant if they viewed the proposed bridges as an iconic design.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the bridges were to serve as a statement for the development.

Mr. Hunter replied in some respects the bridges would serve as an icon for the development. He said they want to have a product that is not seen in a lot of other developments. He said it is not an "in your face" type of icon as they do not want the bridges to take away anything from the buildings. He said the applicant is after clean detail but not a design that is "over the top."

Ms. Ray recommended that the applicant consider other designs for the pedestrian bridges as Staff was not supportive of the current proposal. She said without a recommendation from the ART, the applicant would be responsible for selling this design as the application moves forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Ray noted that EIFS continued to be noted on the plans as a secondary material, and asked Mr. Tyler to review the quality and installation information provided by the applicant.

Ms. Umbarger explained that the EIFS material acts as a rain screen system where the water flows down through the space instead of getting held up in the insulation.

Mr. Tyler said Staff is not recommending EIFS as it is not permitted by the BSD Code.

Ms. Ray said vinyl windows had been eliminated from the proposal. She said if the applicant decides to go with fiber cement panels that similar quality and installation information needed to be provided.

Ms. Ray addressed the Waivers for garage entry widths and stacking requirements for the parking structure. She said 20 feet for stacking is required and will not to fit on this site for the Longshore and Tuller Ridge entrances. She said this is important as the entrances are close to intersections. She asked if the inside of the garage entry could be modified to meet Code. She indicated this is not a pay-for-park garage now but it could become one in the future when stacking would be more of an issue. She recommended this be a condition rather than a Waiver.

Ms. Ray asked for clarification on where the entry gates for the parking garages would be located with relation to the stacking spaces. Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, asked for clarification on this Code requirement. Ms. Ray said there needed to be two vehicle stacking lengths at least 20 feet in length between the street and the entry gate. She said the way Code is written the stacking could potentially block the sidewalk. Mr. Quackenbush said he will review the entrances and adjust the gates as necessary. Ms. Ray recommended this be a condition.

Ms. Ray inquired about the Parking Plan's revised calculations. Ms. Umbarger said the calculations were based on restaurant use only, which have the highest parking requirements instead of considering a combination of retail and restaurant use in the calculations.

Ms. Ray inquired about open space as a gateway feature and streetscape element.

Darren Meyer, MKSK, presented several hard copy ideas as they were being discussed with the ART. He presented a graphic showing the 12-foot clear area and how they line up along the intersecting paths of travel along Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive. He explained that the right-of-way meets at right angles but that is not how people move. He said a more natural flow for pedestrians would be to cut the corners so he presented curved corners and where the planters could possibly start or end. Signature intersections were discussed and how emphasis could be made to promote the importance of those intersections with the use of plantings, monumental stairs that accommodate seating and the possibility for use of boulders, granite, or art pieces/sculptures. The "corners" and business frontage need to service the buildings but be a public feature. The idea of how the corners should relate across Bridge Park Avenue was discussed. Mr. Meyer suggested that the intersections provide an opportunity to tell a story and provide a lot of visual appeal.

Ms. Shelly suggested the use of other elements, such as sculpture and presented an example of an eye-catching curved, wooden bench; we do not have to be limited to boulders and granite.

Mr. Meyer asked what would define an area for a visitor. He suggested a brick intersection, lush streetscape, pedestrian bridges, and great five-story urban architecture. He said there needed to be a balance for scale to not overload the public realm, but not be too small either.

Mr. Hahn said curving the corners helped the design. Ms. Shelly said no matter who owns the right-of-way line, the entire area feels like quasi-public space up to the face of the building. Mr. Meyer said areas on B block to the south across Bridge Park Avenue would require less features than on this side of the intersection. He suggested the blocks complement each other rather than match.

Ms. Ray inquired about the single tree conceptually shown between the boulders in the proposed design at the corner of Building C2 and asked if art could be placed there instead of one lonely tree. She asked if the landscape could be lowered to allow more "breathing room." Mr. Meyer said art can be placed on granite or within the landscape. He said a tree adds value and pointed out the corner is facing west and would become hot in the summer so shade would be desired and it would break up the scale. Mr. Langworthy asked what kind of tree would be planted there. Mr. Meyer said the limbs would not begin until at a higher level to promote views. Mr. Hahn was not supportive of the single tree approach.

Ms. Shelly suggested there could be a pop of color to draw the eye to the area and presented examples.

Mr. Meyer said he would move forward with his plans to open up the corner, refining the details to create a presence.

Ms. Shelly inquired about outside restaurant seating and stated that the seating area would only be used four months of the year, or five months at most. She asked the applicant how that space would be treated during winter and the rainy seasons when not in use. If fence lines or planters were used to delineate this space, she asked if they would be temporary or permanent fixtures.

Mr. Meyer said the worst-case scenario would be a wobbly fence around stacked chairs and tables. He said planters could contain seasonal displays.

Mr. Hunter said they would not want stacked furniture but could not conceive how the seating areas could completely go away during the off season. He agreed to prepare a plan showing possible tenants to occupy the tenant and patio spaces along Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue to show the ART what uses are adjacent to each other and anticipated for those areas. He said every tenant will come to the ART asking to create their own unique space so what he would present would just be a baseline estimate. Ms. Ray stated that the PZC has indicated concern about tenants requesting enclosures that would take away walkable space for pedestrians and cyclists.

Mr. Hunter said even if he illustrated "worst case scenarios," there would still be breathing room for pedestrians. He said the tenant occupied line would not be continuous but interrupted by the variety of tenants.

Mr. Meyer concluded by asking the ART if he was moving in the right direction with his designs.

Mr. Langworthy said there is not a lot of space to work with.

Mr. Meyer said he thought presenting the pedestrian view at street level would provide a better context within the architecture and the parks.

Ms. Ray reiterated that the ART is supportive of the general direction of the discussion.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or comments. [There were none.] He stated that the ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on April 9, 2015, was scheduled for April 2, 2015.

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 19, 2015

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

Rachel Ray said this is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings with 149 dwelling units, 98,700 square feet of office uses, 48,900 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 864-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Ray said she had no new materials to present. She said the applicant has received the most up-to-date comments from Staff. However, she did say that the applicant has retracted vinyl windows as a proposed material.
Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, asked if it is acceptable for the applicant to be at 29% transparency when 30% was required. Ms. Ray said that could be within the Administrative Departure range if the applicant had reached their limit after exhausting all architecturally appropriate options.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant if they had anything new to present or was it still a work in progress.

Miguel Gonzales, Moody Nolan, said the applicant met the maximum transparency at the retail level but were working through the levels above.
Ms. Umbarger reported that the right-of-way and door swing issues were all resolved except for the tower element for building C4 at the parking garage entrance.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, added to achieve a door swing in the tower, a ramp would need to be removed, and therefore, recessing the doorways was not an option.

Mr. Gonzales reported that Building C1 met the vertical increments at street and residential levels but was a problem at the roofline for aesthetic purposes. He asked if a Waiver could be requested. Ms. Ray asked if any portions of the façade could be pushed out or pulled in to create some dimension.

Ms. Umbarger explained that the elevator overrun would be exposed if there was no parapet. Joanne Shelly said a Waiver could be supported if the applicant demonstrates the need based on practical reasons.

Ms. Umbarger noted a secondary material issue. Mr. Hunter said the applicant prefers fiber cement siding if it does not compromise the design. Mr. Gonzales added the final installation of the product is a concern and will depend on the quality of the install.

Ms. Shelly asked which product wears out first, between EIFS and fiber cement. Mr. Hunter said if both are done right, EIFS is guaranteed upwards of 10 years and fiber cement/Hardi-Plank can yield a warranty upwards of 20 years.

Ms. Shelly pointed out that since the secondary material would be used on the higher elevations, and will need repair in 10 – 20 years, to consider that a large machine/lift will be required to achieve the

replacement. Mr. Hunter said he preferred to go with cementitious siding. Ms. Shelly said quality also depends on the fasteners. Mr. Langworthy suggested that the way to help gain approval is for the developer to engage a third-party inspector that would report findings regarding installation directly to the City.

Deadlines for materials to be reviewed were discussed briefly.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, concluded that MKSK was close to having the materials completed showing the streetscapes, rights-of-way, and buildings on Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further comments or questions regarding this application at this time. [There were none.] He said a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission on this application would be scheduled for April 2, 2015.

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 12, 2015

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

Rachel Ray said this is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 149 dwelling units, 98,700 square feet of office uses, 48,900 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 864-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Ray provided a handout with the ART's preliminary analysis for the Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews that included Code specific requirement tables to highlight issues still to be resolved.

Development Plan

Ms. Ray said she expected the detailed comments on the public improvement plans by the end of this week/early next week of March 16th since the comments on the public improvements will equally apply to this application.

Ms. Ray identified four **Public Improvement** items to be discussed:

- A minimum of one ADA space per street segment on each side of the street near crossings/mid-block crossings was needed. She said one on Bridge Park Avenue between Longshore Street and Mooney Street would be sufficient. She said ADA ramps were also required.

  Aaron Stanford added that the spaces and ramps needed to be appropriately dispersed throughout the development.

- Crosswalks should be specified to match the BSD Streetscape Design Guidelines and mid-block crossings should have brick pavers or an otherwise different material to call attention to them for motorists and pedestrians.
- An additional crosswalk was needed at the fourth leg of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Longshore Street.
- Motorcycle parking spaces needed to be provided where room was available along the streetscape. She said the spaces should be approximately four feet by nine feet and installed with the same brick pavers. She suggested the applicant consider areas where there was not sufficient space for a full motor vehicle but could accommodate motorcycles.

Ms. Ray identified three **Right-of-Way Encroachment** items to be discussed:

- Doors are not permitted to encroach in the right-of-way. Code requires a minimum recess of three feet.
- Canopies may be acceptable if they meet the minimum height clearance of eight feet.
- Balconies and building elements are being reviewed with Legal.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, said there was a case to be made for the doors that were not in the shopping corridor and to the right of intersections.

Ms. Ray said the applicant would have to demonstrate adequate space to accommodate the doors to support a potential Waiver. She said five feet is the acceptable space permitted for the door swing while maintaining adequate sidewalk width.

Joanne Shelly suggested using a sliding door as an option.

Site Plan

Ms. Ray provided some **general comments** per the ART's analysis:

- All plans (especially architectural plans) should be numbered.
- Ground floor uses should be labeled on all plans shown.
- Streets should be labeled if a right-of-way is visible on any plan or rendering.
- Scale is off on many of the architectural plans.
- Narratives should be provided on 8.5 by 11 inch paper, not full sized plans for Building Variety, Gateways, Waivers, and Alternative Material Statements, etc.
- The overall use area tables on the cover page for each building do not match the square footages for each floor plan, i.e. should show total circulation, service, amenity, patio, and consistent use of retail and/or food and beverage.

Ms. Ray discussed **Waivers** in general:

- Need to specify which Waivers apply to which elevations and which floor/level for each building.
- All rationales are insufficient that state "maximum transparency is provided adequate to the design and programmatic functions at this level" or similar.

Ms. Ray recommended the elimination of as many Waivers as possible; the ART is not convinced the issues cannot be resolved at this time. She said more information is needed. Ms. Ray emphasized after the applicant takes another look at the buildings and the Code requirements, the final list of Waivers need to meet the four **Waiver criteria**:

- Request is caused by unique site, use or other circumstances
- Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience
- Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District
- Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality

Ms. Ray referred to the highlighted areas in the handout and explained those items need to be addressed by the applicant. She said the applicant should consider what issues can be eliminated and to provide more information where requested. She emphasized that all details need to be worked out prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Ms. Ray discussed **Site Operations**:

- Valet Service
- Waste Removal

Ms. Ray asked if valet spaces would be provided in the parking garage, the parking spaces would need to be identified (label and counts) for which will be public, which will be private, and which would be designated valet spaces. She asked where valet stops would be located along the streetscape.

Jeff Tyler said the applicant needs to specify the types of parking in parking garages, i.e. compact vehicles, ADA, etc.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the special electric, compact, and ADA spaces have been identified and will show the labels and counts on the plan. He said valet service may be considered if certain tenants request it but to date, no tenants have requested valet service. He said possible valet stops could be provided along Longshore Street in front of Building C2; and north of Building C1 but has not had the opportunity to identify such stops.

Mr. Tyler suggested the applicant provide information on the intent of operations for valet service as this has been a recent issue for other areas of the City.

Ms. Ray said a Parking Plan is needed to address the parking, which is short of meeting the Code requirement since the plans show the parking counts on both sides of the street (only the sides immediately adjacent to this phase count toward meeting this phase's parking requirements). She stated that parking functions need to be described, and valet parking needs to be factored into the total numbers.

Mr. Yoder explained for waste management that a central collection point has been established with a trash compactor and permits were being pursued. He said office and retail trash is collected by the staff of that tenant and brought to this location. He said this would be no different than having dumpsters in the parking lot.

Ms. Ray said the trash strategy needed to be explained in a document from a property management standpoint.

Joanne Shelly inquired about waste removal and transportation between buildings during inclement weather or when there was snow and ice on the ground. She recalled the consideration of wheeling little carts around, which would need to go across the street and down the sidewalk. She asked why trash is not internal to each building.

Mr. Yoder said it was not a Code requirement to have trash next to each building and one compactor was better. He said the applicant considered remote compactors but decided this plan was best when trash trucks were considered going in/out of the site and the noise the trucks would produce.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, added if there was not the central collection point there would be dumpsters and compactors all throughout the site.

Gary Gunderman inquired if buildings were sold off to separate developers, what those buildings were to do for waste management. Mr. Yoder said any and all buildings would still have access to that central location; it would be a matter of easements.

Ms. Ray said the plan would need to be written to address when buildings are sold to other developers.

Ms. Ray discussed **Open Space**:

- This plan requires approval of a fee-in-lieu of open space dedication.
- Pocket Plazas along Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive are needed to be consistent with the approved Basic Site Plan.
- Staff will provide recommended species replacements and other details for landscaping.
- Door swings from the building onto the ramps and adjacent walkways do not meet ADA accessibility requirements.

- Placement and accessibility of the fire department connection (FDC) in the Pavilion and the FDC adjacent to the Mews are too close to the adjacent tree planters.

Ms. Ray said the applicant needs to demonstrate that there is the required clear space for the streetscape and need to determine a "worst case scenario" for patio fencing.

Mr. Yoder asked for an alternative to the current cycle track locations. He said that cycle tracks were not necessary for the main shopping corridor and thought bicyclists could be re-routed around Bridge Park Avenue onto West Dublin-Granville Road and the roundabout. He said he was concerned that there would be adequate space for both cyclists and pedestrians to share and was considering an alternative solution.

Claudia Husak questioned this concern since the topic had already been discussed and determined by City Council with the Basic Development Plan and Preliminary Plat, which Council approved on Monday of this week.

Ms. Ray added that she appreciates what the applicant is saying but it was too late to make those changes and Staff's position was to be consistent with all plans. She suggested that if the applicant was concerned, buildings could be moved back to accommodate adequate space.

Ms. Ray emphasized the need for a streetscape exhibit that shows cyclists and pedestrians sharing the same spaces. She noted the conflict with doorways for ADA accessibility for the Mews and the Pavilion open spaces.

Mr. Tyler recommended that the applicant explore alternative door options.

Ms. Ray said the FDC was not shown on the plan and proximity to the planter is an issue for the Mews open space.

Alan Perkins explained that the concern for the FDC location was that the trees might be planted far enough away but future tree growth could obstruct visibility and accessibility. He said FDC identification signs were also required and in detail. Mr. Perkins noted the distance of the fire hydrant to Building C1 was okay but there are potential issues for accessing it with the configuration of the Pavilion open space. Again, he said, planting beds obstruct the hydrant.

Ms. Ray discussed **Lot Coverage**:

- Provide semi-pervious coverage percentages and details (either inside of ROW or on Building Terraces).
- Provide more information:
    - **Parcel 2** (Buildings C3 & C4) = 93.27% Impervious Coverage
        - Parking Structure permits maximum 80% impervious coverage with additional 10% semi-pervious coverage
        - Corridor Building permits maximum 80% impervious coverage with additional 10% semi-pervious coverage
    - **Parcel 3** (Buildings C1 & C2) = 90.13% Impervious Coverage
        - Mixed-Use Building permits maximum 85% impervious coverage with additional 10% semi-pervious coverage
        - Corridor Building permits maximum 80% impervious coverage with additional 10% semi-pervious coverage

Ms. Ray said a **Lighting Plan** needed to be submitted. Mr. Quackenbush said a lighting plan was submitted. Ms. Ray specified that the lumen/power level needed to be identified for building light fixtures and compliant with Code Section 153.065(F).

Ms. Ray discussed **Tree Removal/Replacement**:

- Show what is required, per Code Section 153.065(D) Tree calculations not shown.

Mr. Quackenbush said they have tree replacement information. Ms. Ray specified that overall project calculations were not included and the total bottom line per open space was needed.

Ms. Ray referred to the extensive list of items in the Building section and highlighted several items:

Ms. Ray discussed **Pedestrian Bridges:**

- Need details including appearance of undersides, lighting, interiors, etc.
- Open design needs to be modified as noted at the Basic Site Plan – the design of these bridges must discourage jumping, climbing, and the throwing of debris.

Ms. Ray emphasized the need to accomplish the design objective.

Mr. Stanford asked if lighting elements had been incorporated. Mr. Tyler said the lighting needed to be functional but aesthetically pleasing as well.

Mr. Yoder said the applicant is enclosing the bottom of the bridge and will make sure they are exceeding the Code requirement. Ms. Umbarger said the railing height had been increased.

Mr. Yoder said the objective was to prevent the pedestrians crossing the bridge to be disconnected from the activity below.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said that was the way he presented to City Council as well.

Ms. Ray said the expectation was that the pedestrian bridges be as “cool and interesting” as possible with a lot more detail. She said the design was not where it needed to be to move forward.

Ms. Umbarger said the details were in the construction documents. Ms. Ray explained that that level of detail needed to be in this set of plans; the construction documents act as backup material, not part of a submittal. She said normally Staff would have all of that information at this stage.

Ms. Ray discussed **Alternative Materials:**

- More information is needed such as specifics on installation details, inspection commitments, warranty information, and examples with better/non-blurry pictures that indicate the approximate age of the product.

Ms. Ray said Staff appreciates what has been received from the applicant so far but information about installation, quality, or depth have not been provided and emphasized the need for details. She suggested that the applicants attend the Commission meeting that evening to hear the case for Tuller Flats as they are also trying to introduce alternative materials.

Mr. Tyler added that the ART has had this same issue with the Tuller Flats applicants as they are with the current applicant regarding alternative materials. He said Staff has been emphasizing the need for detailed

information to actually review to enable a recommendation to the PZC. He said it is difficult to make a case for alternative materials that depart from Code. He explained that the Commission will ask the ART if the ART supports the materials; therefore the applicants need to work toward an ART recommendation of approval as the first step.

Ms. Shelly read from Code "Other high quality synthetic materials may be approved as permitted primary or secondary materials by the required reviewing body with examples of successful high quality installations in comparable climates." Ms. Shelly emphasized that Staff's objective is to help the applicant meet the requirement. Ms. Umbarger said the applicant is trying to comply, but they are not sure what Staff expects them to submit in support of the alternative materials.

The ART critiqued the photo examples the applicant provided and asked for close-up photos of the materials as they have been used. The ART asked that the photos are identified better to show where the projects are located. Mr. Tyler recommended that the Convention Center photos be eliminated from the examples.

Mr. Yoder said he understood what the ART is asking and will show detailing.

Ms. Ray concluded there are numerous items in the Building section to work through and she emphasized that the applicant review the tables where she highlighted the need for clarifications, etc. She supplied the applicant with the Site Plan that included her mark-ups.

Mr. Yoder said he is supporting brick but inquired about cementitious material as a secondary material. Mr. Tyler said cementitious material could be used as a secondary material for their project.

Mr. Ray said she approved of the applicant's plan of intent, architecturally. She said this application will continue to be reviewed by the ART at the next two meetings and a recommendation is scheduled for March 26, 2015, which would require the applicant to submit final plans by March 23rd. She explained this will enable the application to be forwarded to the PZC for their meeting on April 9th.

Mr. Gunderman asked the ART if there were any further comments or questions regarding this application. [There were none.]

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

Mr. Gunderman adjourned the meeting at 3:02 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team March 19, 2015.

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 5, 2015

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

Rachel Ray said this is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 149 dwelling units, 98,700 square feet of office uses, 48,900 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 864-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Ray provided a handout for the Development Plan showing how the application measured against the Code and highlighted the few outstanding issues.

Transportation
Ms. Ray said multiple modes of transportation needed to be considered: how buses could be accommodated within the travel lanes along Bridge Park Avenue; cycle track details including materials, delineation, sign, and intersections; and motorcycle parking. She asked if COTA needs 11 feet for buses, the applicant should show how they would be accommodated, and how pedestrians would be able to access the sidewalk, etc. She suggested that spaces for motorcycle parking could be incorporated on Tuller Ridge Drive.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, requested clarification on delineation of the cycle tracks. Ms. Ray deferred to Joanne Shelly and Aaron Stanford. She said how bikes will need to navigate the intersections at Mooney and Longshore needed to be determined as well.

Crosswalks

Ms. Ray said design and materials should be noted on the plans, consistent with the BSD Streetscape Design Guidelines.

Streetscape Detail Plan
Ms. Ray said the 12-foot clear path of travel along the shopping corridor, cycle tracks, open spaces (public and private) and possible patio areas needed to be shown on the plans. She said how pedestrians interact with that space also should be included. She requested close-up renderings along Bridge Park Avenue as well as design intent and typical layouts for areas where a patio bleeds into an open space.

Mr. Quackenbush said MKSK had the detail on the street sections.

Gateway Detail Plan/Narrative
Ms. Ray said an explanation was needed to state how the Bridge Park Avenue/Riverside Drive intersection is treated as a gateway and how it will correspond with Phase 2 to the south. She asked that the design for the tower at Bridge Park Avenue be taken a step farther by providing a perspective rendering showing the intent for a gateway.

Mr. Quackenbush said MKSK is working on the plans to show the integration of patios.

Parking

Ms. Ray said on-street parking could only be counted for buildings and uses on the same side of the block, so the Site Plan detail needed to be revised. She said the applicant will be short some spaces but could address this through a parking plan.

Ms. Ray requested the RBZ be removed from the Final Plat as it was already being shown on the Site Plan.

Dan Phillabaum inquired about the height requirements for the tower on Building C2. He said information is needed.

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, said the tower exceeds the requirements by ±22 feet as the applicant wants the tower to be a cornerstone element.

Steve Langworthy noted that it might be possible for Staff to support a Waiver for the height of the tower, if it is a strong gateway element.

Mr. Phillabaum said Building C3 needed material transitions shown.

Joanne Shelly said it was an opportunity for the applicant to provide a rendering of the interior detail.

Mr. Phillabaum asked that the applicant confirm that the parapets are tall enough to screen rooftop mechanicals and units.

Mr. Briya said small condensers were designed for each residential unit within the footprint of the roof.

Jeff Tyler said the range hoods for restaurants also have to be screened as there is a height and screen requirement.

Mr. Phillabaum reiterated that building entrances needed to be recessed three feet from the base of the building so doors do not swing into the right-of-way. Mr. Quackenbush said he recalled the plans were acceptable. He said it would be difficult to change some of the entrances. He asked if a Waiver could be requested for key locations.
Ms. Ray said a Waiver could be considered where there is a lot of space if there was at least a five-foot sidewalk but not in the tight areas. Mr. Quackenbush asked if the applicant could show adequate space, if specific areas could be considered. He said he understood the applicant would have to demonstrate the appropriateness.

Mr. Langworthy noted that there should be as few Waivers as they can provide. Mr. Briya said they covered a handful so far but there are problems with the C2 building as changing the entrances would impact the architecture. Mr. Briya clarified the required entrance design would not visually look as good.

Ms. Shelly recommended sliding flush doors as an alternative option. She said those doors are better for weather and people coming/going. She encouraged the applicant to consider other options.

Mr. Briya said they do not know what those spaces are yet; the unknown tenants are the issue. He said the new tenant may not want an alcove. Mr. Langworthy recommended creating the alcove to meet Code now and they can come back later for a Waiver if the tenant prefers something different.

Fred Hahn said too many compromises have been made already.

Mr. Phillabaum inquired about the lobby space to the roof deck for Buildings C3 and B3, and if the counts included occupied space as the plans are sparsely detailed. He said these are not considered towers as they are in the interior of the roof, rather than connected to exterior walls.

Mr. Briya said that part of it was the elevator. Mr. Phillabaum requested that a shadow line be inserted as well as some additional architectural detailing. Mr. Langworthy suggested a color or material change.

Ms. Ray explained the planter details had changed. Mr. Quackenbush said the width of the tree grates changed from five feet to four feet making them narrower. Ms. Shelly confirmed that the tree planting area overall stayed at five feet.

Aaron Stanford said encroachments are important as well as cycle track transitions to cross the street. He cautioned the applicant to consider eliminating as many of the building entrance Waivers as possible.

Mr. Langworthy reiterated that alternative materials being considered like vinyl windows will need a strong case including specifications, installation methods, and expected longevity of materials. Mr. Tyler said it has to be stated how the materials will be physically installed and used and the depth and details of the windows should be noted, as flush-mounted windows are not permitted.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further comments or questions regarding this application. [There were none.]

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on March 12, 2015.

City of Dublin

Land Use and Long Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 26, 2015

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

Rachel Ray said this is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 149 dwelling units, 98,700 square feet of office uses, 48,900 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 864-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Ray stated that she had spoken with the applicant earlier in the week and they had discussed the boundaries for the Development Plan, Site Plan, and Final Plat. She said the Development Plan encompasses the street network, block framework, and building arrangement. She said this proposal includes Tuller Ridge Drive, Bridge Park Avenue, Mooney Street, and Longshore Street. She said the Development Plan Review examines street requirements, rights-of-way, and bike network. She added the review determines lot and block requirements and permitted building types.
Ms. Ray said the Site Plan Review encompasses four buildings in the area identified as the C block. She said a Final Plat was submitted and includes the same roadways, which form three blocks. She said the Site Plan Review serves as a review of uses, building types, open space types, and site development standards including parking, landscaping, and signs.

Ms. Ray noted that there were still some timing issues to work out in terms of the final disposition of the COTA site and the development agreement.

Ms. Ray reported the applicant provided numerous plans for C block but she did not have an opportunity to review them thoroughly prior to this meeting. However, she noted the following:

- Street sections are not consistent with the Preliminary Plat, including no cycle track shown along Bridge Park Avenue.
- The Final Plat does not show easements for pedestrian bridges over right-of-way or public access easements for the open spaces.

Fred Hahn inquired whether the pedestrian bridges would require a mid-air easement.

Rachel Ray inquired about open space as there has been a change since the Basic Site Plan. She noted that the pocket parks were no longer being shown along Riverside Drive or Bridge Park Avenue, and the only open spaces were those between the buildings and the riverfront park acreage.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, said there are too many unknowns to designate open spaces along the streetscape. Mr. Hunter said they still know they will have the pocket plazas and seating areas, but they were not able to identify them on the plan as yet.

Joanne Shelly stated that this was not acceptable in that the point of the open space requirement is to guarantee there will be a variety of spaces for public use. She noted that the City wants these public spaces and cannot be made to adjust to what a tenant may want later. She emphasized that public spaces needed to be carved out in the plans and maintained. She indicated credit was being given for the public park across the street, but some of the requirement needed to be provided through the pocket parks and pocket plazas along the streetscape. Ms. Ray agreed with Ms. Shelly.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said a tenant is required to come before the ART with an application and the ART can make a determination then about the open spaces being proposed.

Ms. Shelly reiterated that the Site Plan Review includes a guarantee for permanent, required public open space, and delineating these spaces cannot be put off until later when a tenant decides what they may want. She said the Site Plan Review will likely not be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission if the Code required open spaces are not shown on the plans. She said right now just one type is being shown and multiple types are required, therefore the project is not in compliance with the open space variety requirement. Ms. Ray agreed with Ms. Shelly's assessment.

Ms. Ray said Staff had requested elevations on how the façades of the building, framing the open spaces, will look and the elevations have not yet been received. She said the intent is to review these open spaces in three dimensions, not just in plan view. She said there are a lot of blank façades and service areas, and it will be important to see how the buildings frame these spaces rather than detracting from them.

Mr. Hunter confirmed that the elevations were provided in the application submission package. Ms. Ray said they were, but they were only included with the architectural plans. She reiterated that the particular elevations framing the open spaces should be provided and considered with the open space plans for the three-dimensional context.

Ms. Ray noted that on the architectural plans, some of the building floor plans appear to encroach into the right-of-way. Ms. Umbarger said some buildings are right on the ROW, but she was not aware of any encroachments. Ms. Ray said at a minimum, the door swings encroached into the ROW, which was not permitted by Code.

Ms. Ray stated that prior to Staff's complete analysis it appears that Waivers will be required for all buildings for transparency, building materials, and primary materials, at a minimum.

Ms. Ray said the designs were almost identical to the Basic Plan Review except for Building C2, which had been modified. She asked the applicant to summarize where the application stands with respect to Building C2.

Mr. Hunter said the applicant considered several changes in the design of the C2 Building corner tower. He said they considered curves, circles, shrouds, etc. as were shown to the ART previously, but they were not satisfied with any of those designs. He explained that many of the designs were trendy and could be appropriate for five years, but would soon fall out of fashion. He said they decided to enhance the original design for a more timeless look. He said the original design had a metal panel tower with inset glass. He explained they thinned down the brick, and the metal panel is now all glass and wrapped the corner with intricate horizontal metal bands added for three-dimensional character making it a three-sided piece. He added they pulled the brick out on all the balconies for additional outdoor space. He said they also modified the canopy at the base of the tower. He said they are happy with the revised plans and the building is now

iconic without being trendy. He said they are happy with the direction they have taken as the design is more timeless.

Mr. Langworthy said he never understood the term 'timeless' as it refers to architectural design and asked Mr. Hunter to explain his view of the term.

Mr. Hunter said the term 'timeless' is subjective and is usually a basic design concept. He said the design is more about detail. He said last week they had presented a glass box with a shroud around it. He said that made the building more sculptural than architectural. He said it did not look like it belonged with the buildings that would be around it.

Jeff Tyler said he saw some really cool ideas in this latest design, with lots of interesting details. He said he liked the design of the corner piece with the corner balconies as it creates a series of nice spaces. He said the revised plan certainly has potential.

Ms. Umbarger said there will be activity on that corner.

Ms. Shelly said the revised design was interesting looking. She said where the building meets the streetscape it begs to do something on the corner so the building and the corner relate to each other. She emphasized making the design relatable all the way through.

Mr. Hunter indicated there was a charcoal brick that could be spread out through the sidewalk.

Dan Phillabaum questioned the use of the tower lighting to make it a complete iconic element. Mr. Hunter said that was the intention; they did not want to see the tower go dark each evening.

Ms. Ray identified a Waiver needed for the C1 Building for the north elevation facing Tuller Ridge Drive. She said the design feels harsh and lacks detail. She asked what the vision was for the expansive brick section.

Ms. Umbarger answered the intent was some type of a mural or a place for artwork. She explained that the stair and elevator were on the interior side of that brick wall.

Ms. Ray asked that details be provided, if art or a mural is planned.

Ms. Ray stated that the applicant had provided some information with respect to the proposed materials that are not directly permitted by Code. She said a lot of the information speaks to more descriptive features, rather than quantifiable specifications. She said the material provided in support of these materials and should make a strong case including specifications, installation methods, and expected longevity of the materials.

Mr. Tyler added specifications should state how the materials will be physically installed and used. He said the depth and details of the windows should be noted, as this is required.

Mr. Hunter agreed to provide that information.
Ms. Ray indicated there would be a few more weeks to review this application as the determination from the ART was scheduled for the end of March to be forwarded to the PZC for the meeting on April 9, 2015.

Mr. Hunter said he would like to meet internally as needed.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further comments or questions regarding this application. [There were none.]

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Keenan called the Tuesday, January 20, 2015 Special Meeting of Dublin City Council to order at 6:30 p.m. at the Dublin Municipal Building. The meeting was for the purpose of review of the Bridge Park Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan.

ROLL CALL

Members present were Mayor Keenan, Vice Mayor Gerber, Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, Mr. Lecklider, Mr. Peterson, and Ms. Salay. Mr. Reiner was absent (excused).

Staff members present were Ms. Grigsby, Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Readler, Mr. Foegler, Ms. Mumma, Mr. Langworthy, Ms. Gilger, Ms. Puskarcik, Mr. Hammersmith, Mr. Tyler, Ms. Husak, Ms. Ray and Ms. Burness.

BRIDGE PARK BASIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND BASIC SITE PLAN (Case 15-002BPR)

Introduction and Development Agreement Update

Mr. Foegler stated that in late 2012/early 2013, City Council made the decision to make the river corridor area the first focus of Bridge Street District, and authorized the River Corridor framework planning effort to begin. A variety of items informed that planning effort. One of these was the public improvements that the City had been contemplating – a roundabout, a re-located road, and a river park. It would build upon the assets of the Historic District of the City as well as the visibility afforded by the sheer volume of traffic and the sites. There were some parcels and developments prime for redevelopment. As an outgrowth of those planning efforts, private developers, particularly Crawford Hoying, were very supportive of the City's planning effort and began tying up key parcels to help advance that vision. In October 2013, the City held a large public meeting at OCLC to present some of the initial ideas -- both from that development planning that was emerging from Crawford Hoying as well as some of the planning of the City's River Corridor details, such as the park, pedestrian bridge and other key elements.

Since that time, there has been a continuous planning effort on the public improvements and private improvements. Those plans have advanced to the point where some formal regulatory review can now begin. Simultaneous with those efforts, the team has also been advancing discussions on the development agreement. In negotiations with the School District to formulate an arrangement providing for predictable development incentives, most of those efforts focused around expectations that the largest development financing gaps would be in the area of parking structures and construction of the road grid system within the corridor. That has proven to be true. He plans to highlight tonight the key elements of this development agreement framework, which are still under negotiation. There will be much more detail when the formal agreement is presented to Council.

- New Community Authority/Community Reinvestment Area.
  The agreement will provide for the utilization of the incentive that was negotiated with the School District to place the City in a position to capture 100% of that tax increment for the first 15 years; 90% for the second 15 years. With that financing that will overwhelmingly assist with the funding of parking structures, the method proposed by this developer combines tools to get to that same point, as opposed to straight tax increment financing. The arrangement would create a New Community Authority for the geography of the entire development. That New Community Authority would be accompanied by a Community Reinvestment Area, which effectively makes the taxes "go away," as provided for in the existing agreements with the City. Rather than capturing the TIF revenue for the full 30 years, it is a combination of a New Community Authority fee being levied, which is equivalent to the taxes that are being foregone, in combination with tax increment financing. That will provide the revenues necessary to fund the parking structures. In early discussions with the developer, the City made it clear that this financing mechanism for the parking structure should not expose the City to credit risk. The

model being developed accomplishes that objective, but there are several layers of complexity that are being worked through. This is the largest mechanism and incentive element that is critical to the arrangement.

- The City will provide funding for the road system within the project area, which is currently estimated at $17 million. The City is looking for prospects that may exist for long-term reimbursement.
- There will be some real estate transfers. There are roads, such as Dale Drive, that are not in the location the City Thoroughfare Plan recommends for the grid system, so there will be some rights-of-way in need of abandonment. Some of the City's acquisitions, original land for parks, and relocated Riverside Drive were estimates based on pre-design considerations. Subsequent to those efforts, the design has been finalized. There is some excess land in those locations. Therefore, in the development agreement, the City will be exploring ways to address the land needed from the developer for right-of-way, as well as some of the excess land that the City has either through abandonment or excess purchases.
- The other key feature proposed by the developer is the development of a special event/conference facility in conjunction with a hotel. The developer is proposing that they capture significant portions of the bed tax revenue from that in some fashion to help underwrite the cost of that facility. They believe that the conference facility and hotel would provide a totally different dimension to this market, bringing people in on a daily basis for events, which will benefit restaurants and retail within the area. The residential portions and offices portions do not necessarily feed the restaurant and retail activity. They are proposing to build a conference facility larger than any other within the City of Dublin, so it would be able to accommodate larger activities, training and events that the City cannot currently accommodate.

These items are currently being negotiated, but this describes the basic framework of the agreement for Council as they begin to review the project itself.

Mr. Lecklider asked who comprises the City's team that is negotiating with the developer.
Mr. Foegler responded that the lead team is comprised of the City Manager, the Finance Director, himself, the Development Director /incoming City Manager, the City's legal advisor at Squires and the City's law department.
Mr. Lecklider asked for confirmation that no City Council members are involved in that effort.
Mr. Foegler confirmed that Council members are not involved.

Vice Mayor Gerber stated that the Casto devevlopment agreement included a requirement that those properties remain apartments for the life of the TIF -- 30 years. Is a similar restriction envisioned with respect to the property involved with tonight's proposal?
Mr. Foegler responded that this depends upon the nature of the TIF. The City is contemplating Chapter 40 and 41 TIFs. For certain areas, there are limitations on condominiums as opposed to rental units. Legal counsel will be recommending that for some portion, if not all of the units, there be commitments to maintain them as apartments. That does not mean that in the future there cannot be negotiations to undo that requirement. However, the terms would have to address the debt that has been issued with the expectation that the TIF revenue would be produced through use of those tools. Future re-negotiations would have to identify another tool to provide those payments. Given the limitations of tax increment financing in this case, however, those units would have to remain as apartments.
Vice Mayor Gerber asked for confirmation that there is not another option upfront.
Mr. Foegler responded that is correct.

Mayor Keenan inquired if there is any ability to have such an option upfront.
Mr. Foegler responded that it depends upon the nature of the TIF. With the geography of a Chapter 40 and 41 TIF, there will be more flexibility. Chapter 41 TIFs apply in

redevelopment areas, so how much of this area is characterized as a redevelopment area versus a new development area will be the major determinant. That is one of the major details that is being finalized. There is more reliability in the revenue stream in the incentive districts in the residential component.
Mayor Keenan noted that it would be very difficult to convert the units to condominiums in the future.
Mr. Foegler responded that the economics would have to permit it, such as retiring bonds from the proceeds of that in a predictable way. Where the bonds are in their cycle and what flexibility exists for those options can be explored.

Mayor Keenan stated that the lack of flexibility with this might not be a desirable thing.
Mr. Foegler responded that there would be a good mix of condominiums and apartments in this development. The young professional market will lead the demand for apartments, and increasingly, the empty nesters will also have a higher apartment rate. The young professionals will also have a regular turnover need, which will be easier to meet with a significant number of apartment products. This is an area with restaurants and activity zones that will appeal to young professionals.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Ray provided an overview of the Basic Plan application for the Bridge Park mixed-used development. Five motions will be requested of City Council this evening. Two are related to the Basic Development Plan; two are related to the Basic Site plan; and a third is to define the reviewing bodies for approval.

The Bridge Street District is comprised of the entire area inside the arc of I-270, between Sawmill Road and the US 33/I270 interchange that extends along US 33/Bridge Street to the eastern boundary with Sawmill Road. The site under discussion tonight is a 30.9-acre site on the east side of the Scioto River, a small part of the overall Bridge Street District. The site is on the to-be-relocated Riverside Drive; south of the first phase of John Shields Parkway (currently under construction); west of the new connector roadway between Dale Drive and Tuller Ridge; and north of SR 161. It includes the existing Bridge Pointe shopping center, portions of the existing driving range, and the commercial properties along Dale Drive. It is located south of the Grabill health care facility (currently under construction).

The Basic Development Plan applies to the entire site. The purpose of this plan is to evaluate at a conceptual level the cohesiveness of the framework that will set the tone for the public realm. The public realm is composed of the street network, the block layout, and the lots created for development. This application includes an analysis of the project based on the principles of walkable urbanism, as well as the Community Plan's objectives for the Bridge Street District. A preliminary plat was included, but prior PZC review and recommendation is required, so that will be forwarded from PZC to Council at a later meeting.

The Basic Site Plan does not include the full 30+ acres, but relates to a four-block area, which involves an increasing level of detail. Future basic site plan reviews will be required for the other lots that are not included this evening. The purpose of the Basic Site Plan Review is to provide an early analysis of the arrangement of uses, where the buildings are sited, and where the open spaces are planned, as well as for the applicant to obtain early feedback on architectural concepts. This application includes the preliminary analysis of those site details, although much more detail is expected in the next phase of review – the Final Site Plan.

The purpose of a Basic Plan review is not to make determinations on all the project details. It is to determine that all the basic building blocks are in place, and that the development character is appropriate and consistent with the Community Plan objectives for this area. This request includes waivers for both the Development Plan and Site Plan. Waivers are required for elements of a project that do not meet the letter of a specific Code requirement. They are not variances, which have a negative connotation. The

Bridge Street Zoning regulations are form-based and specific. Yet not all developments could or should be "one size fits all" and meet every single Code requirement. It was anticipated with the Code that a degree of flexibility would be necessary. The five waivers requested reflect that measure of flexibility along with all the Code requirements that have been met at this time.

The next steps following this application include:

- The Final Development Plan review to determine all those project details as well as the public realm. That will correspond with the Final Plat phase.
- The Final Site Plan review that includes the highly detailed review of all the project elements, all the aspects of the architecture and landscaping, open spaces and parking.
- The Conditional Use review for the parking structures – those that are visible from the right-of-way, as well as the master sign plan – looking at all the tenant sign plans for all these buildings.
- A request for open space fee in lieu if needed to meet the open space provision for this project.
- Building permit process.

This evening, Council will determine the required reviewing body for those next phases of review.

The Administrative Review Team (ART) made a recommendation to City Council on this application on January 8. The ART recommendation is the culmination of a significant amount of work on the part of the applicant as well as a number of public reviews: public reviews with City Council of the preliminary plat in September and an informal review the preceding year; four recent P&Z reviews; and many staff meetings to work through the project details. Staff appreciates the applicant's effort and collaboration with staff to ensure this is the best possible project.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if at each of the steps, the project received approval.
Ms. Ray responded that the formal decisions regarding the Preliminary Plat and the Basic Plan were for approval.
Mr. Lecklider inquired if that included the PZC.
Ms. Ray responded affirmatively.

Basic Development Plan Components

The proposed Basic Development Plan includes: a grid street network, nine development blocks and five new public streets -- including Bridge Park Avenue, Mooney Street, Tuller Ridge Drive, Banker Drive and Longshore Street. It also includes designation of a future mixed-use shopping corridor. Although all the streets in the area are expected to be very pedestrian oriented, the shopping corridor is the area where the highest degree of pedestrian activity is anticipated. All the front doors are for shops, restaurants and patio spaces. The plan also includes the Preliminary Plat for all the utilities, right-of-way vacation, etc.

Bike facilities on the site have been discussed. Under its previous iteration, the Basic Plan included below-grade parking structures. The revised plan has all above-grade parking structures. That also changed the block framework and street framework. The cycle network is a loop system that includes the pedestrian bridge and the future John Shields Parkway vehicular bridge. In this portion, Bridge Park Avenue will be in the center of the site with five-foot, one-way cycle tracks on both sides of the street. At Riverside Drive, a ten-foot, two-way cycle track will run along the west side -- the park side, of the roadway. This will allow for more pedestrian space and patio space on the development side of that area.

Basic Site Plan

Phase 1 of the proposed Basic Site Plan is a four-block area with eight mixed-use buildings, 371 housing units and 260,000 square feet of commercial uses, including office, retail, personal services and restaurants. The developer is considering a hotel and

conference facility, but that is not proposed with Phase 1. Their plan also provides two parking garages off of Riverside Drive, one block east, that have a total of 1,700 parking spaces. There are no surface parking lots with this development. The review also includes conceptual open space plans as well as preliminary parking, landscaping and sign details. A diagram is included that indicates how the open spaces would be distributed throughout the four-block site. Essentially, at least one gathering space is provided on each block, linear in nature that leads up to the new riverfront parkland. Details will be provided for the Final Site Plan review.

Mayor Keenan asked for clarification about public open space designated versus future park space.
Ms. Ray responded that, based on the number of residential units and the commercial developments, the applicant is required to provide a total of 1.83 acres of publicly accessible open space. In developing the Code requirements for the Bridge Street District, staff was aware that some projects would be able to provide all that within the scope of their overall project, whereas some would rely on other developments.
Mayor Keenan inquired if that would be future park space or is dedicated open space. Do they pay for that space?
Ms. Ray responded that there is a fee in lieu requirement.

Vice Mayor Gerber inquired if the five-foot cycle track is on one street or all streets.
Ms. Ray responded that it is only on Bridge Park Avenue.
Vice Mayor Gerber inquired if that is different from the previous plan reviewed in September.
Ms. Ray responded that, previously, no cycle tracks were shown on any streets other than Riverside Drive.
Vice Mayor Gerber stated that when this was before PZC, the Commission discussed their desire to expand the size of the sidewalks. Is it staff's opinion that has been adequately addressed in the plan being reviewed tonight?
Ms. Ray responded that in staff's opinion, and as it was back at that time, it has been adequately addressed. There is a five-foot cycle track and a five-foot sidewalk is adjacent to it – a total of 10 feet, and a two-foot, at-grade space that provides additional "wiggle room." From an urban design perspective, a balancing act must be achieved with the streetscape because a great deal needs to occur within an appropriately narrow area in order to have a comfortable urban environment. They worked very hard with the applicant and the consultants on the public realm projects for this area. Staff's recommendation is that the plan is appropriate as shown.
Vice Mayor Gerber stated that during previous discussions, Council was concerned not only about the cycle track but also that there was sufficient room for the outdoor cafes and pedestrian traffic.
Ms. Ray responded that the applicant has also relocated the garages in the project, which allows more flexibility to place the buildings to give more space within their private property for patio spaces.

Mayor Keenan inquired if the five-foot wide sidewalks were in the retail area. His understanding was that a portion of the sidewalks was five feet in width, but some portion was wider.
Ms. Ray responded that will range a bit within this area, given the fact that the building placement and details are still being worked out. The area under discussion at this time is essentially a five-foot cycle track and a five-foot sidewalk area. The cycle track is intended to serve as a spillover zone. There will be signs and other directional information to ensure that cyclists know that if they are at the sidewalk level – the pedestrian level -- the hierarchy is that pedestrians have priority. Cyclists can move to the street. The Bicycle Advisory Task Force (BATF) indicated that they were comfortable with this arrangement.

Mr. Lecklider stated that with the garages relocated in the revised plan, it appears that the patio spaces are located on private property.

Ms. Ray stated that the intent is that it feel seamless, as a continuation of the street and that one is not aware of where the right-of-way begins. There will be adequate space to allow for patios and seating areas.
Mr. Lecklider inquired the distance from the curb to the building front.
Ms. Ray responded that in most locations, the number would range from eight feet to 12 feet.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked how Gay Street in Columbus, from High Street to Third Street, compares to what is shown tonight.
Ms. Ray requested Mr. Meyer to respond, noting that other examples throughout the Columbus region were reviewed to make sure that enough space is in this plan. Eight to 12 feet is sufficient for at least two rows of dining tables.

Darren Meyer, MKSK stated that the distance from the curb to the building face on Gay Street in the portion between High Street and Third Street is between 14 and 16 feet. The distance from the curb to the building face on Bridge Park Avenue as shown tonight averages around 24 feet.

Ms. Ray noted that figure includes the right-of-way as well as the space on private property.
Mayor Keenan inquired if that is true of both examples.
Mr. Meyer responded affirmatively.

Vice Mayor Gerber inquired how that compares to what PZC reviewed in October -- is it wider or the same size?
Ms. Ray responded that it is somewhat wider in terms of the space that is available for seating areas.
Mr. Gerber inquired the specific width.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 555 Metro Place, stated that it is three to four feet wider, approximately two feet on each side.

Ms. Salay stated that, previously, the plan provided that along Bridge Park, moving east up the hill, the space was wider near the park. The buildings become closer together moving further east. Is that what is now contemplated?
Ms. Ray responded that it is somewhat the same. Along the street section, there is still the five-foot cycle track and the five-foot walkway plus the spillover area. Closer to the intersection of Bridge Park and Riverside, there is more space because there is a shorter intersection there. Due to the tightness of the intersection, there is opportunity to remove the on-street parking in that segment. When the onstreet parking is eliminated, the sidewalk widens to 7-1/2 feet plus the additional space in the private area. This opens up the view shed to the park, because the intersection is located near the landing of the pedestrian bridge.
Ms. Salay stated that she has looked at examples of bicycle facilities over the internet, but was unable to find an example of the proposed setup. Is staff aware of this type of facility located elsewhere? If so, she requests that staff provide that information in the future.
Ms. Ray responded that information could be provided for the Preliminary Plat review.

Applicant Presentation

Brent Crawford, principal of Crawford Hoying and Crawford Hoying Development Partners, stated that as a resident and business owner in Dublin, he is passionate about what this City is today but also what it will be in the future. The other members of his team are also Dublin residents, so they feel a responsibility to deliver a first-class project of which they, their families, the City, and the City of Dublin residents can be proud. This development of this area has been a long time coming – five years of community planning; two and a half years of their planning; thousands of hours have been dedicated by their team over those years; site design; and building design to reach this point. It has been worked on not only by their team but professionals in the local market and out of this market – some of the best-qualified people in the country. That has brought the project to this point today,

which is the introduction of Phase 1 of Bridge Park. As will be seen, their plan fits nearly identically with the 2010 Vision Report, which accurately predicted the changes and demographics that are seen today -- their development meets those demands head on. They applaud the City for being visionary on this front and preparing the City well for the future. This plan created with the City and the community is meant to build upon what exists in Old Dublin and connect it to the east side through the pedestrian bridge. The physical connection will be through the bridge, but a connection also will be created with the businesses and residents who live, work and play on the east side of the river. There will be significant relationships between the east and west side that are more than physical and will be very important for the fabric of what they are trying to create in Dublin. This is definitely not about one building or product type. It is about creating a destination – Dublin's destination. That is created through delivering the right mix in the right location for the right market. They are confident that they are achieving that. This development is about enhancing the assets the City already has, creating new ones and connecting them so people can live, work and play in one location. That is an often over-used phrase, typically because it is poorly executed or not executed at all. In this case, however, the City of Dublin had the vision; they have the plan; and they are ready to execute that plan. Their goal is to create a destination for families, residents, talented workers, and visitors from inside and outside the market. It is also about keeping residents and jobs in Dublin because of their desire to be part of a mixed-use development. It will add new, fresh talent from outside the market who want to experience this. This product currently does not exist in Dublin or in most communities like Dublin within central Ohio. This experience will make it possible to access easily all that Dublin has to offer – arts, cultural, economy and community. It is all within walking distance – a destination location that they expect not only people from Dublin to enjoy. They have tremendous interest from many groups, and they are excited about making many announcements over the coming weeks. Cameron Mitchell Restaurants and similar groups are the type of quality businesses expected to be part of this development. In summary, the project is about enhancing what already exists in Dublin; building upon the core of Old Dublin and the river; creating these new assets; making the connections. This will create that special destination place desired. When people think of Dublin, they will think of this heart and core of the City. They are excited to bring this forward and show Council all the progress that has been made over the last two and a half years, particularly in the last few months. [A video of their proposed vision, which they are showing in the marketplace, was shared with Council.]

Nelson Yoder, principal of Crawford Hoying Development Partners, stated that he is a lifetime resident of Dublin. The Bridge Street District map shows the location of the new interchange on the western end of the downtown district and the new street grid signature streets to create the connections between the different segments of the City. Bridge Park is a large project being launched to help realize the vision that the City has of a combination of public and private projects that will make up the District and create a competitive edge to the City.

Bridge Park – Phase One

Mr. Yoder described phase one, noting it is a short walk from Historic Dublin over the pedestrian bridge to the east side to Bridge Park. On the west side of the river is the new parkland – the more natural of the two parks that will be created on the riverfront. It is a space that engages with the water, utilizing the beauty of the Scioto River, which is under-utilized at this point. On the east bank of the river is a park in which live performances might occur. From there, one can reach Bridge Park Avenue, either by foot, bike or vehicle. The signature streets are closely integrated with the City's planning efforts for the District. Wayfinding maps will seamlessly integrate with the streetscape to help with the pedestrian experience. They have been working with Kolar Design, which is also the City's streetscape and wayfinding consultant. An example of the wayfinding in this plan is the wayfinding kiosk. There are casual and formal dining destinations spread along the river and along both sides of Bridge Park Avenue. There are four stories of office located over one-story of retail with great views of the river and the park. The upper stories have balconies from which the view can be enjoyed. On Bridge Park are many multi-

generational living options. Large floorplates for creative offices are in some of the buildings, which will accommodate some growing Dublin businesses. This will also be the "spine" for personal services – bank, spa, other casual dining places that are spread along Bridge Park Avenue. The pedestrian is treated differently here, an area that is centered around people, not the automobile. The Mews is one of four unique public open spaces included in the first phase of the project. The Mews has a great deal of grade change with interesting steps leading through the spaces. Using the spaces will be office workers working from their laptops; residents and visitors eating lunch; bicycle traffic – as there will be bicycle facilities off the open space; and streams of people in and out of this portal to one of the public parking garages.

There are two, 850-space parking garages in Bridge Park, which are designed to provide the "best in class" parking experience -- open and airy from the inside, but at the same time, canvasses for public art. From here can be seen residential balconies and residential bridges overlooking the open spaces. As well as adding visual interest, they are key components for making the project work. The bridges allow the first three floors of the parking garages to serve the visitors to the restaurants and office spaces that are closer to the street and have a more frequent turnover. The upper floors are accessed by a ramp between levels four, five and six. Those will be utilized by employees of retailers and residential parking. The intent is to pull the residents up out of the area of more frequent coming and going traffic. This is an improvement over the previous iteration that had large plates of below-grade parking -- people would park below ground and use an elevator into their desired building without any interaction with the outside. With the new plan, it is possible to sort the residential parkers from the retail parkers.

Down at Riverside Drive is another open space called "The Pavilion," which is a great outdoor concert venue, created in one of the public open spaces between two buildings. Here, interaction can be seen between outdoor patio spaces, the river and the park. Outdoor public space has been created for almost every plate of office within the project. Each of the office floors has an outdoor balcony that overlooks the river and park; the top floor has a larger balcony. An outdoor terrace is provided for the residential building, which has a view of the river, in addition to all the residential private balconies. There will be a variety of open spaces that can engage the park and river, tying that back to the rest of the project.

Timing Details

This plan has evolved since September 2012. During that time, the City has also been working on its own planning efforts – relocation of Riverside Drive and the Dale-Tuller connector, etc. They have worked in tandem with the City to gear toward the start of construction in the spring of 2015. The goal of the phasing is to minimize the disruption to Dublin residents. The phasing schedule provides for most of the "heavy lifting" in their project to take place at the same time that Riverside Drive is being relocated and people are being routed around the area. Phase 1 is geared for a summer 2016 occupancy. Their work began in earnest in November 2014 at their own risk. They have already cut a portion of this site to grade. Preliminary grading was done under two buildings with the goal of getting ahead of winter so they will be able to hit the desired dates. They had also made a commitment to Council of being able to get in the ground at the end of last year, and they were able to do that. Block 1A and Block 1B are comprised of eight buildings, which Council will review tonight.

There are other phases, which he will describe briefly, that will be presented to Council for review in a few months. Phase 2A and 2B have condominiums, additional retail, mixed-use buildings with residential, a proposed theater, and parking. Phase 2C is the hotel, event center and an office building. This will occur later in 2016. Phase 3, in the spring of 2017, will be owner-occupied condominiums. Phase 3A and 3B are contemplated to include a larger format grocery store with residential above, another mixed-use building along the river, and parking. That is the overall schedule. More details on the future phases will be presented later to Council.

Public Realm and Open Spaces
Darren Meyer, MKSK, stated that the main street east and west through the center of the site is Bridge Park Avenue. Streets in this District are for more than moving cars. They are for bikes, pedestrians, outdoor dining, leisure and recreation. There should be no distinction between right-of-way and non right-of-way, between private and public open shape. Everything outside of the buildings is seamless, urban public space. Similar to BriHi -- from the corner of High and Bridge Street back into the district is a seamless environment of urban space – that is the effect they want to create. Bridge Park Avenue is a signature street, and as such, merits the use of higher-grade materials to have the benefit of longevity and warmth in appearance from a pedestrian's standpoint. Brick sidewalks will flow through the shopping corridor both on Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. From the two parking structures, people will exit at two lobbies. The quality material, the brick that is used in the street, will also be used to encompass the entrances from the parking structures to the street. The brick will also be used to blur the line between the right-of-way and the open spaces.

Urban open spaces, different from parkland, serve many more functions:

- Accommodate service deliveries and trash removal for the retail it backs
- Serve as a courtyard for residences
- Solve practical circulation problems by providing bike parking and bike racks
- Move pedestrians through open spaces
- Provide space for social functions for office workers, residents and visitors
- The greenspace within the open space provides shade, green and stormwater function. The stormwater roof runoff will be accommodated.

Architecture
Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 555 Metro Place, stated that the building designs have evolved since the first renditions in 2013. The original plan had parking under the buildings, which complicated some things, but as the design evolved, Bridge Park Avenue moved so it was possible to create a street that had two sides – a complete main street. Information from the October 22, 2013 public presentation has guided them in the evolution of the design. Initially, the buildings lacked detail with a rigid repetition. Today, the buildings appear as though they could have been designed by different architects. Moody & Nolan brought designers in from every one of their offices, who provided fresh, different input. Elimination of the underground parking also freed up the first floor of the buildings and allowed for more design flexibility, to tie what is happening on the ground floor into the upper floors. They looked at how to add more outdoor space and how to embrace six-story urban buildings and make them special. This is the Basic Site Plan, which begins to show some of the detail. The Final Site Plan will provide a great deal of building details. Building highlights include:

- Building C1 – fronts Riverside Drive, is on the northernmost part of Phase 1. It has retail and restaurant on the ground floor and four stories of residential above. In this phase, it is the corner that is seen when traveling southbound on Riverside Drive. In subsequent phases, more will be built there. It is a U-shaped building with a courtyard for the residents in the middle. It overlooks the river and the park. The open space called "The Pavilion" is on the south side of the building. The ground floor of this building is 20 feet in height. They tried to raise the ground floor for the retail somewhat to allow variety in the kinds of spaces that restaurants and retailers can develop. For the Final Site Plan, window, sill and railing details will differ between the buildings to differentiate the identity.
- Building C2 - It has primarily office in the top four stories, with retail and restaurant on the ground floor. The most prominent piece of the building is the tower element, which is to acknowledge that this is the gateway to Bridge Park Avenue. Across the street, Building B2 has a tower element, too, but that one is more secondary. The swoop of the bridge landing focuses the view on the tower of Building C2, so this will be the heart, or beacon, that will draw into the development. The building has "The Pavilion" open space on the north side of the building. There are balconies on every floor for the offices, both on Riverside Drive and on Bridge Park Avenue.

- Building C3 – Turning the corner onto eastbound Bridge Park Avenue, the building provides retail and restaurant on the ground floor, office and commercial on the second floor, and three stories of residential above that. Because this is a long building and on the main street, special attention was paid to the use of materials and massing to make sure it maintains the "Main Street" character. There is a grade change from the east to the west side of this site, moving toward the river – about eight feet. That allows them to increase the height of the first floor for the restaurant tenant; it would be possible for a restaurant to have a mezzanine in that space. There will be some unique masonry details – a corduroy brick pattern, a contemporary look. A different material will also be used for the balcony railing.
- Building C4 – This building has the parking garage and residential that wraps two sides of the parking garage. The residential in the building wraps the Mooney Street side and the open space that is between Buildings C3 and C4. This is done to maintain an open, naturally ventilated garage that provides a quality experience. Two sides needed to be kept open; two could be wrapped. A visitor to the District could enter the garage at the first level at Longshore Street or at the second level at Tuller Ridge. A resident would take a speed ramp to the fourth floor. On that floor, there is a resident lobby that connects to the elevated pedestrian bridges. Those bridges are designed so that only residents of Bridge Park can access them. There will be a large, glass elevator stair tower at the main entrance that opens up to the welcome mat, open space area. That is the place that a visitor would enter/exit the garage. The screening for the two garages will be unique, intended to provide best in class, garage experience. For this garage, we have looked at metal perforated panel, introducing them into the openings into the garage, using variations in height, color and light. On the ground floor plain – the Longshore Street elevation, introduction of planters and lighting, doing everything possible to ensure that remains a strong pedestrian experience. Because the open side of the garage faces Longshore Street, there would be an opportunity later in the process, if the market dictated, to add more restaurants and services. The garage is designed so that it is possible to make some of it, or all, space that could be leased out if desired in the future.
- Building B1 – This is on Riverside Drive, on the southern edge of Phase 1, closest to the block that will have the hotel and conference center. This is retail and restaurant on the ground floor; larger office footprints on the second floor; residential on the top four floors; balcony for offices on the second floor; courtyard for residents on the third floor. There is an open space between this building and Building B2, called "The Plaza." It is a smaller space, mostly hardscape. The restaurant spaces will flow in and out of that space. The building has been stepped back a little to allow more light into that space, because it is one of the tighter open spaces on the project.
- Building B2 – This is located on the south side of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive. This building has the secondary architectural tower feature. There is retail and restaurant on the first floor; office on the second level; and four levels of residential above that. This is an L-shaped building, similar to the one next to it, with large outdoor spaces on the third level, covered areas for patio and dining along Riverside Drive. It also has an additional space on the sixth floor for residents that will overlook the river. The building will have different masonry details and railings to achieve a contemporary design and a unique character.
- Building B3 – This is the Bridge Park Avenue elevation. It has retail and restaurant on the ground floor and four levels of residential above. This is referred to as the warehouse building; it has remained in much the same form since the beginning of the process. Through the use of windows and architecture, this warehouse format does allow some different residential environments. There are larger windows and taller ceilings. The grade change is about seven feet on this side of the block and opens the restaurant space on the west side of the building to a potential mezzanine. There is an amenity on the roof on the west side – a tenant would be able to go up to a roof outlook of Bridge Park Avenue. The back of the building

overlooks a linear open space. Every one of the buildings overlooks some portion of open space.

- Building B4 – This is the last building. It has the second parking garage. It is naturally ventilated, lined on two sides with residential. The open space is lined to enhance it, but they lined the residential on Longshore. This was done because if the theater comes online, there will be another parking garage to accommodate high parking counts. They did not want the experience along Longshore from one end to the other to be a mirror image of parking garages. It makes more sense for this side of the building to have a residential liner and let the garage open on the other two sides. However, the vehicular circulation for the parking garage in this building is similar to that of the other building. The entrance for commercial users would be from Banker Street on the first level and from Mooney Street on the second level. On the fourth level, there would be a residential lobby that connects to pedestrian bridges. They are looking at the use of metal mesh for this building. How it is mounted and the use of lighting can make it a work of art.

Residential Bridges
The design attempts to keep the bridges light and open, to avoid the feel of hermetically sealed containers. Users can still feel the air and hear sounds from the street -- and therefore still feel connected to the community.

Sustainability
Bridge Park is sustainable by its very nature.

- In these more dense communities, there is less reliance on the automobile. Whether the people live or work there, having most of their needs filled within walking distance will encourage foot traffic. There will be no need for a car. Theater and grocers added to the mixed-use communities encourage less use of cars.
- There is also less energy consumption with shared roofs, walls and floors. This is within an urban service area with existing City utilities and services.
- What makes this work is the structured parking. Adding these six-level parking structures eliminates over 20 acres of surface parking by stacking the parking. In addition, having rain run-off from two parking garage roofs rather than 12 surfaces means eliminating 10 million gallons of polluted stormwater from running into the river over the course of a year. All of the stormwater that is captured on the roofs of each building is funneled into the open spaces and used as a design feature. This is especially noticeable on the east side where there is a grade change. During a rain event, the stormwater will cascade off the building and down a series of biodetention.
- Multimodal transport. Bike facilities will be placed in many locations, making them completely natural to this development, not only for visitors but for residents. There is both public and private bike parking; cycle tracks are integrated into Bridge Park Avenue. Efforts continue to re-connect COTA here. There might be shuttle service for those who live here but work in Metro Place or somewhere else.
- Other considerations they are researching include:
  - Zero grid lighting, which is low voltage lighting in areas that are lighted 24/7, such as parking garages, or common corridors in residential and office areas. Powering the lighting through either solar or wind would pull no energy from the grid.
  - Use of smart water heater thermostats that can communicate with the grid to provide heating at times less taxing for the electric grid. Crawford Hoying has pilot programs testing this in some of their smaller developments to see if this could be implemented at Bridge Park.
  - Power and heat co-generation for the hotel building, where there are areas that always need power or heat – one generates the other. They are working with IGS energy on the options.

Mr. Yoder thanked Council for their patience as the presentation was longer than anticipated. It has been a long process to get to this point. He thanked Council for their

continued partnership and asks for their support to move forward. They hope to be back before Council in 5-6 weeks to continue moving the project forward in order to transform that side of the river by summer 2016.

Council Questions/Discussion

Mr. Lecklider asked how these buildings compare in terms of height to other building examples in central Ohio, such as in Harrison West, the Short North, Grandview Heights and Columbus Commons?
Mr. Hunter responded that Grandview Yard is probably the best example with buildings one level shorter. The Short North is a great example, as is the Arena District with buildings that are one or two levels higher in some cases. The Short North has developed over such a long time that there is a great deal of variety.
Mr. Lecklider inquired about the height of newer residential buildings in that area.
Mr. Hunter responded that the newer residential buildings in the Short North top out at eight stories, but in the Short North, some of the buildings have stories that are stepped back. The buildings may go up five stories, then step back so that the last three stories would be 20-30 feet off the front. That maintains a comfortable feel of a 100-110 feet height, building to building.
Mr. Lecklider inquired the height of a five-story building.
Mr. Hunter responded that it would be 60-70 feet in total height.
Mr. Lecklider inquired if the typical two-story building in Dublin is 35 feet at its peak.
Ms. Ray confirmed that is correct.
Mr. Lecklider stated that, for the most part, these buildings are then approximately twice the height of existing residential in Dublin.
Ms. Ray responded that they are a little higher than that.
Mr. Lecklider stated that an example of the proposed streetscape exists in downtown Columbus, in the vicinity of the new County Courthouse, on Town Street, Rich Street, Front Street, etc. He is referring to the curbs and sidewalk treatments. Although it is more expensive, contrast that to the Short North's use of concrete – whenever they re-do those curbs, it will likely not be with concrete.

Staff Recommendations

Ms. Ray stated that the Administrative Review Team (ART) made their recommendation to Council on January 8. The report in the Council packet contains includes discussion on the big picture elements – the development agreement, the principles of walkable urbanism, architecture, open spaces, etc. The purpose of the Basic Plan Review is to determine if the big picture elements are in the right spot; are the streets in the right places; are the buildings sized appropriately; and are the open spaces going to contribute appropriately to the urban development. In the ART's opinion, the major project components are determined to be appropriate and consistent with the principles of walkable urbanism, as well as the Bridge Street District Area Plan and the Community Plan. The upcoming applications – the Final Development Plan and the Final Site Plan are going to help determine the ongoing success of this project. A high level of coordination and exacting attention to detail will characterize the next levels of review. At this point, however, the ART's opinion is that the big pieces are in the right place.

Much of the open space information that Crawford Hoying shared this evening is fairly new information, emerging as early as last week. The opportunities that will be created between these buildings is exciting. The buildings that are framing the edge of these spaces really need to be special, have a lot of visual details, not feel like service areas, but define the spaces in a three-dimensional sense. There must also be vertical elements that will draw pedestrians in and through those spaces. Their report has a detailed review of how all the buildings measure up against the Code requirements and some of the consistent themes on which they will continue to work with the applicant in the next level of review. The applicant has worked very hard with the ART and staff on the architectural character to achieve the results shown in the plan. Some items Council could comment on tonight to guide the discussion include: architectural character, proposed building materials, resident pedestrian bridges, street sections and the proposed waivers.

Five Council actions are requested this evening. The ART recommendations for each waiver follow.

Development Plan
Two (2) waivers, relating to the street network and the block framework.

1. Maximum block size. Seven of the blocks meet the requirements; two exceed the maximum block size. The reason the Code has maximum block size requirements is to ensure there are no super blocks; that there is adequate distribution of traffic as well as pedestrian permeability. In these two cases, there are unique circumstances. One relates to the spacing between John Shields Parkway and Tuller Ridge Drive. Because this is Riverside Drive, it is not desirable to add another street intersection along that roadway, if it can be avoided. There is also an 80-foot greenway along the north side of this block. Because the Code measures block size from right-of-way to right-of-way, ART recommends approval of the larger blocks.

Ms. Salay inquired if the waiver would be needed if the greenway were to be removed.
Ms. Ray responded that the waiver would still be needed.

2. Designation of front property lines. The Code requires that all blocks have two front property lines; the other sides are corner side property lines. This prioritizes where the front door is located and where the vehicular access is located. The Code states that if there is a principal frontage street – the signature streets, then that is the front door – the address street. It is desirable to ensure that there is building frontage and great pedestrian spaces that are not interrupted with driveways or surface parking lots. There are front property lines at Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. That means that all the other property lines are corner side property lines. That causes an issue with two blocks where there is only one front and three corner sides. That is due to the parking structures on those two blocks, some grade changes and the pattern of front property lines with Bridge Park, Riverside Drive and Dale Drive. This is a technical waiver, and ART recommends approval.

Mr. Peterson requested clarification of the significance of a front property line.
Ms. Ray stated that a good urban pattern is established by prioritizing special streets as having the front doors. The front door streets are Bridge Park Avenue, Riverside Drive, and Dale Drive. The others are more secondary streets, where service, vehicular circulation and garage access occurs.

Basic Development Plan – 30.9-acre area
ART recommends approval with six conditions as outlined in the materials.

Basic Site Plan
Three (3) waivers are requested. These are applicable only to certain buildings. They are bigger picture elements, and the applicant would like feedback this evening.

1. Front property line coverage. This is related to the previous waiver, but essentially applies to the buildings fronting Riverside Drive. The Code has front property line coverage requirements to make sure that along the whole length of a development site that there is either building or open space or some other high quality pedestrian-oriented environment. This is another technical waiver. If all those buildings were on separate parcels, the requirement would be met; however, they are on shared parcels. This lot is the same as the block, with an intervening open space between. Because that takes up some of the front property line, this is a technical waiver. ART recommends approval of the waiver.
2. Horizontal Façade Divisions. These are designed to enhance the pedestrian environment. The Code requires a horizontal façade division, which could be a change in building materials with an architectural feature at the top of the first floor to ensure that there is not a giant glass façade, for example, which would make an uncomfortable pedestrian environment right up against the street.

These three buildings, by nature of the fact that they have retail and commercial on the first floor and office above, set up a base/middle/top architectural character, where the division occurs at the top of the second floor. This sets up an appropriate relationship between the first two floors and the upper stories. They will work with the applicant to ensure that there are awnings, canopies, elements that will bring the building down to a pedestrian scale. ART recommends approval of the waiver.

Mayor Keenan inquired if that means that there be awnings, canopies, etc. in the later, more detailed plan.
Ms. Ray responded that they would be included in the Final Site Plan review.

3. Ground Story Height. Four buildings on Mooney Street are impacted by the change in grade that occurs between Mooney and Longshore Street. The height of the ground floor at the top of the hill meets Code requirement. Down the hill, the same ground story height is carried, but the floor progressively lowers. For those four buildings, ART recommends approval of the waiver.

Mayor Keenan inquired if there should be another future project of similar size and scope located elsewhere in the District, should waivers be anticipated as a normal part of the process?
Mr. Ray confirmed that is correct.
Mayor Keenan noted that most of the Code requirements have been complied with and relatively few technical issues need to be addressed.
Ms. Ray noted that they relate more to the site than to anything else. ART recommends approval of these three waivers for the Basic Site Plan.

Basic Site Plan (a four-block area) – ART recommends approval with the total of eight conditions as outlined in the materials.

Public Comment
Kevin Walter, 6289 Ross Bend, Dublin stated that the Vision for the Bridge Street District calls for creating a dynamic, economically viable, human-scale, live-work area that inter-relates with Historic Dublin, draws focus on the Scioto River and defines the core of Dublin for the next century. It's a bold and dramatic framework that will benefit generations of Dubliners. To date, the City has invested tens of millions of taxpayer dollars, issued and sold millions of dollars in bonds, created a TIF agreement with the Dublin City Schools, established development agreements and committed hundreds of millions of private investment dollars to that vision. Council has changed the fundamental relationship between Dublin and its development community; re-ordered the allocation of public funds; and re-molded City Code to ensure that the vision becomes reality. The question is, given all that effort, does this current application live up to the expectations of the community? Does it create a truly special place, a uniquely Dublin place? Does this application make the years of effort to get to this point worth it? He supports the fundamental vision of the Bridge Street District, but the current application fails to live up to that vision. It fails to live up to the high quality standards that Council itself has articulated for the District. This application, the first major project to come through, will serve as a foundation for the District, and will be the application by which all other projects are judged. The bar by which this project should be judged should be set very high. The fundamental elements of this plan that are being reviewed tonight include: building placement, open space arrangement; and a variety of elements that will create the look and feel of the District. Getting those elements right is critical. After all the time, effort and expense put into the process to date, this body is compelled to set a standard worthy of that investment.
From the outset, this application calls for five waivers from the specifically created Bridge Street District Code. Five waivers from which the very Code that was tediously worked through by City staff, Planning and Zoning Commission, City Council and the residents of the community to ensure that the development community had predictability and certainty about what was required within the District. Why should we expect that each and every future project coming forward will not ask for a waiver rather than add to the quality of the individual project by bring a level of detail and specialness and vision by the Council? The waivers requested tonight have to do with the size of City blocks, the manners in

which buildings are oriented to the street, and the way the building facades are created. In each case, the need for waivers is not because the empty ground that exists today cannot be shaped to fit the Code, but rather because the developer would be required to invest more into the project than they are willing, at this point. Is that the standard by which each project should be measured? So many projects have come through Dublin over the years that have only been approved because the developer chose to meet the standards set forth by the City. Several projects have gone above and beyond what was set forth by law -- Dublin Methodist Hospital, IGS Energy, Cardinal Health, the MAG campus. In those cases, the developer chose to make a statement in Dublin. This developer and this application reverses that history, and reverses that history in the face of a significant public investment and the success of their project. The least the City should ask of the developer is to meet the fundamental basics of the Code and deny their request for waivers.

Another significant departure in this application from the Vision Plan for the District is the way in which the principles of walkable urbanism are articulated. The intent of the principles is to create a District that is vibrant, a District that provides ample opportunities for neighbors to meet on the street, gather in coffee shops, walk to work, and create a fabric for the community. The principles attempt to define ways in which communities can embrace pedestrian-friendly developments to build a rich and deep sense of place. The Short North is a perfect example of a district that is developed with walkable urbanism concepts. Retail shops face the street, casual interactions happen on the street and corners, and people exit their homes and enter the public realm to meet others in the same realm. Contrast that with the traditional urban living where we exit our homes to our private space and our car to continue to the private space of a drive-through before we finally arrive at our final destination -- never stepping foot in the public realm but, rather, travelling through it, isolated. The Bridge Street District was originally envisioned to have underground parking facilities that were physically disconnected from the living units contained in the District, but because of the expense, the developer moved the parking facilities above ground into two sizable garages. Then sky bridges were added to make it more convenient for residents to get to and from their cars. This application brings forward a vision of 887 residents leaving their homes to the private space of their car to continue to the private space of a drive-through before arriving at their final destination. Does that sound familiar?

He asked Council to have the courage of their convictions. They should hold this applicant to the standards that Council articulated to the people of Dublin. Don't allow this applicant to use sub-standard materials like EIFS, vinyl and stucco; to make buildings too massive, under-mining the walkability of blocks and blocks; to hide open spaces where they have never been used and are economically advantageous. Don't comprise City standards now, while there is still the opportunity to get the development promised.

Chris Amorose Groomes, 5896 Leven Links Court, Dublin stated that she was not aware the public comments would be time limited. She has two items to address. She requested Ms. Ray pull up the 6th or 7th slide that lists the review process that has occurred for this project thus far. Mr. Lecklider inquired earlier if the plan had received approval at every step of that process. She wants to clarify that there have only been two approvals that this project has received -- one from the Planning and Zoning Commission and one from City Council. Both of those approvals were with regard to the plat exclusively. The applicant has abandoned that plat and is now applying for a new plat. So, in fact, this application, as seen today, has no approvals.

The Bridge Street District is indeed a transformative initiative in the City of Dublin, one that she welcomes. It continues the City's long and rich commitment to bold thinking. At its core, it fulfills the vision principles that this body adopted on October 25, 2010. Those principles are fivefold: enhance the economic vitality; integrate the new center into community life; embrace Dublin's natural setting and celebrate commitment to environmental sustainability; expand the range of choices available to Dublin and the region; create places that embody Dublin's commitment to community. At best, this proposal fails to meet three of those objectives. It could be argued that it fails to meet all five. This development does not integrate itself into community life; it does not embrace

the natural setting; nor does it create places that embody Dublin's commitment to community.

With respect to integration into community life, this development is highly outer dependent; does not provide an attractive public realm; and does not encourage multi-modal forms of transportation. For a sense of community, interaction is critical. Here, residents are encouraged to park their cars and proceed directly to their living quarters without ever interacting with the street or the community in which they live. There are six sky bridges that are designed to allow residents to travel from building to building without contributing to the vitality of the street network below. According to Andreas Doumy, the country's foremost expert of walkable urbanism, skywalks rob sidewalks of pedestrian life and hurt retail business. The successful urban environment is one that creates an experience. To create that experience, the proper ingredients must be present in exacting precision. There must be architecture that is interesting and captivates attention. There must be a sense of energy created by the people in the public space. There must be something to draw those people in. Those elements simply will not be present in this place. Attention must be given to various forms of travel. There are no transit stops planned, and once this application leaves Council tonight, there will not be space available to provide transit stops and structures that would not impede the little public realm that is left. Cycle tracks, too, have been compromised to the point that they are no longer effective forms of transportation.

With respect to embracing Dublin's natural setting in celebration of commitment to environmental sustainability, this development is in no way sustainable because it will not pass the test of time. The best opportunities our residents will have to interact with the Scioto River from the east and experience its beauty is to create a tunnel that will pass under six lanes of asphalt. This is certainly not the celebration of the natural setting that we set out to engage, but rather, a barrier to its access. The applicant is requesting waivers to ensure that they do not have to integrate into the natural topography of the land, but rather ignore it to place their façade at a higher elevation in order to avoid the expense of integration. The Community Plan specifically calls for terracing to tuck parking below buildings. The architecture selected is what she refers to as "2010 construction." As she travels the country on a regular basis, these are the style of buildings being constructed in virtually every city, largely due to the affordable nature of its design. They are not environmentally sustainable as they are not convertible spaces that can serve different uses over the course of time, a requirement of the Code. The "stick" construction on Floors 3 – 6 eliminates the convertibility of the structures, yet it does provide a very cost-effective means of construction for the developer.

With respect to creating places that embody Dublin's commitment to community, this development has compromised walkability, variety and vitality. The requirement is to have a clear 12 feet of sidewalk in the shopping corridor. To try to create the illusion that it meets this standard, the tree wells and cycle tracks have been added into the sidewalk calculations, certainly not living up to the intent nor the letter of the law. The Code is clear – 12 feet of sidewalks, not a mixture of tree wells, cycle tracks and sidewalks to achieve 12 feet. Sidewalks are the single most important part of any urban area.

She asks that Council honor the tradition of this community and the efforts of its taxpayers, who have to date spent in excess of $30 million to create this blank canvas upon which the vision of the Bridge Street District will be painted. She asks that Council require the applicant to bring forth an application that is worthy of our efforts and an asset to our community's future.

Amy Kramb, 7511 Riverside Drive, Dublin stated that staff is recommending that Council vote "yes" tonight on the Basic Development Plan, which is basically the streets. She urges Council to vote "no" until the developer can show a higher conformity to the vision principles, Community Plan, and principles of walkable urbanism.

The application fails review criteria #4, #8 and #9 as they pertain to transit. Walkable urbanism and vision principle #2 speak about integrating the District into the community with transit connections. Yet none of the street designs accommodates transit. If Council approves this tonight, the right-of-way will be set, and it will be too late to widen these streets for any bus pull-ups, bus stops or shelters. Just like cycle and pedestrian accommodations, transit elements need to be designed at this stage of the plan. Trying to

find space after buildout will only degrade the quality of this environment by lessening or removing other elements, such as on-street parking, the cycle track or the five-foot sidewalks.

This application fails criteria #5 – these buildings are not appropriately sited. The application allows the developer to occupy two blocks of prime real estate with parking garages. The Community Plan states the District will use existing topography to terrace buildings with parking tucked below to maximize use towards the river. Why are we compromising this vision? These blocks should contain multi-use buildings, not parking garages, and high-end condominiums not studio apartments. Staff also recommends that Council approve the Basic Site Plan; she urges Council to vote "no." This Basic Site Plan should establish the walkable urban environment. It will be the bar against which subsequent reviews will be based. The Code requires that the applicant ensure that any subsequent site plan is substantially similar to the plan Council is voting on tonight. The developer will be held to the building locations, heights, uses and materials approved by Council tonight.

This application also fails Criteria #10 – the plan is not consistent with the vision principles, Community Plan, or walkable urbanism. Walkable urbanism calls for a wide range of high-quality architectural styles on buildings that contain easily convertible spaces. The architecture should reflect Dublin's commitment to enduring character. The buildings depicted by the applicant are not unique from each other and other buildings under construction in urban areas. This is evidenced by visiting any recent urban renewal project or conducting a quick internet search on the last urban apartment complexes.

The developer is already asking for waivers to Code requirements that exist to ensure high quality, such as the 80% minimum primary building material. These frame buildings are not easily convertible. When Council approves these building types tonight, it will be guaranteeing apartments that, in the future, will not be convertible into "for purchase" condominiums or office space. If Council approves this, it will be setting a very low bar for future developers. The plan does not represent the best high quality development Dublin should expect for its prime riverfront property.

Vision principle #5 demands the creation of a development with Dublin's commitment to walkability, variety and vitality. This plan lacks variety. The buildings are all of similar size, scale, massing and design. One of these buildings standing alone may be acceptable, but together, these buildings create a monotonous symmetrical wall. Tonight Council will vote on several waivers. These waivers are exceptions and should only be granted because of extraordinary situations when granting the waiver would result in a greater quality development. It is premature to grant these waivers. The present application does not show a unique, high-quality design that warrants waivers. There is no need to grant these waivers. The policy allows the applicant to bring the waivers at the development and site plan review stage when the applicant can show more detail design and prove that these are magnificent, high-quality buildings that warrant an exception. Should Council entertain the idea of voting on these waivers, there are a few other points:

- The applicant is asking for less front property line coverage on two blocks.
- No horizontal façade divisions on three of the eight buildings
- Greater ground story height on four of the eight buildings

These Code requirements were written to ensure designs meet the principles of walkable urbanism. The purpose of the first-story façade division and ground-story height requirement is to create a comfortable pedestrian environment. Windows, doors, awnings and details should be kept to 12 feet or lower to engage pedestrians at street level and diminish the overall, overwhelming feeling of the six-story buildings. The applicant is asking to build ground-floor elevations as tall as 22 feet on four of these eight buildings. This is an increase of 10 feet, 55% greater than the Code requires. She urges Council to vote "no" on tonight's application. Further discussion is needed between the developer, the reviewing body and the public to inspire original, thoughtful and high-quality design deserving of this prime riverfront property in the heart of the City. The applicant needs to return with a design that meets Dublin's Vision, Community Plan and the principles of walkable urbanism.

Scott Haring, 3280 Lilymar Court, stated that he addressed Council in November 2013 on this matter. Again, he asks, why does the City need to be so involved in this project? He

respects the right of property owners to develop their land. He is not opposed to some sort of development but is always nervous when he hears a government is paying for the improvements. Tonight, he heard the figure of $17 million to facilitate what he saw – 371 apartments and over a thousand parking spaces. That is a tremendous amount of money and translates to $2,600 per apartment unit. He has lived in Dublin for 18 years and has attended Council meetings and PZC meetings. Overall, the theme has been how to attract corporate citizens because they generate revenue for the City. He has always heard that residential properties are a cost to the City. That is part of the reason he has objected to the Bridge Street Corridor and this massive attempt to build all of these apartments. This weekend, in preparation for tonight's meeting, he watched the video of the January 5 meeting. He was surprised to hear a Council member state that this is a way for the City to "provide" housing for senior citizens and young people. This same Council member also made some remarks about misinformation. It seems there is misinformation. He has attended at least six meetings over the last four years, and never before has he heard the City was setting out to "provide…". When he saw the meeting packet that was distributed last week about all these waivers, he couldn't begin to comprehend this – that over the past five years, all this planning for this development – the Bridge Street Corridor was carved out as a special section, with a special, totally new zoning written for it. Over and over, he heard "urban walkability." Tonight, with the first sizable project, there are many waivers requested. The question arises of whether the zoning lousy, or the proposal is lousy. It doesn't make sense to him that there should be a need for such significant waivers. He believes one of the slides stated that the maximum block length is 500 feet. The applicant's request is to have 640 feet – that is a huge percentage. He does not understand why that can't be resolved on the front end. His thought is that Council should modify the zoning, then the applicant can come back and comply with the zoning. He believes this topic should be tabled for at least 90 days to allow some of these things to be worked out. He agrees with many of the remarks of the previous speakers.

Don Spangler, 3614 Jenmar Court, Dublin stated that he is a 17-year resident. He was somewhat horrified looking at all Council is doing to that area. He is disappointed with what has been changed in Dublin. He is concerned about the public transportation. It was explained to him that this whole area would be a walkable area. He questions how one can cross Riverside Drive, from one side to the other, and survive. It puzzles him how it is possible to walk across that many lanes of traffic with no traffic signal. He doesn't understand that the City is developing this area for an American generation that likes to use public transportation, yet there is no provision for public transportation. Dublin had a park and ride bus lot in the District, but it is being moved. He doesn't understand why it is essential to make so many changes to the City's Code just to accommodate this development. Is there a problem with the Code language or the development? Everyone else has to comply with the Code and what is special about this development? If he were young, single and wanted to move some place, there is nothing about this that would appeal to him. He would go to Columbus, near a stadium or a busy district. Is the City planning to turn this into the Short North or the area around the hockey rink? What will this become five years out? He is disappointed in the change.

Randy Roth, 6897 Grandee Cliffs Drive, stated that he is the president of the East Dublin Civic Association. The members voted at their meeting to set up a subcommittee to be constructively engaged in an effort to help the City. Many members are present tonight. In past years, he served as vice chair on a City Transportation Task Force; Vice Mayor Gerber was the Chair of that task force. He noted that the City clearly needs a multimodal transportation hub somewhere in this area. The Task Force in the 1990s believe at the time that, even at lower densities, the City really needed to have a place for buses, where the multifamily was concentrated.. The Task Force believed that good sites would be at Dublin Village Center and Perimeter, near the hospital. COTA would interact with the City at those sites, and Dublin would provide circulator buses moving between those sites. In the Bridge Street District, affordable housing is not being created. There will be a lot of people working in Dublin who can't afford to live in this District, but people who do live there will need transportation. This is a good time to think about this issue.

Rachel Hughes, 5819 St. Ann's Court, stated that the Bridge Street District seems like a great idea, but when compared with German Village, the Short North, Downtown Columbus and all the new builds in those locations– realistically, Dublin does not have the same incentives to attract young professionals. She graduated from college in May, and this is not a place that she would likely move. The other areas are more central to friends and colleagues. She has learned that living in Dublin precludes her participating in certain social events with her friends who live downtown. People want to live near their friends, work, and have access to places like the Convention Center and the Arena. Dublin doesn't have those amenities. There are also financial incentives, such as tax abatements for properties downtown, and Dublin does not offer these. The majority of young professionals cannot afford these apartments on their limited salaries -- it is not a viable option for them. She is concerned that the City is making a massive investment in this project, promoting a migrational pool of young people and this District cannot compete with those other areas. Taxpayers do not have enough return on investment for this project.

Council Discussion

Mr. Lecklider stated that in the record provided for this case, there was a reference to building material that he is not familiar with -- Arriscraft. Is it on one of the display boards?

Mr. Hunter responded that it is on most of the boards [he pointed it out.]. There are different versions of the material on all the buildings. Some are smooth; others more roughhewn. They are the base materials used for a majority of the buildings; some does reach into upper stories. It is used as a design element; it replaces cast stone, because it is a more stable material. When detailed properly, it will hold up at the ground plain to water and other contact. It is a solid, durable material for the ground plain. They use brick in other locations, as well. It provides some variety.

Ms. Ray stated that in the Code provisions, it is considered to be a cast stone, which is a permitted primary building material. It is a common material, used frequently in Dublin. Arriscraft is a name brand.

Mr. Yoder added that one reason it is used is that it comes in a variety of unit sizes, in different textures and different colors, which can create a variety between the buildings. It is also one of the most expensive materials they have on the project, in an effort to make it durable, high quality, and with variety.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if it is more expensive than brick.

Mr. Yoder responded affirmatively.

Mr. Lecklider inquired the composition of the material.

Mr. Yoder responded that it is calcium silicate, a mixture of sand and calcium.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if it is intended to be used as a foundational material.

Mr. Yoder responded that it is, and it can be seen on the lower levels of these buildings. It is durable, but warm. Brick would be a downgrade in variety and in cost.

Mr. Lecklider noted that one of his concerns is with respect to the use of EIFS. He recalls 15-20 years ago, when he served on the Planning and Zoning Commission, EIFS was not favorable viewed. It may have been due to the extent that it was being used in some of the office buildings in Dublin, rather than because it was an inferior material. There has been a substantial use of EIFS, as evidenced on many of the office buildings that exist in Dublin today. In many if not all the buildings, they do not seem to meet the minimum requirements for use of the approved materials -- brick, stone and glass.

Ms. Ray responded that staff would continue to work with the applicant on this. The applicant's goal is to have interesting colors and textures to lend variety to the streetscape. For that reason, they are looking at other applications of different types of materials. They will continue to test for the Site Plan review.

Mr. Lecklider stated that he may ultimately be persuaded. He does appreciate the fact that in virtually every instance that this material is used in combination with metal panels, it is used in the upper elevations. He also appreciates the fact that it creates some diversity. His compliments to the applicant's staff and City staff for this latest iteration, which achieves some distinction between each building. However, the metal panels conjure up a negative image because of its use in other places. Although he is not 100 percent opposed

to its utilization in this project, he has some concern. The vinyl windows, as well, have a negative image for him. He requested justification for their use.
Mr. Yoder responded that the vinyl windows that are proposed in the residential buildings are a higher-end product than used in any previous project; that is due to Dublin's requirements. The warranties available on these windows are the same as on aluminum windows – 25 years. With these windows, it is possible to create a warm color on the outside; they are operable; they are a higher value window than an aluminum window that would satisfy the requirements. They are looking holistically at the material for its warranty, R value, energy star rating. Rather than a low quality metal window that meets the requirement, they can spend the same amount or a little more on a vinyl window that meets all the sustainability and aesthetic requirements of the project. There are many locations in the building where, to add to the variety of the buildings, aluminum is used at all the ground floor levels and commercial spaces. Part of the variety of textures and materials that will be achieved between the different floors of these buildings includes integration of the various window types.

Mr. Hunter stated that when people think of vinyl windows, they expect the typical builder-grade window in a choice of white or beige; it is a negative image. However these windows not only provide higher R values and energy efficiency, they are high quality with welded seams and available in any color. As an example, NRI just installed the exact window at Grandview Yard that they are proposing for Bridge Park. Online, you can see the construction process. The windows were custom-colored, which they are proposing to do with this project, so the windows were matched to the trim pieces or composite panels. This window product will provide performance and design flexibility.

Mr. Lecklider stated that Mr. Reiner, who is not present tonight, would likely inquire about the height of the proposed buildings compared to the typical residential two story, which is 35 feet to the peak. A building height estimate of 70 feet was mentioned, but is that a sufficient height to accommodate something more than an eight-foot ceiling in the interior of these units? In the presentation, a ceiling height of 9 to 10 feet was mentioned.
Mr. Hunter responded that the residential units have a minimum ceiling height of nine feet throughout the project. The upper floors, some penthouse units, have 10-foot ceilings; the warehouse building has 10-foot ceilings. This is actually a market standard; they must provide that to be competitive.

Mr. Lecklider stated that he appreciates the diversity in the buildings, as they can appeal to different tastes. His overarching concern is with the quality, particularly with the parking garages. He appreciates the creativity that has been employed, but he is concerned about its sustainability over time and how it fits within the overall District.

With respect to the bridges incorporated within the design – as they are described, including utilization, he is not concerned. The street sections also appear to be fine.

Mr. Lecklider stated that throughout the Bridge Street District, over time, he believes that any large-scale project will involve waivers. At the outset of the discussion with this Code, it was always contemplated that, given the very prescriptive nature of the Code, that waivers would be more than likely. Every waiver request should not necessarily be approved, but he has no issue with any of these waivers requested.

He essentially agrees with the ART comments and recommendations. He compliments Planning staff and the ART members. The high standards to which ART has held the applicant certainly meet his expectations. One of the speakers tonight pointed out a question he had asked staff earlier this evening. At its August meeting, PZC approved the Basic Plan. It is true that subsequent changes have altered that application. His point is that since the time of PZC's 7-0 approval, the plan has improved a great deal. He anticipates the application will continue to improve as it moves forward.

Mr. Peterson asked if the five waivers would be voted on as a group or separately.
Ms. Ray responded that either way Council prefers would be fine.

Mr. Peterson asked what would be entailed with adjusting the roads so the block complies with Code. Is the proposed block 50 feet wider than required?
Mayor Keenan inquired if that issue relates to the lots.
Ms. Ray responded that the waiver applies to two lots, where there are unique factors – the defined locations of future roadway connections -- Tuller Ridge Drive and John Shields Parkway. That has driven the definition of the greenway along there and how those two blocks are shaped.
Mr. Peterson stated that this is therefore more of a pragmatic waiver. Does it benefit the developer financially?
Ms. Ray responded that she does not believe it has a financial impact for the applicant. The block will likely be developed with internal vehicular access. There will still be pedestrian connectivity through the block, which achieves the goals.
Mr. Peterson responded that there may be more room for wider sidewalks through there, or more space between buildings.
Mr. Peterson indicated the front property line is logical, so he has no issue with that waiver. In regard to the front percentage waiver, does that not meet the Code because of the separation of two buildings with greenspace between?
Ms. Ray responded that is correct. If Buildings C1 and C2, and B1 and B2 were on individual parcels, there would be no issue; however, the applicant is proposing one lot shared by two buildings with a greenspace between them.
Mr. Peterson stated that the front percentage is less because of the open space added between the buildings.
Ms. Ray responded that is correct. They are being provided by means of public access easements, so the public can use the spaces as well as the people living and working here.
Mr. Peterson inquired about the waiver for the horizontal façade division. He is not an architect, but if he understands the picture shown, the first floor is retail; the second floor is office space; the third floor and up are residential. The façade division would be between the office and the residential, as opposed to above the first floor. However, awnings will be placed where the Code would require it.
Ms. Ray responded that is correct. There will be awnings or canopies to help keep the scale down for pedestrians despite the extra floor.
Mr. Hunter added that what drives this architecturally is the windows. The sizes of the windows on the second floor relate more to the size of the retail windows below. This is a more natural architectural division than the prescribed position. It would end up being a four-part building, rather than a three-part building. Some element will be introduced at that location instead to achieve the pedestrian scale.
Mr. Peterson inquired if the applicant is requesting the waiver because it would cost more to comply with Code.
Mr. Hunt responded that the purpose is for a better design.
Mr. Yoder stated that the Bridge Street Code did not contemplate the fact that there would be a second floor of office in many of the uses. It contemplated retail on the ground floor and two or three floors of residential or office above. These are unusual buildings; there aren't many around with ground floor retail, second floor office, and additional residential floors above. The intent is to achieve a proportional breakdown of the front façade, but with a six-story building, placing the façade break that low and making everything above it a different material would make the ground story look "squished." It does not achieve a good proportion between the commercial space and the residential space. There is another reason, namely -- as different commercial tenants come forward, they will update the façade to identify the space as their own. Different tenants will, through the use of different materials, add a lot of variety to the streetscape from façade to façade as well as vertically.
Mr. Peterson stated that the last waiver requested relates to ground story height. Because the ground slopes, the ground story height is lower at the higher elevation than at the lower elevation.
Ms. Ray stated that is correct -- the height change is due to the ground floor following the slope of the ground.
Mr. Peterson stated that actually the floor is lowering; the ceiling is staying the same.
Mr. Yoder stated that the Code requirement is 12 feet, which is really low for some commercial spaces, such as a restaurant that may want to have live music. For some

retail, 12 feet is adequate, but for other users 20-22 feet is needed. They are trying to capture the unique topography of the site to create some great variety in these buildings. There can be a live music venue at the bottom and a retailer, such as a bank branch, at the other.
Mr. Peterson stated that even if this were a two-story building and not a six-story building, a waiver would still be needed because of the slope of the ground.
Ms. Ray stated that would probably be true, although it might be possible to "step" the building.
Mr. Hunter stated that if the building were stepped on the second level, the office level would have steps, which means it would not be the flexible space needed for tenants who will come and go. This waiver will allow them to keep that floor plate flat.
Mr. Peterson stated that he has some questions, based on testimony tonight. Is there anything in the information presented tonight that would adjust, alleviate or relax any City building code requirements?
Mr. Hunt responded that there is not. They meet with their architect on a weekly basis to review code issues to ensure that they are in line with building codes.
Mr. Peterson inquired if Council is being requested to approve any materials not consistent with code.
Ms. Ray responded that they are not. As Mr. Lecklider pointed out, there are required percentages that are not yet met. Staff will be working with the applicant further on this issue, and it may be addressed as a future waiver, if needed.
Mr. Peterson inquired who is responsible for maintenance of the common areas – the City?
Ms. Ray responded that will be worked out through the development agreements. At this point, the areas are owned by the developer and they have a public access easement.
Mr. Yoder stated that it is their intent to maintain the spaces, or at least to contribute to the maintenance, and pass those charges through to their tenants. If the City wants to take a role in maintaining the quality of the surfaces within that space, that is possible, but they are not looking to avoid the expense of maintaining those spaces.
At this point, there was a question from the audience about greenspace allocation.
Ms. Ray referred to the greenspace as shown on the applicant's presentation. These are not submitted for Council's review tonight. This is the diagrammatic greenspace allocation, but these concepts are evolving. The presentation depicts the general location and character.
Mr. Peterson inquired if the greenspace is a completely pedestrian area.
Ms. Ray responded affirmatively.
Mr. Peterson, referring to the ART report, stated that there was discussion concerning compliance with Code of the mechanicals on the roof. When would issues such as that be addressed?
Ms. Ray responded that screening is a Final Site Plan issue.
Mr. Peterson stated that in summary, he likes some buildings more than others. He is concerned about the sky bridges. He does not like them particularly, although he understands their need.

Ms. Salay complimented staff and the applicant on the amount of detail provided in this report.
She believes that Council needs to learn more or see more regarding the parking garages. The applicant has provided some photographs or renderings to PZC that she would like staff to forward in a Council packet and provide at the website. She is interested in the aspect of the parking garages providing a canvas for public art. She agrees that beauty is in the eye of the beholder, but what she believes is missing in terms of architecture is curves. Well-placed curves can be pleasing to the eye. In the sky bridge, there is an archway. The tower at the terminal vista might be a place where a round element could be added. She does not know where it should be added, but believes adding a curved element would enhance the beauty of the buildings.
In terms of building materials, she is concerned about the EIFS and the metal panels. Council took cementitious siding off the table, but that was not necessarily the intent. She wanted to limit the use of cementitious siding to a lower number; the more Arriscraft and brick used, the better. She would need to be convinced about EIFS and metal panels.

She appreciated the explanation about the vinyl windows, but are there any places that casement windows might be contemplated? It might be nice somewhere overlooking some streets.
Mr. Hunter responded that they have looked at different windows. For the warehouse building, for example, they looked at the copper-style windows. Those windows do provide the opportunity for a different opening; that might be a possibility.
Regarding maintenance, Ms. Salay stated that she needs to understand more about the long-term maintenance of the materials. There is a prominent hotel in Dublin that is beginning to show aging, although a top quality material was used. The appearance is deteriorating, and she is not aware of how that might be addressed. She recognizes that the issue is not only about the materials, but also about how they are installed. She does not know how to achieve a quality level of contractor installation in the field, but it is important to have expectations met.
In regard to street sections, Ms. Salay believes this plan is an improvement. She inquired how many sky bridges were proposed.
Mr. Yoder responded there are five sky bridges.
Ms. Salay stated that if underground parking had been used, there would have been express elevators from the parking garage to the residences.
Mr. Hunter stated that with underground parking, residents would walk to an elevator lobby that would connect to the correct building and then to the desired floor. There would be no interaction with the street. That was a part of the plan that was approved by PZC. The revised parking plan is certainly an improvement over that plan in terms of interacting with the street. With people outside on a bridge, there will be more activity in terms of using the grocery stores and restaurants. The access between the stores and the residential units is improved with this type of parking. The sky bridges can be an interesting feature, and can integrate some branding and personalities into the bridges. It can actually be a trademarking or branding element for this project, building upon the brand of the bridge in Bridge Park.
Ms. Salay stated that she likes the details of the open spaces and anticipates they will be used by the pedestrians, and she doesn't oppose the bridges as they interact with that space. Perhaps some plantings on them would be a nice amenity.
She noted that comments were made about enhancing the economic viability. Another speaker commented that he wasn't aware the City was "providing" housing. That was simply a choice of words by Mr. Reiner. Extensive studies have been done about what will make the Dublin community relevant going forward, and that informed all of the decisions about Bridge Street. With regard to what young people want, staff has spent an extensive amount of time, the economic development team has spent a lot of time with corporate residents who essentially enable Dublin to have a quality community. Those corporate residents have indicated that it is absolutely necessary to attract the next generation of workers and it is important to have an environment that will do that. Many young professionals currently employed with these companies were interviewed. All of that has informed the direction that Council is taking with regard to Bridge Street.

Mayor Keenan noted that there are many young folks who live at Craughwell Village primarily because they can walk to the grocery store, dry cleaner and many other facilities available in the vicinity. That is a good case in point, and he is confident that this new project will further address that need.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that she was critical the first time this plan was brought forward, and believed that the developer needed to do much more work on the plan. There has been substantial progress, but she does not believe the developer has met the expectation yet. Even though different materials have been used on the buildings and there is a little more architectural interest, it is not enough. It is not "uniquely different." She does not want Dublin to look like downtown Columbus. Columbus has done a wonderful job with their recent development, but theirs is an urban setting. Dublin has the opportunity to be more interesting and less conservative. Even though the rest of the Dublin community has a particular style throughout, this is a unique area of the community and an opportunity for something different because of the population it is intended to serve.

In terms of skywalks, she is conflicted about them; personally, she doesn't like them. In downtown Columbus and other cities, over time, they have been removed. The open sky bridge has a better feel than the closed bridge, and the closed ones have been torn down more frequently than the open bridges. It would be helpful to view photos from around the country where these open bridges have been used effectively. She is not totally opposed to them, but is conflicted.
Transportation was commented on by a couple of speakers. It is a big issue that has been discussed regularly over the years in this area. It does appear that the plan provides provides bicycle, vehicle and pedestrian opportunity, but what about the ability to have buses, even small buses to serve the District?
Ms. Ray stated that this project will provide the critical mass and density that make more transit options feasible. Although nothing is proposed tonight, the applicant is considering transit. In fact, one of the plans considered where a bus stop could be located. There are no details associated with it yet, so it is not possible to provide a recommendation at this time. In the short term, the City needs to work with COTA; it will require significant coordination. This has been discussed with the applicant, and will continue to be addressed with this project.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that her vision may not be a COTA style of transportation, but perhaps more of a streetcar. The C-bus in downtown Columbus is the type she envisions for this area. To meet the interests of both the older and younger generations and integrated living arrangements, as well as accommodating the outdoor activities, that type of transportation makes more sense than a COTA bus. Users need to be able to hop on, hop off such transit. If Dublin is really trying to encourage people to work within the community, that type of transportation would permit them to leave their cars behind, versus driving to a corporate office in Dublin. More space is needed to accommodate that mode of transit, but maybe less buildings are needed so that it is possible to incorporate the transportation options that people might be able to enjoy. Dublin does not want this area to be the same as what other cities are doing. Other communities in the region are now developing urban/suburban concepts. Dublin's should be "uniquely different" from what others have done or are doing. To her, there is nothing overly unique about these buildings -- they are deluxe apartment buildings. They are unusual for the Dublin community, but she does not believe they would be viewed as unusual by the population the City is trying to attract. More work needs to be done on the gathering spaces that the population would want to use, even within the building. The internal spaces of the buildings are not being addressed today, but perhaps going forward, it could be an attraction to future residents. In summary, the applicant has made much progress, but the plan is not yet what she envisions it can be.

Vice Mayor Gerber concurred with Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher's comments. When he served on the Planning and Zoning Commission, he always envisioned gateway features. This is a new gateway for the City, and he is looking for something that is extraordinary, that stands out. He doesn't see that with this plan. The words that have been referenced are, "a destination place" – but what is the attraction? They mentioned future restaurants locating in this development, but that also brings cars and traffic related to the use. The plan is also for 371 residential units, and the related traffic. In addition, the cycle track and sidewalk are set up in a way that will result in conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. He would like to consider some options for safety barriers between the two. This area should be walkable and also bicycle friendly.
In terms of sky bridges, he is somewhat undecided. In many areas of the country, such sky bridges are being torn down. However, if he resided in these buildings, he would consider them necessary for carrying groceries home during inclement weather.
In regard to transit, he stated this was envisioned as the new 21st century, hip place to be with new ideas. In his mind, transit options are one of the top three things that should be considered.
He noted that with the vote tonight, Council is setting parameters. If a building is too big or the setbacks are not adequate, and if the other items discussed cannot be accommodated, then what? Approving this tonight will establish the parameters going forward.

Ms. Ray responded that is correct. Council will in essence be giving the applicant the guidance needed to move forward with those greater levels of detail.
Vice Mayor Gerber stated that if there is not space in the plan for transit options for the future, it will be too late to address it.
Ms. Ray responded that transit is being considered. With the street sections and right-of-way, they have tried to strike a balance --having enough space for flexibility for everything that needs to happen without the street feeling too wide and no longer urban. They will continue to work on that aspect.
Mayor Keenan stated that he supports Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher's concept of a shuttle.
Vice Mayor Gerber stated that nearly 20 years ago, the Transportation Task Force studied those options, and more recently, CSAC discussed options.
Mayor Keenan stated that there are more areas in need of connectivity – the Ohio University campus, for example.
Ms. Salay inquired if it is possible to eliminate some on street parking to provide a transit stop.
Ms. Ray responded affirmatively.
Ms. Salay clarified that the opportunity is not eliminated. It is a matter of reconfiguring the public space to accommodate it – perhaps a smaller circulator bus. The plan provides for a large amount of on street parking; if some of those spaces are eliminated, a potential transit stop can be accommodated.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that it would not be a matter of simply giving up two parking spaces. There is the transition space the transit system needs to move in and out, as well. It would require more space.
Vice Mayor Gerber stated that it might be difficult to retrofit in the future.

Vice Mayor Gerber stated that in subsequent phases, there will be more condominiums as well as apartments. A substantial number of apartments have been built in central Ohio in the last five years. Where is the "bubble" in terms of the need – is it now past that point?
Mr. Meyer responded that he expects condominiums in certain locations to pick up. The condominiums on the west side of Columbus have been very well received. But for those who will be attracted to this area in Dublin, it would not be well suited to have all condominiums. That is not the market being pursued and is not what all the studies indicate is needed for the next 30-40 years. There is a condominium need as well, so there can be a mix with some for-sale options. But all the studies indicate that apartments need to be a predominant part of that. Many apartments have been built recently, but the supply is only now reaching the level that should be built. During the years of 2008 to 2010, only a very few apartments were built. In Dublin, essentially no apartments have been built, so Dublin has a tremendous demand for this type of housing.
Vice Mayor Gerber stated that he is trying to understand the market and the options. He is being told by financial experts that the buildings financed by TIFs will commit the City to having those as apartments for the 30 years of that TIF. Because it is impossible to envision 30 years out, he is trying to look for options with respect to those housing needs should they change.
Mr. Meyer stated that they have reviewed the studies that have been done, including studies commissioned for this particular development that considered the needs over the next 30 years. No one can exactly predict what they will be; one can only rely upon what the studies indicate today. He had a meeting today with a Dublin business owner. They have been able to meet dozens of business owners – office users, restaurants, and potential tenants both for rental and ownership. The office user he met with today has a tech company located in Dublin with an office located in downtown Columbus. Both leases expire next year. Their decision is simply this – to move everyone downtown or move into a development like Bridge Park. It is not an option to remain in their current office-only development. This office user indicated that the decision is not being made by him; it is being made by his employees. They want to work in a walkable urban area. They followed up further and had discussions about the rents at the development. A comment was made earlier tonight that the rents would be unaffordable. They discussed the rents for each type of unit. The business owner had already had these conversations with his employees. He and his partner stated that the proposed rents would be in line with what they are accustomed to paying already in different markets. Now, they would be able to

live and work in the same location, so it would be affordable. He also stated that his employee base is about 40, and he is expecting to grow to 100 employees. About 50% of his employees are current renters. The age of their employee group continues to be younger, so he is expecting that group to increase to about 75% renters. He expected that a large majority of those would want to live in the same building or a building next door to the office.
Vice Mayor Gerber stated that he is concerned with the issue of flexibility, and 30 years is a very long time commitment.
Mr. Meyer stated that from a physical perspective, the way these units are being built, they could be converted to condominiums. But whether or not that would result in issues with the TIF would be a separate issue.
Mr. Yoder stated that, typically, the ground and second floor of most of these buildings is concrete construction on a podium building, which means they are completely flexible. In the case of the two office buildings and the hotel along Riverside Drive, all those buildings are five stories that are scaled to be completely convertible to other uses.

Vice Mayor Gerber stated that waivers are sometimes variation of a theme, sometimes they actually raise the bar. The use of the word "waiver" does not necessarily connote something negative or positive. He was not aware that the City had issued a lot of bonds related to the District – this seems to be misinformation. One reason he did not support Ordinance 114-14 was for this very reason tonight. Council has not yet reviewed an economic development agreement related to the Bridge Park project. He had hoped that when the developer came to Council, Council would have the opportunity to review a concept plan with some details, have a presentation such as tonight's, and provide constructive feedback to keep the discussion moving forward. If he is being asked to vote tonight, committing taxpayer dollars to support this plan, he wants to see what it will ultimately look like. That is good business; it is being prudent. The difficulty and the angst he is experiencing tonight is that, although there are a lot of good things included in this plan, there are many things that he is not yet comfortable with. The applicant is asking for an affirmative vote tonight, but giving that will result in not having another opportunity to provide input. It will proceed to the next reviewing body and not return to Council.

Mayor Keenan stated that he likes the changes made in the architecture. He also agrees with the comments that there needs to be a "wow" factor. If there is a way to make that happen --maybe a curved feature would help, as the architecture does seem "boxy." There may be some elements that could be added to alter that on a couple of the buildings. The materials and detail are difficult to discern on some of the renderings, but this iteration is a big improvement over the previous ones.
He emphasized that there are no bonds related to this project. His understanding is that the project infrastructure will be paid for by the project.
Initially, he was concerned about the vinyl windows, but the applicant's explanation has addressed that concern.
In regard to the parking garages, there is parking on the top deck. Presumably, that will be screened somehow, and he would like to see more detail on that aspect.
Mayor Keenan stated that it is clear that there is a tremendous amount of passion with respect to this project. Some people do not want any development in this area; some people have very different visions; and there are many that embrace the Planning staff's work on this and the developer's view. It is noteworthy that this Council has fully embraced this project at every step. Council continues to see improvement in the plans, and expects to see that continue going forward.

Mr. Lecklider commented in regard to the transit discussion. The C-bus uses downtown stops in three lanes at the posted locations. It does not require any otherwise dedicated space.

Vote on Recommendations

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher requested clarification of what an affirmative vote tonight would mean. What is the level of flexibility after that vote?

Ms. Ray responded that an affirmative vote on the Basic Plan and the Basic Site Plan authorizes the applicant to move forward with the additional detail. At this point, the applicant is making sure that the big pieces are coming together and that they understand Council's concerns and feedback before exploring the additional details of the project. The affirmative vote on the Basic Development Plan and the Basic Site Plan allows the applicant to move forward with the Final Development Plan, working out the streetscape details and the Final Site Plan, which explores all the details of the buildings and explores different concepts for those. Council brought up many concerns and provided suggestions. The ART has also noted many in their report. The ART completes a very exhaustive analysis based on the Code, so the applicant is well aware of the issues that they need to continue to work on -- both from the form-based perspective and also from the big picture character perspective. The next step is the Final Development Plan and the Final Site Plan. Those are required to be substantially similar to what Council has reviewed tonight with the Basic Plan review, but are not required to be identical. If there are addition items that Council requests, Council can either add as a condition, or reflect them as part of the record. This information can be passed along to the applicant for the next levels of review.

Vote on the Waivers
Mr. Lecklider moved to approve the following Basic Development Plan waivers related to:
a. Maximum Block Size
b. Front Property Lines
Ms. Salay seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

Mr. Lecklider moved to approve the Basic Development Plan with the six conditions recommended by the Administrative Review Team (ART).
Ms. Salay seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that she has voted yes, but is focused on the feedback from the applicant to Council's concerns and comments. In the next round of reviews, she will not approve this if they return with the same exact plans. Council has invested significant time in tonight's review, and the applicant should seriously consider all the comments that Council and the citizens have made before coming back for the next stage.

Mr. Lecklider moved to approve the Basic Site Plan waivers related to:
a. Front Property Line Coverage
b. Horizontal Façade Divisions
c. Ground Story Height
Ms. Salay seconded the motion. She noted the expectation that the applicant and staff would work together to have the first level with awnings delineated appropriately.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Lecklider.
Vice Mayor Gerber stated that he has voted in support of this, but echoes the comment regarding the expectations of Council as this project goes forward.

Mr. Lecklider moved to approve the Basic Site Plan with the eight conditions recommended by the Administrative Review Team (ART).
Ms. Salay seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher moved to designate Planning and Zoning Commission as the required reviewing body for Final Development Plan Review, Final Site Plan Review, Conditional Use, and Master Sign Plan applications for the Bridge Park mixed-use development.
Vice Mayor Gerber seconded the motion.

Vice Mayor Gerber noted that there will be a related development agreement for this application. Before approving that agreement, is there is an opportunity for Council to review this plan again? As the Code is written, when PZC approves the final plans, that is the end of the review process. He is confident that PZC will do a great job with their review, but before Council makes the financial commitment, he believes it is essential to review that final plan again, prior to approving a development agreement.
Ms. Readler stated that the development agreement will be brought forward to Council in the near future, and provides Council an opportunity to give more direction. Council has given substantial direction tonight that PZC, if so designated, can use in their reviews. Certainly, nothing prohibits informal reviews or updates to Council to which Council can provide input to inform the PZC decision.

Mayor Keenan asked about the anticipated timeline for the development agreement review. It seems that the developer would not proceed until the agreement is in place.
Ms. Grigsby stated that staff and the developer have continued to meet regarding this agreement. There was a staff meeting this afternoon to discuss some of the key issues in the general terms of the agreement. Some items remain to be worked out with the developer. There is a March 22 deadline to be met that relates to the use of a New Community Authority for this project. The expectation is that at one of the upcoming Council meetings, an update will be provided to Council on the timeframes for the New Community Authority – what needs to be set up and when; and the Community Reinvestment Area – what needs to be set up, and when that legislation will be brought forward. Staff and the applicant continue to work on finalizing the terms, and anticipate bringing something forward to Council in February.

Mr. Gerber stated that some of this might be a situation of "the chicken and the egg" in terms of timing. He is very hopeful that the applicant takes all of Council's comments and those of the citizens tonight into consideration.
Mr. Keenan stated that he does not believe it is possible for Council to sign off on a development agreement without all of the information available. How will that be handled?
Mr. Lecklider pointed out that the option exists for Council to retain review jurisdiction for this case. That is not the motion on the floor, but that is an option in the Code as amended.

Mr. Gerber stated that he has no objection to the motion as stated, because he would prefer that PZC work on this going forward. They are familiar with the detailed review process and will advise Council of their recommendations.

Mayor Keenan stated that the next iteration will have to be very close to final before he will be comfortable approving a development agreement.

Ms. Readler stated that staff and the applicant will have to work on the timing. Subsequent applications that are authorized under this will come after the development agreement timeline, or very close in time, so that there is a good idea of what the subsequent renderings are at the time of the development agreement.
Mr. Gerber stated that he is voting to support this motion with the intention of moving this along, but if the plan does not meet Council's expectations, there are no guarantees at the end.
Mayor Keenan commented that everyone is learning how this form-based Code works with this first major project. Mr. Gerber had made suggestions at a previous meeting about how Ordinance 114-14 could be amended to meet the needs of Council. It may be necessary to address that in the future.

Ms. Grigsby stated that, typically, development agreements have contingencies. The financial terms can be agreed upon for the most part, but if items remain with regard to architectural issues and final approval of the plan – that is a contingency that would be included in the agreement itself.

Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Mayor – Presiding Officer

Clerk of Council

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

JANUARY 8, 2015

The Administrative Review Team made the following determinations at this meeting:

1. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development
Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road
15-002BPR/PP Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan/Preliminary Plat Reviews

Proposal:	This is a request for preliminary review for a new mixed-use development on a 30.9-acre site located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road. The proposal includes new public streets and nine blocks for development for the overall site, with eight mixed-use buildings containing 372 housing units and 260,000 square feet of commercial square footage (office, retail, restaurant).
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan Review applications under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). This is also a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.
Applicants:	Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4656 or rray@dublin.oh.us

DETERMINATION #1: Recommendation of approval to City Council for two Development Plan Waivers:

1) Maximum Block Size – Zoning Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(b)

   To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Lot 6 (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±584 feet on the west and 617 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,979 feet); and

   To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Lot 9 (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±640 feet on the west and 687 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,894 feet).

2) Front Property Lines – Zoning Code Section 153.060(C)(3)(b)

   Allowing only one front property line (and three corner side property lines) instead of two front property lines (and two corner side property lines) for Lots 3 and 5 containing parking structures, where a minimum of two front property lines are required.

RESULT: The Development Plan Waivers were forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

1. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development
Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road
15-002BPR/PP Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan/Preliminary Plat Reviews

DETERMINATION #2: Recommendation of approval to City Council for three Site Plan Waivers:

1) Front Property Line Coverage – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(a)1/ 153.062(O)(6)(a)1
Allowing Front Property Line Coverage to be 52.52% instead of 75% for Buildings B1 and B2 along Riverside Drive, and allowing Front Property Line Coverage to be 63.32% for Buildings C1 and C2 along Riverside Drive.

2) Horizontal Façade Divisions – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4
Not requiring a horizontal façade division at the top of the ground story (allowing a horizontal façade division at the top of the second story instead) for Buildings B1, B2, and C3.

3) Ground Story Height – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b)/ 153.062(O)(12)(b):
Allowing ground story height to exceed the maximum permitted height for Buildings B3 and B4 (Parking Structure Façades), C3 and C4 (Parking Structure Façades) from maximum 12 feet for parking structures and 16 feet for corridor building types up to maximum 22 feet.

RESULT: The Site Plan Waivers were forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

DETERMINATION #3: Recommendation of approval to City Council for the Basic Development Plan with six conditions:

1) That the applicant works with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;
2) That the applicant selects building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
3) That the applicant provides the full 12-foot minimum clear sidewalk area within the designated shopping corridors as part of the Site Plan Review;
4) That the applicant describes the intent for the required BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review;
5) That the applicant provides a phasing, demolition, and interim site conditions plan for the development as part of the Development Plan Review; and
6) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering comments as part of the Development Plan Review.

RESULT: The Basic Development Plan was forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

1. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development
Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road
15-002BPR/PP Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan/Preliminary Plat Reviews

DETERMINATION #4: Recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council for the Preliminary Plat with four conditions:

1) That the plans are revised to include parking on the south side of Banker Drive for the section between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street;
2) City Council approval of the Plat modification of the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent;
3) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering comments prior to final review by City Council; and
4) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to final review by City Council.

RESULT: The Preliminary Plat was forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council with a recommendation of approval.

DETERMINATION #5: Recommendation of approval to City Council for the Basic Site Plan with eight conditions:

1) That the applicant seek approval of conditional uses for the proposed parking garages prior to (or with) Site Plan approval;
2) That the parking garage entrance/exit drives are reduced to less than 24 feet wide, or seek approval of a Waiver at Site Plan Review;
3) That the applicant provide awnings and/or canopies and/or other elements wherever possible and architecturally appropriate at the determination of the required reviewing body at the top of the first story (as conceptually shown in most of the renderings) at the Site Plan Review;
4) That the plans are revised to include a crosswalk at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Longshore Street;
5) That the building plans are modified to address the potential "Future Waivers" and other modifications noted in this report prior to the Site Plan Review, or Site Plan Waivers will be required;
6) That the applicant seek approval of a request to pay a fee-in-lieu of dedicating the full open space requirement;
7) That the proposed open spaces that fail to meet the minimum dimensional requirements are modified prior to the Site Plan Review, or Site Plan Waivers will be required; and
8) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering comments as part of the Site Plan Review.

RESULT: The Basic Development Plan was forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

1. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development
Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road
15-002BPR/PP Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan/Preliminary Plat Reviews

DETERMINATION #6: Approval of this request for four Administrative Departures:

1) Front Property Line Coverage (minimum 75% required)
   a. *Building C2* – 73.46% along Bridge Park Avenue
2) Upper Story Height
   a. *Building B4 (Garage) – 12.5 feet (maximum 12 feet)*
   b. *C2 – 15 feet (max. 14 ft.)*
   c. *C4 (Garage) – 12.67 ft. (maximum 12 feet).*
3) Upper Story Street Façade Transparency Requirement (minimum 30% required)
   a. *Building B1 – 27.70% at 4th floor (Riverside Drive elevation);*
   b. *C3 – 29.19% at 5th floor (Bridge Park Avenue);*
   c. *C4 (Residential) – 29.31% at 2nd floor and 29.88% at 5th floor (Mooney Street).*
4) Minimum Primary Façade Materials Requirement (minimum 80% required)
   a. *Building B1 – 74.45% (Longshore Street elevation); 74.71% (open space); 73.85% (Banker Drive)*
   b. *B2 – 76.15% (open space)*
   c. *B3 – 73.06% (Longshore Street); 78.70% (Mooney Street)*
   d. *B4 (Residential) – 73.08% (Longshore Street; 78.73% (open space)*
   e. *C3 – 74.13% (Mooney Street)*
   f. *C4 (Residential) – 74.58% (Mooney Street)*

RESULT: This request was approved. This approval shall be valid for a period of two years from the date of approval in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Steve Langworthy, Planning Director

City of Dublin

Land Use and Long Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 8, 2015

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; and Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Tammy Noble-Flading, Senior Planner; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

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

Others Present: Dan Phillabaum, dp planning & design, LLC; consultant to the ART.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 30, 2014, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATION

1. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development
Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road
15-002BPR/PP Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan/Preliminary Plat Reviews

Rachel Ray said this is a request for a review for a new mixed-use development on a 30.9-acre site at the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road. She said the proposal includes new public streets and nine blocks for development for the overall site, with eight mixed-use buildings containing 372 housing units and 260,000 square feet of commercial uses (office, retail, and restaurant) in this first phase. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan Review applications under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). She said this is also a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray presented an overview of the application, summarizing the contents of the Administrative Review Team Report. She began with the Basic Development Plan and presented a graphic of the site area that includes:

- A grid street network;
- Nine development blocks (Lots 1 through 9) subdivided by public streets;
- Five new public streets (Bridge Park Avenue, Tuller Ridge Drive, Banker Drive, Mooney Street, and Longshore Street);
- A future mixed-use shopping corridor designated along portions of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive; and

- A Preliminary Plat for the project site that includes the reconfiguration of rights-of-way for John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive and the necessary vacation and reconfiguration of the right-of-way for the east/west portion of Dale Drive.

Ms. Ray shared a graphic of the site area that encompasses the Basic Site Plan Review, including:

- Lots/Blocks 2, 3, 4, and 5;
- Eight buildings; and
- Associated open spaces proposed on the four blocks.

Ms. Ray explained the ART had identified two Development Plan Waivers and three Site Plan Waivers to be recommended for approval/disapproval separately.

Ms. Ray stated the ART is required to make recommendations to City Council on this application including the requested Waivers, the Basic Development Plan Review, the Basic Site Plan Review and Preliminary Plat. She said a major caveat relates to the ART analysis of the building type requirements. She said Staff has reviewed the information with the assistance of Dan Phillabaum, who completed the building type calculations and Code analysis. She explained the following Administrative Departures were identified:

1) Front Property Line Coverage (minimum 75% required)
   a. Building C2 – 73.46% along Bridge Park Avenue
2) Upper Story Height
   a. Building B4 (Garage) – 12.5 feet (maximum 12 feet)
   b. C2 – 15 feet (max. 14 feet)
   c. C4 (Garage) – 12.67 ft. (maximum 12 feet)
3) Upper Story Street Façade Transparency Requirement (minimum 30% required)
   a. Building B1 – 27.70% at 4th floor (Riverside Drive elevation);
   b. C3 – 29.19% at 5th floor (Bridge Park Avenue);
   c. C4 (Residential) – 29.31% at 2nd floor and 29.88% at 5th floor (Mooney Street).
4) Minimum Primary Façade Materials Requirement (minimum 80% required)
   a. Building B1 – 74.45% (Longshore Street elevation); 74.71% (open space); 73.85% (Banker Drive)
   b. B2 – 76.15% (open space)
   c. B3 – 73.06% (Longshore Street); 78.70% (Mooney Street)
   d. B4 (Residential) – 73.08% (Longshore Street); 78.73% (open space)
   e. C3 – 74.13% (Mooney Street)
   f. C4 (Residential) – 74.58% (Mooney Street)

She noted that for these buildings listed, the specific Code requirement is within 10 percent of the numerical requirement of being met. She said this is within the range of an Administrative Departure. She reiterated that the numbers and percentages are based on two-dimensional calculations completed on the renderings submitted with this application. She explained that at this project advances to the next level of detail, some additional Administrative Departures may be identified, some of the items listed may be modified to no longer be eligible for Administrative Departures (requiring Waivers instead), and some may ultimately meet the Code requirement.

Ms. Ray said for the rest of the building type analysis, Mr. Phillabaum had reviewed each of the buildings against applicable building types (Corridor, Mixed-Use, and Parking Structures). She noted that there are a number of Code requirements noted on the tables that are “not met” and would require a “future Waiver.” She said the reason why they are noted as “future Waivers” and not being evaluated at this time is because at this level of detail, there is not enough information to determine the merits of each potential Waiver. She said the applicant would need to verify the numbers and provide justification based

on the Waiver criteria for the items that do not meet Code. She suggested that some Waivers may be appropriate, but the applicant would need to be prepared to make the case that *not* meeting the requirement will result in a better building, or other justification why the requirement cannot be met.

Ms. Ray said the Basic Development Plan includes the proposed street network, block framework, and street types in accordance with BSD Zoning Code. She said the proposed Preliminary Plat for 30.9 acres establishes nine blocks coinciding with nine developable lots with new public rights-of-way to establish the street network, block layout and dimensions for a portion of the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District. She said the plat includes the vacation of the east/west segment of Dale Drive and realignments of portions of existing rights-of-way.

Ms. Ray stated that Bridge Park Avenue is the east-west District Connector Street providing an eventual future road connection from Sawmill Road to Riverside Drive. She said the proposed roadway has three sections:

Between Riverside Drive and Longshore Street: 80-foot typical street section includes:
- Two 11-foot travel lanes, plus an 11-foot left turn lane;
- 3-foot carriage walk;
- 8-foot planter/sidewalk area;
- 5-foot cycle track; and
- 7.5-foot sidewalk.

Between Longshore Street and Mooney Street: 80-foot typical street section includes:
- Two 11-foot travel lanes, plus an 11-foot left turn lane;
- 8-foot parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street;
- 5.5-foot planter/sidewalk area;
- 5-foot cycle track; and
- 5-foot sidewalk.

Between Mooney Street and Dale Drive: 69-foot typical street section includes:
- Two 11-foot travel lanes (no turn lane);
- 8-foot parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street;
- 5.5-foot planter/sidewalk area;
- 5-foot cycle track; and
- 5-foot sidewalk.

Ms. Ray explained that Tuller Ridge Drive is a Neighborhood Street that runs east/west and connects the existing, realigned Tuller Ridge Drive (realigned as part of the Dale/Tuller Connector road project) with Riverside Drive. She said the 65-foot right-of-way accommodates all required streetscape elements, including:
- Two 11-foot travel lanes;
- 8-foot parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street;
- 2.5-foot carriage walk;
- 5-foot planter/sidewalk area; and
- 6-foot sidewalk

Ms. Ray stated that Mooney Street is a Neighborhood Street that runs north/south and connects the dedicated Mooney Street north of John Shields Parkway, south through the Bridge Park development to future Banker Drive. She said Longshore Street is a Neighborhood Street that runs north/south parallel to and between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street, and Banker Drive is an east/west street that is an extension of the same road located farther to the east of the site. She stated that Banker Drive connects Riverside Drive east to Dale Drive. Ms. Ray explained that the 60-foot right-of-way for all three streets accommodates all required streetscape elements, including:

- Two 11-foot travel lanes;
- 8-foot parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street;
- 5-foot planter/sidewalk area; and
- 6-foot sidewalk.

Ms. Ray pointed out that not all portions of Banker Drive show parking on the plans. She said the plans should be revised to include parking on the south side of the section between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street. She noted that the section of Banker between Mooney Street and Dale Drive will not have parking due to the grade change but all other elements will remain the same.

Ms. Ray said the Basic Site Plan includes site details including building types/architecture, open spaces, parking, landscaping, stormwater, and signs in accordance with the BSD Zoning Code. She presented a diagram showing buildings B 1–4 and C 1–4 identifying the eight building types proposed as part of Phase 1 of the Bridge Park development project:

B1 Faces Riverside Drive at the northeast corner of the intersection with new Banker Drive.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; and Retail
Floor 2: Office
Floors 3 – 6: Residential

B2 Is at the highly prominent intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, visible from the future pedestrian bridge landing.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; and Retail
Floor 2: Office
Floors 3 – 6: Residential

B3 Faces Bridge Park Avenue.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; Retail; and Office
Floors 2 - 5: Residential

B4 Functions as two buildings in one: the north and west sides of the building (facing an open space and Longshore Street respectively) are entirely residential. The east and south sides of the building (facing Mooney Street and Banker Drive respectively) are parking structures from the ground floor up.
East and South Elevations: 6 levels of garage parking
North and West Elevations: 5 floors of residential

C1 Faces Riverside Drive at the southeast corner of the intersection with the Tuller Ridge Drive extension.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; and Retail
Floors 2 - 5: Residential

C2 Is at the highly prominent intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, visible from the future pedestrian bridge landing.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; and Retail
Floors 2 - 5: Office

C3 Faces Bridge Park Avenue.
Street Level: Eating & Drinking; and Retail
Floor 2: Office
Floors 3 – 6: Residential

C4 Functions as two buildings in one: the south and east sides of the building (facing an open space and Mooney Street respectively) are entirely residential. The west and north sides of the building (facing Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive respectively) are parking structures from the ground floor up.
North and West Elevations: 6 levels of garage parking
East and South Elevations: 5 floors of residential

Ms. Ray asked the applicant to provide an overall view of all four Riverside Drive buildings in their presentation to City Council. She presented elevations of one side of all four buildings to show how the architectural elements reflect some consistency, but demonstrate unique architectural character across the overall site.

Ms. Ray said the resident/pedestrian bridge detail presented on the screen was submitted after last week's ART meeting, which contained the following elements:

- Stainless steel cable guardrail;
- Exposed rivets;
- Composite metal panels; and
- A design with unenclosed sides.

Ms. Ray stated that the ART raised concerns previously about the design of the proposed resident/pedestrian bridges, and that they be designed to deter people from climbing out of them or from throwing or dropping objects over the edge into the public right-of-way. She said greater detail would be expected at the Site Plan Review.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the distribution of proposed open spaces throughout the site to meet the open space requirement. She suggested the applicant think of the open spaces in a three-dimensional sense, rather than just in plan view. She presented a few concepts that had been submitted for the spaces between buildings. She added the drawings need to show how the open spaces will capture the eyes of the passers-by and draw pedestrians in and through the open spaces, which will require more than just landscaping and seating areas. She said she understood that these are all four-sided buildings with streets on three sides, and they needed to find some place to put the mechanical elements. She said however, showing how the mechanicals will be screened in the open space is critically important for the next review.

Fred Hahn asked if design intent and square footage should be included in the presentation to City Council, as well as the conceptual open space plans, given all of the feedback on the spaces. It was decided that only the open space distribution diagram should be presented given the work that needed to be done on the open spaces.

Ms. Ray summarized the ART's overall comments on the project, beyond the more Code-specific elements:

- General
  Ms. Ray reiterated that the street network, block framework, site, building, and open space designs for the Bridge Park mixed-use development must serve as examples of desirable Bridge Street District development, and this can only be accomplished through exacting attention to detail, thorough and well-coordinated planning, and adherence to applicable Code requirements. She stated that as this is the Basic Plan Review; there are many details still to be identified and coordinated, in later more detailed approvals.

- Development Agreement
  Ms. Ray stated that at this time, City Council has not approved a development agreement, although the City Administration is actively working with the developer to establish terms. She

said a project of this size, scale, and impact requires significant partnership between the City, the developer, property owners, and many other interested parties. In addition to project financing, she said the development agreement is expected to address the following:

- A series of land acquisition and/or land swap issues;
- Public improvement design and construction responsibilities;
- Park and open space issues;
- Parking facility and policy issues;
- Other public and private development investment responsibilities; and
- Project phasing.

- Principles of Walkable Urbanism
  Ms. Ray said this was a newer section of the Zoning Code. She said Staff can provide a technical review of projects like this based on the numerical requirements of the Code; however, she noted the importance of stepping back and asking if the overall application makes sense, and how all of the big pieces fit together. She explained that the Principles of Walkable Urbanism, which the Planning and Zoning Commission had added in the 2013 Code amendments, provides some criteria for this overarching evaluation. She summarized the comments in the ART report. She said the application has come a long way, but additional details will be needed.

  Steve Langworthy suggested that more information be provided on transit. He said the applicant needs to address how transit stops could be integrated into the project. Ms. Ray said work needed on transit should be coordinated with COTA, to which Mr. Langworthy agreed should happen at the appropriate time.

- Building Types and Architecture
  Ms. Ray said the following comments are particular points of emphasis to be addressed at the Site Plan Review:

  - Future Waivers
    Ms. Ray said material details such as durability, performance over the long term, and installation details will need to be addressed, in particular for the proposed materials that are not permitted by Code.

  - Terminal Vistas/Pedestrian Bridge Landing Point
    Ms. Ray advised the applicant to pay special attention to the elevations of Buildings B2 and C2 at the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, which had been discussed previously.

  - Pedestrian Experience
    Ms. Ray said the design of the individual storefronts will characterize this project, and a Master Sign Plan will start this conversation. She said the next level of detail will be required at the Site Plan Review.

  - Framing Open Spaces
    Ms. Ray said all eight proposed buildings are four-sided buildings, with no true “rear elevations,” and as such, siting service areas, utility rooms, and other architectural elements that would normally be placed on an alley-facing elevation must be located on an elevation that faces either a street or an open space. She said the proposed buildings generally locate these building mechanicals on the elevations facing the open spaces between the buildings, and as a result, many of these elevations fail to meet many of the building type requirements of the Code. She said as noted earlier, that could be acceptable, assuming the screening is accomplished through creative architecture and

interesting open spaces. She reiterated the importance of the design concepts for these spaces at the Site Plan Review.

- Parking Garages
  Ms. Ray said at the Planning and Zoning Commission review of this project on October 21st, the Commission stated that parking structures need to be "works of art," with an interesting concept and should not appear to be "just parking garages." She said they needed to be well-designed and interesting buildings. She commended the applicant for their collaborative effort to come up with two unique designs that the ART feels positively about, with details to be reviewed at the Site Plan Review.

  Mr. Langworthy suggested that the applicant provide a graphic showing the lighting effects in daytime and nighttime.

- Sky Bridges
  Nelson Yoder asked that these be referred to as "residential pedestrian bridges," as that is a more appropriate term. He reiterated the bridges will only be accessed by residents and visitors to the residential units.

  Ms. Ray said the applicant should be prepared to discuss the bridges, their design, and functionality at the City Council review.

- Shopping Corridors/Pedestrian Oriented Streetscape
  Ms. Ray said a minimum of 12 feet of clear sidewalk width is required to be provided along designated shopping corridors.

- Block Size and Access
  Ms. Ray said Waivers are required for the sizes of Lots/Blocks 6 and 9, which the ART is supportive of due to the greenway along the south side of John Shields Parkway.

- Crime Prevention Thru Environmental Design
  At the Site Plan Review when additional details are available, Ms. Ray said the open spaces and spaces around the buildings will be evaluated to ensure that opportunities for crime are minimized, such as shrubs or architectural elements that can conceal someone, and appropriate lighting levels and sight lines are maintained. She said that although Sgt. Barnes was unable to attend today's ART meeting, Police has also recommended that plenty of locations to secure bicycles are provided throughout the streetscape. She reiterated that bicycle parking will be finalized at the Site Plan Review.

- Economic Development
  Colleen Gilger said she likes this project and is eager to see it built. She confirmed that the C2 building will be built first along with the parking garage. She inquired if a tenant would be able to occupy office space in 18 – 24 months.

  Mr. Yoder responded he certainly hoped it would be possible to expect occupancy by then.

- Engineering
  Barb Cox referred everyone to her memo dated January 5, 2015, and said she was curious about how stormwater integrates with open space.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, stated they had been working very recently with MKSK Studios on the designs of the open spaces and the stormwater facilities, and would be prepared to share the concepts soon.

Mr. Hahn verified that the plan was for the stormwater facilities to function as amenities to the open spaces, and that the open spaces are not secondary to the stormwater function.

Mr. Yoder agreed, and said the applicant was also working on outdoor Wi-Fi work areas for laptops and plans to conceal transformers.

- Fire
  Ms. Ray referred the ART to the letter from Alan Perkins at the end of the report that references the recommended fire access zones, a site utility plan, and 22-foot drive aisles.

  Alan Perkins explained that fire setup zones are not necessarily required as the whole street provides fire access.

Ms. Ray stated that approval for two Development Plan Waivers is recommended to be forwarded to City Council:

1) Maximum Block Size – Zoning Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(b)

   To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Lot 6 (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±584 feet on the west and 617 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,979 feet); and

   To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Lot 9 (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±640 feet on the west and 687 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,894 feet).

2) Front Property Lines – Zoning Code Section 153.060(C)(3)(b)

   Allowing only one front property line (and three corner side property lines) instead of two front property lines (and two corner side property lines) for Lots 3 and 5 containing parking structures, where a minimum of two front property lines are required.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding any of the Waivers. The ART confirmed that these were primarily “technical” Waivers. He confirmed the ART’s recommendation for approval of both Waivers.

Ms. Ray stated that approval for three Site Plan Waivers is recommended to be forwarded to City Council, and briefly summarized the analysis for each, as explained in the ART Report:

1) Front Property Line Coverage – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(a)1/ 153.062(O)(6)(a)1
   Allowing Front Property Line Coverage to be 52.52% instead of 75% for Buildings B1 and B2 along Riverside Drive, and allowing Front Property Line Coverage to be 63.32% for Buildings C1 and C2 along Riverside Drive.

2) Horizontal Façade Divisions – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)4
   Not requiring a horizontal façade division at the top of the ground story (allowing a horizontal façade division at the top of the second story instead) for Buildings B1, B2, and C3.

3) Ground Story Height – Code Section 153.062(O)(5)(b)/ 153.062(O)(12)(b):
   Allowing ground story height to exceed the maximum permitted height for Buildings B3 and B4 (Parking Structure Façades), C3 and C4 (Parking Structure Façades) from maximum 12 feet for parking structures and 16 feet for corridor building types up to maximum 22 feet.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding any of the three Waivers. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation for approval of all three Site Plan Waivers with a condition for the second Waiver.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the Basic Development Plan to be forwarded to City Council with the following six conditions:

1) That the applicant works with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;
2) That the applicant selects building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
3) That the applicant provides the full 12-foot minimum clear sidewalk area within the designated shopping corridors as part of the Site Plan Review;
4) That the applicant describes the intent for the required BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review;
5) That the applicant provides a phasing, demolition, and interim site conditions plan for the development as part of the Development Plan Review; and
6) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering comments as part of the Development Plan Review.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART had no further questions or concerns regarding this application for a Basic Development Plan with six conditions. He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval for this Basic Development Plan to be forwarded to City Council.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the Preliminary Plat to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council with the following four conditions:

1) That the plans are revised to include parking on the south side of Banker Drive for the section between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street;
2) City Council approval of the Plat modification of the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent;
3) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering comments prior to final review by City Council; and
4) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to final review by City Council.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application for a Preliminary Plat with four conditions. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval for this Preliminary Plat to be forwarded to City Council.

Ms. Ray stated approval is recommended for this Basic Site Plan with the following eight conditions:

1) That the applicant seek approval of conditional uses for the proposed parking garages prior to (or with) Site Plan Review approval;
2) That the parking garage entrance/exit drives are reduced to less than 24 feet wide, or seek approval of a Waiver at Site Plan Review;

3) That the applicant provide awnings and/or canopies and/or other elements wherever possible and architecturally appropriate at the determination of the required reviewing body at the top of the first story (as conceptually shown in most of the renderings) at the Site Plan Review;
4) That the plans are revised to include a crosswalk at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Longshore Street;
5) That the building plans are modified to address the potential "Future Waivers" and other modifications noted in this report prior to the Site Plan Review, or Site Plan Waivers will be required;
6) That the applicant seek approval of a request to pay a fee-in-lieu of dedicating the full open space requirement;
7) That the proposed open spaces that fail to meet the minimum dimensional requirements are modified prior to the Site Plan Review, or Site Plan Waivers will be required; and
8) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering comments as part of the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application for a Basic Site Plan with eight conditions. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval for this application to be forwarded to City Council.

Ms. Ray stated approval is recommended for the following four Administrative Departures:

1) Front Property Line Coverage (minimum 75% required)
   a. Building C2 – 73.46% along Bridge Park Avenue
2) Upper Story Height
   a. Building B4 (Garage) – 12.5 feet (maximum 12 feet)
   b. C2 – 15 feet (max. 14 ft.)
   c. C4 (Garage) – 12.67 ft. (maximum 12 feet).
3) Upper Story Street Façade Transparency Requirement (minimum 30% required)
   a. Building B1 – 27.70% at 4th floor (Riverside Drive elevation);
   b. C3 – 29.19% at 5th floor (Bridge Park Avenue);
   c. C4 (Residential) – 29.31% at 2nd floor and 29.88% at 5th floor (Mooney Street).
4) Minimum Primary Façade Materials Requirement (minimum 80% required)
   a. Building B1 – 74.45% (Longshore Street elevation); 74.71% (open space); 73.85% (Banker Drive)
   b. B2 – 76.15% (open space)
   c. B3 – 73.06% (Longshore Street); 78.70% (Mooney Street)
   d. B4 (Residential) – 73.08% (Longshore Street; 78.73% (open space)
   e. C3 – 74.13% (Mooney Street)
   f. C4 (Residential) – 74.58% (Mooney Street)

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding the four Administrative Departures. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval for Administrative Departures.

Mr. Langworthy thanked the applicant stating the ART appreciates their patience and willingness to work with the City.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [Hearing none.] He asked that each of the ART members attend the City Council meeting at 6:30 pm on January 20, 2014. He recommended that the applicant talk about the character of the project and how pedestrians will interact with the street, and provide a sense of day-to-day activity and what the project is going to be like. He also said descriptions of the various units and who the tenants will be marketing to

should be included in the presentation to City Council.

Ms. Ray suggested that staff and the applicant meet next week to coordinate their presentations.

Mr. Langworthy adjourned the meeting at 3:25 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team January 29, 2015.

City of Dublin

Land Use and Long Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 30, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Rodney Barnes, Police Sergeant; and Laura Ball, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; Logan Stang, Planning Assistant; Nicole Martin, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Greg Briya, Moody Nolan; John Woods, MKSK; and Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T.

Others Present: Dan Phillabaum, dp planning & design, llc; consultant to the ART.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 18, 2014, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

1. **Pre-Application Review (Bridge Street District) – BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development**
   Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road

Rachel Ray said this is a request for non-binding review of a future application for a new mixed-use development on a 30.9-acre site at the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road. She said the proposal includes new public streets and nine blocks for development for the overall site, with eight mixed-use buildings containing 372 housing units and 260,000 square feet of commercial (office, retail, restaurant). She said this is a request for pre-application review prior to submission of an application for Basic Plan Review (Basic Development Plan Review and Basic Site Plan Review) and a Preliminary Plat in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(C). She said the purpose of the pre-application review meeting is to provide the applicant with a non-binding and informal review of the development proposal, and information on the procedures and policies of the City including application review procedures that may be used.

Ms. Ray said Dan Phillabaum, dp planning & design, did a preliminary review of the building type plans, and was present to provide comments. She reiterated the anticipated project schedule, with the ART making their recommendation to City Council by the January 8th ART meeting, which would allow as much time as possible for Council to review the materials before their meeting. She requested that the ART members submit their comments by Monday, January 5, 2015.

Ms. Ray said General Staff reviewed this application December 23rd with a focus on general architecture comments. She said that following the General Staff meeting, she compiled the comments along with her preliminary Code analysis into a set of notes to discuss at this ART meeting.

Ms. Ray began reviewing the Pre-Application Review Note sheets provided. She pointed out that everything noted with a "DPR" or "SPR" on the tables MUST be addressed at the Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews as well as for the next ART meeting, but were noted at this point to make sure the applicant was aware of the additional information that would be expected. She said the following **clarifications** need to be made prior to review by City Council:

- Proposed uses and square footage need to match between the architectural plans and the data included on Illustrative Elevation cover sheets/civil drawing sets;
- Signs shown on the renderings should be removed or reconfigured to eliminate signs for actual businesses;
- Block size calculations for Lots 6 and 9 should include the greenway and justifications for the block adjustment Waiver should be added;
- Line work on the plans adjacent to the greenway in Lots 6 and 9 need to be cleaned up; and
- Locations of building entrances need to match between the plans and elevations.

Ms. Ray highlighted changes needed for the **Basic Development Plan/Preliminary Plat**:

- Crosswalks should be shown at Bridge Park Avenue and Longshore Street, since pedestrians are likely to cross at that location anyway;

Brian Quackenbush explained how the grading increases at varying degrees in this area, but agreed that the plans could be modified to include the crosswalks if desired by the City.

Barb Cox agreed the crosswalks were appropriate.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Verify that turning radii will be acceptable for truck access to trash compactors;
- Consider adding motorcycle parking in the odd areas/parking spaces across from vehicular access drives to parking structures;
- Add parking to the south side of Banker Drive between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street, but no on-street parking on Banker Drive in areas due to the steep grade is acceptable; and
- Future right-of-way will need to be dedicated for Banker Drive with the development of Lot 1 and/or Lot 7 along with an access easement in the short-term providing turf instead of tree grates.

Ms. Ray added that even though on-street parking may not be practical due to the grades, street trees should be provided on the north side for the section between Mooney Street and Dale Drive.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Show all crosswalks (particularly around the edges of the Development Plan site area) and details will be needed at the Development Plan Review for Lots as they are developed.

Steve Langworthy asked whether overhead pedestrian crossing signs were needed within the Bridge Park Avenue right-of-way, or if that was something that would be installed later. Ms. Cox suggested this be discussed with Jeanne Willis as this is not a requirement. She said these are typically only installed later if a problem is identified.

Ms. Ray highlighted changes needed for the **Basic Site Plan:**

- *Uses*
  - The number of dwelling units should match between the required parking table and site data block;
  - Square footage needs to be noted as they vary within a building as well as across the different buildings as this affects the parking space requirement; and

- Uses such as Personal Services and Leasing Offices need to be identified with on the spreadsheet listing the proposed uses, as it affects the parking requirements.

Ms. Ray asked about the range of unit sizes across the project. She noted that although this was not a Code requirement, she was interested if all of the one-bedroom units, for example, were the same size among the different buildings. She thought there was interest in the community about the range of dwelling units, and a desire that the units with the same number of bedrooms should not be identical across the site.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, stated that there was a great variety in unit types and sizes, as well as price points. He said for example, a one bedroom unit facing Riverside Drive and the Scioto River is going to be more expensive and could be larger overall than a one bedroom unit elsewhere on the site, and the same goes for units with two and three bedrooms.

- *Architecture*
  - Corners of Buildings B2 and C2 need more attention;

Ms. Ray stated that a lot of discussion on these two buildings, and particularly the southwest corner of building C2, had already occurred, but she wanted to reiterate that with the Site Plan application for these buildings, the corner would need to be even more special and detailed since they function as a terminal vista from the pedestrian bridge. She noted that although there is a protruding tower element on the upper stories, she pointed out that at ground level, the space is recessed, which seems to detract from the prominence of the corner. She said she understood the desire to create patio space in that area, but she was concerned with what was happening at ground level.

Ray Harpham suggested that the two corners have a relationship to one another in terms of design. Mr. Yoder suggested a “twin towers look” but not identical towers.

Joanne Shelly suggested concentrating on the street level.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Pay particular attention to the articulation of the first floor(s)/below the expression lines of each building to show details and activity of storefront character, pedestrian entrances, signs, and placemaking;

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, said the storefront details are usually determined when the tenant moves in. Mr. Yoder added that some will come over time. He said the desire is that the basic storefront will not be bland but will evolve over time.

Jeff Tyler recommended focusing on framing the storefront areas to achieve consistency, while allowing for each space to be individualized. Ms. Shelly said a “story” needs to be created for current and future tenants. Ms. Ray suggested the applicant be prepared to define a “basic package” of what a vacant tenant space would look like, and to what extent an individualized tenant space could be modified.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Add more pedestrian entrances on all of the buildings, especially the south elevation of building C2 facing Bridge Park Avenue, and the parking structures. She said this will provide an opportunity to eliminate some of the preliminarily identified Waivers and achieve greater pedestrian connectivity through the site;
- Consider applying color through the use of lighting for parking garages to maintain flexibility over time rather than coloring the actual materials;

Mr. Yoder agreed and said they would revise the renderings to show the colored lighting effects rather than colored mesh.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Provide more information about the “open” sky bridges and proposed materials;

Mr. Yoder explained the current elevations. He said there is an arch with a railing that is higher than normal as the railing reaches 48 inches to prevent a pedestrian from falling. Mr. Briya showed a detailed rendering of the proposed sky bridges.

Mr. Harpham was concerned about debris being dropped off the sky bridges, and did not believe 48 inches would be nearly high enough. Mr. Briya said the bridges are private and not open to the general public. Mr. Harpham said there is still a problem of casual debris such as a coffee cup being dropped and rolls off to land on the pedestrians below. Mr. Briya said there would be a four-inch kick plate at the floor.

Ms. Cox said this was an important issue because the sky bridges are proposed to span public rights-of-way. She said if they are going to be approved, they need to be designed to deter climbing, jumping, and items from being thrown or dropped.

Colleen Gilger inquired about building code or ODOT requirements for sky bridges.

Fred Hahn asked if requirements for sky bridges need to reach the ODOT level, as those are quite extensive and not usually very attractive.

Different examples of designs for alternative sky bridges were shown and discussed. Ms. Cox said a roof would prevent people from climbing over a high railing. Mr. Yoder said they were not considering a roof.

Sergeant Rod Barnes said from a security perspective, the City of Dublin has not had a history of problems with the roadway overpasses, so he predicted it would not be too big of an issue here.

Dan Phillabaum noted plexiglass was used in some examples.

Mr. Yoder stated they would be prepared to show several images to Council to help them understand what is being proposed. Mr. Tyler recommended the applicant show in the narrative their intent for preventing jumping, climbing, and throwing debris.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Provide highly detailed elevations for the facades framing the mid-block open spaces;
- Provide elevations with coded notes and window schedules to confirm transparency and material requirements;
- Provide impervious/semi-pervious material coverage;
- Confirm occupant load for roof terraces for the Fire Department;
- Demonstrate quality and installation of the EIFs cladding material as it is not permitted as a primary or secondary material;

Ms. Ray said a Waiver would need to be requested for EIFS to even be considered as a material, and would need to be justified in terms of providing proof of quality, durability, appearance and installation details.

Mr. Yoder said it is to some degree an issue of budget. He requested consideration of their attempt to spend more on materials at ground level and the lower stories and using materials like EIFS on the upper stories where they will only ever be visible from a distance.

Mr. Harpham said a narrative and specifications for how the materials are used and how they will age over time would be needed. He suggested pictures of local successful projects that show aging of 10 – 20 years.

Mr. Yoder confirmed no stucco would be used but rather the EIFS product only.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Provide information that will speak to the quality of the proposed vinyl windows; and
- Provide additional information about Arriscraft units – cut sheets and installation details that include depth of panels, salt tolerance, and dirt/stain resistance.

Mr. Yoder said Arriscraft is used like brick and is better than limestone for durability. Mr. Briya clarified it is a veneer product, a cultured stone and said he would provide manufacturer literature.

Ms. Ray continued:

- *Buildings*
  - Seek Waiver at Basic Site Plan Review for **Lot 1** as a Commercial Center building type is not permitted;
  - **B1** - Provide elevations facing rooftop gardens; show a circulation area or unit on the northeast corner of Level 4
  - **B2** - Provide elevations facing rooftop gardens;
  - **B3** – See Waivers;
  - **B4** – Provide pedestrian entrances; residential parking speed ramp controls for upper levels; identify elevators;
  - **C1** - Provide elevations facing rooftop gardens; identify the building as a Mixed-Use building and not a Corridor Building; add missing sky bridge to elevation;
  - **C2** – Administrative Departure needed as uppermost story exceeds maximum permitted story height; provide pedestrian entrances on Bridge Park Avenue – show structure where doors could go even though tenants will change; revise key plan on all elevations;
  - **C3** - See Waivers;
  - **C4** – Provide dwelling unit doors from the circulation corridors;
  - **All** - Provide better pedestrian access to the garages;
  - **All** - Indicate sizes of elevators to show regular size vs the freight elevator size at 4,500 pounds – big enough to accommodate furniture being moved; and
  - **B3** and **C3** - Clean up the discrepancies on the Waivers.

- *Open space*
  - Describe the look and feel from a 3-dimensional perspective, especially the screening of transformers and provide utility screen dimensions;
  - Demonstrate how live plants will receive sunlight;
  - Illustrate how quality open spaces will evolve over time in a plain/simple manner to allow for opportunities showing design flexibility for the future and include paving materials;
  - Provide plans for stormwater, including roof gardens, which all should be different building to building to encourage residents to visit the various rooftops for different vistas, lighting opportunities, fun and interest;
  - Consider Wi-Fi in pedestrian open spaces, not just in the streets;
  - Consider a fee-in-lieu mechanism built into the Development Agreement to allow the “greenway” to function as a park;
  - Seek Waivers for three of the proposed pocket plazas or modify the plans, as they do not meet open space requirements;
  - Clarify frontage percentage calculations;
  - Consider changing public seating areas on Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive;
  - Consider interactive art pieces that can be touched or played on; and

- Look at the open spaces holistically providing framing and suitability.

Sergeant Barnes stated the Police would like to see designs that incorporate principles of CPTED ("Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design"), such as low plantings, good lighting, limited walls and screens, etc.

- *Parking*
  - Verify bike parking and plan to show how additional required bicycle parking will be incorporated into the streetscape; and
  - Parking spaces along Dale Drive should not be counted.

- *Right-of-way encroachments*
  - Area wells for garage exhaust; and
  - Sky bridges over Longshore Street.

Ms. Cox stated the right-of-way encroachments would need to be noted on the plat and/or addressed through a right-of-way encroachment agreement.

Ms. Gilger inquired about retail space size since they are all shown as full floors without demising walls. She asked if the office space could be divided. Mr. Yoder replied the office and retail spaces could be demised and there are no predefined minimum sizes.

Sergeant Barnes noted that staff had discussed the possibility of locating a police substation in this area, allowing for a better police presence. He stated his other concerns at this point are that there are places to lock up bikes, and the more lighting, the better.

Ms. Ray continued:

- *Utility Undergrounding*
  - Transformers and Fire Department connections will remain above ground; water meters will be applied to the sides of buildings; and electrical lines will be below ground.

Ms. Cox inquired about plans for oil separators for the restaurants.

Ms. Shelly confirmed recycling facilities were also planned.

Ms. Ray continued:

- *Possible BSP Waivers*
  - Prepare a rationale in support of the proposal for each of the 19 Waivers identified:
    - **Pocket Plaza 1**: Exceeds maximum area
    - **Pocket Park 2**: Too small for a Pocket Park; too big for a Pocket Plaza
    - **Pocket Park 3**: Too small for a Pocket Plaza
    - **Lots 3 and 5**: Blocks exceed 400 feet in length, requiring a mid-block pedestiranway in the middle third of the block (pedestrianways have been provided but are not located in the middle third of these blocks)
    - **Building Type**: Stucco and EIFS are both designated as cladding materials on portions of the buildings and are not permitted as primary or secondary cladding materials. EIFS is only permitted for trim.
    - **B1 Façade Requirements**: Missing two entrances on the North Elevation
    - **B1 Façade Requirements**: Exceeds 250 feet in length, requiring mid-building pedestrianway (Could be an Administrative Departure at 268 feet)
    - **B2 Façade Requirements**: Missing one entrance on the South Elevation
    - **B3 Ground Story Height**: West Elevation (22 feet) and East Elevation (14 feet) exceed maximum height of 16 feet.

- **B3 Façade Requirements**: Missing two entrances on East Elevation
- **B4 Building Siting**: East (Mooney) and south (Banker) elevations are forward of the 5-25-foot Required Building Zone for parking structures
- **B4 Façade Requirements**: Missing two entrances on the West Elevation, missing two entrances on the South Elevation, and missing five entrances on the East Elevation
- **C1 Height**: Ground story height exceeds 16-foot Corridor Building maximum
- **C1 Façade Requirements**: Missing one entrance on the North and South Elevations
- **C2 Façade Requirements**: Missing one entrance on the South and North Elevations
- **C3 Ground Story Height**: West Elevation height (21 feet) and East Elevation height (14 feet) exceed maximum height of 16 feet
- **C3 Façade Requirements**: Missing two entrances on the South Elevation, missing two entrances on the East Elevation, and missing one entrance on the North Elevation
- **C4 Building Siting**: West (Longshore Street) and north (Tuller Ridge) elevations are forward or partially forward of the 5-25-foot Required Building Zone for parking structures
- **C4 Façade Requirements**: Missing one entrance on the South Elevation, missing two entrances on the East Elevation, missing three entrances on the West Elevation, and missing one entrance on the North Elevation

Mr. Briya asked if the graphic material boards should be modified. Ms. Ray reiterated that she would like to receive all revised documents and materials from the applicant and all ART staff comments by 5:00 pm on Monday, January 5th so she can finalize the ART report for the January 8th ART meeting.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [Hearing none.] He said with respect to the ART report for the Bridge Park project, he suggested dividing the report, and particularly the proposed Waivers, by block and/or building type. He said given the fact that this project covers eight blocks, not that many Waivers have been requested. He suggested formatting the Waivers block-by-block and also requested that the ART Report be more unified and topic driven rather than delineated by department for the comments.

Mr. Langworthy adjourned the meeting at 3:55 pm.

City of Dublin

Land Use and Long Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 18, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; and Laura Ball, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; Logan Stang, Planning Assistant; Nicole Martin, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Nelson Yoder, Matt Starr, and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Greg Briya, Moody Nolan; and James Peltier, EMH&T.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 4, 2014, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

1. Pre-Application Review (Bridge Street District) – BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development
Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road

Rachel Ray said this is a request for non-binding review of a future application for a new mixed-use development on a 30.9-acre site at the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road. She said the proposal includes new public streets and nine blocks for development for the overall site, with eight mixed-use buildings containing 372 housing units and 260,000 square feet of commercial (office, retail, restaurant). She said this is a request for pre-application review prior to submission of an application for Basic Plan Review (Basic Development Plan Review and Basic Site Plan Review) and a Preliminary Plat in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(C). She said the purpose of the pre-application review meeting is to provide the applicant with a non-binding and informal review of the development proposal, and information on the procedures and policies of the City including application review procedures that may be used.

Ms. Ray said the Basic Development Plan includes the street network, block framework, and building arrangements. She said this encompasses the blocks east of Riverside Drive, north of the roundabout, in addition to the Tuller Ridge Drive extension, Mooney Street, Banker Drive, Longshore Street, and Bridge Park Avenue. She explained the Basic Site Plan is for the first four blocks adjacent to Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, which includes eight buildings. She said the complete project area covers nine blocks extending east to Dale Drive and north to John Shields Parkway. She indicated some Waivers are being considered and are currently under review. She reported the applicant had completed an analysis of all the buildings against the building type requirements of the Code, and had also provided information about utilities, open space and other plan aspects.

Ms. Ray said the applicant had reached the Basic Plan submittal stage in September when the applicant decided to rescind the previous plans to modify the parking structure arrangement. She explained as a result, entirely new Basic Plan Reviews are necessary.

Steve Langworthy confirmed that the Basic Development Plan and the Preliminary Plat are for the entire site, while the Basic Site Plan encompasses four blocks.

Ms. Ray explained January 7, 2015, is the effective date of the Ordinance for the amended zoning regulations. She advised the applicant that it was possible for the ART to make a determination by January 8, 2014, or January 15, 2014, and still be forwarded to City Council for a potential meeting in January.

Mr. Langworthy recommended making the determination by the January 8th ART meeting, which would allow as much time as possible for Council to review the materials before their meeting.

Claudia Husak said the Preliminary Plat cannot be forwarded to Council until it is reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Langworthy agreed. He asked if everyone understood the change in the Ordinance with respect to the review processes in the Bridge Street District.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, verified the process.

Mr. Langworthy explained that PZC meetings in January will only occur if a quorum of four is met. He said it is possible City Council would appoint someone so Commission meetings could occur in January but they may not have a full Commission with all seven members until a later date.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the applicant could provide an overview of the project materials and walk the ART members through the plans.

Ms. Ray noted that a complete set of material sample boards are available for viewing in one of Planning's conference rooms.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, began the presentation by showing before and after illustrations of the buildings to compare the evolution of the elevations.

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, began with the B1 Building, describing the architectural detail changes. He said they broke down the scale with more vertical and horizontal elements of this corridor type building. He said the central area is brick and includes the introduction to the porch, lower entry, and balcony. He said this change seemed to make it appear more inviting. He said with the addition of signs, canopies, and trees, it appears to have more life than originally presented. He added that shading and shadowing effects were also applied to provide more depth to the illustrations. He said the architectural vocabulary is consistent with the other three sides of the building. He indicated the same brick color is being presented as before. He stated that the B1 building is the farthest south on the Riverside Drive elevation.

Jeff Tyler asked if the percentage of materials was accounted for in the plans. Mr. Briya said that the percentages were reported in the plans.

Joanne Shelly confirmed that the patio was at grade, and the terrace on an upper floor, and suggested they be marked appropriately on the plans.

Mr. Briya explained that the center section at the lowest level was pushed back approximately 10 feet while bringing the whole building forward. He said the residential area stayed the same but the patio is

now a little smaller in size. He said the transformer locations were adjusted; the façade was pushed back to tuck the equipment in the back corner and landscape was placed in front to screen it.

Mr. Hunter added that there is a patio at level 1, a terrace on level 2, as well as a terrace on level 3.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, noted the bridge locations. He said there is a pedestrian bridge that connects Building B1 to Building B4 and lands at Level 4 of B4, which leads through to a parking garage. Mr. Briya indicated the final location of the sky bridge is in question, although the two alternatives are within a few feet of one another.

Mr. Tyler noted there were Code implications with the final location of the bridge.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant how close they were to deciding the final location of the bridge. Mr. Briya answered they are considering options A or B and the decision will depend upon the impact it will have on the unit layout.

Ms. Ray inquired about Waivers. She asked if a preliminary analysis had been completed, and if Mr. Briya was aware of any that would be needed with Building B1.

Mr. Briya said he could not remember all of the requested Waivers for all of the buildings, but he thought one might be necessary for the maximum amount of blank space without a break.

Ms. Ray said based on her preliminary review of the Code, another potential Waiver would be a request to place the required horizontal façade division at the top of the second floor instead of the top of the first floor, as required by Code.

Mr. Hunter said there was retail and office above on the first two levels, with the upper three or four stories containing residential.

Mr. Yoder stated that distinguishing the first two floors gave the building a more balanced appearance, rather than calling out only the first floor on a six-story building.

Ray Harpham mentioned a noticeable difference in the buildings, from the previous version to the current versions. He commended the applicants for the improvements.

Mr. Briya described Building B2 as he presented illustrations of the Riverside Drive elevation. He said the materials were the same, all brick in both red or ivory sections as well as composite metal panels in gray to break down the horizontal and vertical elements. He explained the niches were set back further and the corner on the second floor terrace was carved out for open space. He said they were providing more recesses and projections with the latest designs. He indicated the roof garden was in the original design and is a residential amenity.

Mr. Yoder said residents of these buildings likely would have access to any of the amenity decks on any of the buildings. Mr. Hunter added the different amenity decks provide varied experiences and views.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were square footages of each building marked on the plans and requested a table be inserted to record square footage. He suggested the patios as an amenity be pointed out as well. He noted the parking calculations.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the pedestrian bridge connection that was just penciled in where it goes from level 4 in B2 to B3 and then another bridge connects from B3 to the parking garage in B4. He indicated that there is some concern that bridges keep people off the streets and suggested that these

bridges are emphasized as amenities for the residents and not to remove pedestrians and visitors from shopping, dining, or walking along the sidewalks throughout the area.

Mr. Hunter said they decided on open air pedestrian bridges rather than closed, climate controlled bridges. He said the residents using these bridges would be appropriately dressed as they were traversing back and forth to the parking garages anyway, and the intent was to design the bridges so that the residents could engage with the street activity better, since they will be open.

Mr. Yoder said this eliminates the need for two separate four floor elevator rides.

Ms. Shelly pointed out that she had read a recent article that describes the use of sky bridges of this type, and that they really have no impact at all on either adding to or eliminating street activity. She commented the façade was really nice, distinctive, and interesting. Unfortunately, she said the Revit models were not showing the details as well.

Ms. Ray inquired about the dots on the illustration of the elevations. Mr. Briya confirmed that they are dryer vents.

Mr. Hahn inquired about the sky bridge elevations, and asked if they were final designs or still more conceptual and works in progress. Mr. Briya explained that they were pretty final, and described the bridge's arch designs.

Mr. Briya described the changes made to the B3 Building since October. He said they stayed true to form but added canopies and awnings. He noted the length of the building had been extended. He said it is mainly a red brick with gray composite metal panels at the top. He indicated this was their "warehouse" building. He said the balconies on this corridor building type have metal mesh guardrails. He pointed out that the balconies for each of the buildings have different railing types.

Mr. Briya said there is a roof amenity deck on level 6. Ms. Shelly asked if it is not seen from the front façade. Mr. Briya showed the roof level looking out to the park and open space.

Ms. Ray asked if the windows could be opened. Mr. Briya answered the windows would be operable - opera style.

Mr. Langworthy noted that the elevation change is dramatic. Mr. Briya agreed. He explained the grade was flattened out to create three levels moving from Longshore Street to Mooney Street and would require three different entry points.

Mr. Tyler recommended the applicant provide all examples they are considering for screening mechanicals so there are no surprises at building permitting.

Mr. Briya said the units on the C2 building will be visible but their goal is to group them together over non-residential areas.

Ms. Shelly inquired about the elevator core of B3.

Mr. Briya reported that Building B4 took on a completely new life. He said it is a combination corridor building and parking structure and the footprint has been increased. He said two sides will be open to a parking garage and the other two sides will have residential units wrapping the outside. He showed the illustration of level 1, which shows residential units on one side, the lobby on the corner, utilities, maintenance, electric, bike storage, and bike racks line another side and the garage then is open on the last two sides. He said the illustration of level 2 shows residential units on the two sides and the open parking garage on the remaining two sides. He said the proposed material that makes this building so

unique is the random patterning of the green metal mesh panels. He explained the mesh panels are pulled out and slope to produce shadowing. He said there is also brick, perforated metal guardrails and composite gray flat metal panels used on this building. Mr. Briya said B4 connects to B1.

Mr. Hahn asked how the mesh panels are colored green.

Mr. Briya answered there is a stainless option with a baked-on finish.

Ms. Ray asked if the screen color could it be changed over time. Mr. Yoder said they are considering a brushed stainless for a more timeless look.

Mr. Hunter said with a brushed stainless, more could be done with lighting to produce colors for effect that could be altered more easily than actually changing the color of the panels.

Mr. Hahn asked if the baked-on aluminum color came with a long-term warranty.

Mr. Yoder asked Mr. Briya if it would be a fast process to change the rendering to a silver look option. Mr. Briya said it could be accomplished quickly.

Mr. Tyler asked if a large scale wall section of the screen attached to the building was available. Mr. Briya said they have produced a three sided view layout that tells the whole story. He said it expressed the B4 residential wrapper with the garage and planters placed at street level.

Ms. Ray noted B4 is proposed to be reviewed as two building types: a parking structure and a corridor building. She asked if the parking structure was set up to allow for 'pay to park' in the future. Mr. Hunter said that would be possibility in the future, although they certainly were not planning to charge for parking in the short term.

Mr. Yoder pointed out the 42 public bike racks located next to the bike storage area that will hold 96 bikes. He said there are also benches inserted into the hill.

Ms. Ray asked if the sky bridges were high enough to allow fire equipment to pass under. Alan Perkins confirmed there was enough space for the fire department's equipment.

Mr. Briya pointed out the glass stair tower on the corner of B4 on the Longshore Street elevation with curtainwall glazing combined with composite metal panels. He said the main lobby space and trash hub are in the lowest level of this tower. He said the overhead garage door was panelized under a metal canopy.

Ms. Ray asked if the calcium silicate masonry units were proposed to be considered a primary material. Mr. Briya said yes, and that product is the primary material at the base with brick at the top.

Mr. Briya said Building C1 took on a significant transformation. He said it is on the northwest corner along Riverside Drive. He said the floor plate is similar to B1 in its shape. He described the building having brick, composite metal panels, stucco, calcium silicate masonry units, metal guardrails in a horizontal picketing style for the balconies, and metal canopies along with some awnings. He said the first level is all retail and the rest of the floors are residential. He said a terrace was created as an amenity to look over into the park.

Mr. Yoder said the brick was extended all the way to the ground to break up the vertical plane.

Mr. Briya said the detail for the balconies and the added awnings brought so much more character to the style of the building.

Mr. Yoder remarked that the recessed center space made the building more dramatic and the patio/terrace can be covered.

Mr. Yoder said the private drives were eliminated, which changed the character of the open spaces. He said there are many areas that provide views of the park and the river. He said the ground floor was an amenity open to everyone.

Mr. Langworthy asked about the position of the mid-block pedestrianways. Ms. Ray said the locations need to be reviewed and confirmed that they fall within the middle-third of the blocks. Mr. Briya noted the patio roof gardens distributed throughout the site as well.

Mr. Briya said the height of the building decreased by three feet. He said it is the same floor to floor height as B. Mr. Yoder confirmed the ceiling heights were all nine feet with the exception of the top floor with 10-foot ceilings.

Mr. Briya called attention to the material boards that show window sills and headers along with the brick work. Ms. Ray inquired about the masonry against windows and if the windows are recessed. Mr. Briya said the masonry was not flush with the windows.

Mr. Briya said the curtainwall was broken down on the C2 Building. He described rectangular shapes that were used for floors two, three, and four. He said they accented the tower with glazing along the sides.

Mr. Hunter explained more verticality was presented and the terrace was pushed back for the all the upper floors and the one on the fifth floor was extended out to the north end of the building and a second terrace was added at the south end. He said this will show so much better in real life as it is not showing well in the illustration.

Mr. Briya said the brick colors stayed the same as before and a metal panel screen wall is provided on the roof to hide mechanicals.

Mr. Yoder said just condensing units would be on the rooftop and the rest of the mechanicals will be hidden within the tenant spaces. He said this entire building is for office use on all stories except the ground floor.

Ms. Shelly indicated she liked how the brick wrapped the corner of the façade but as a signature building on the corner of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive, the corner looks like all the other buildings.

Mr. Langworthy agreed with Ms. Shelly and said he was hoping for more dramatic detail or an architectural element at that corner as that will also be where people will be coming off the pedestrian bridge and approaching Bridge Park Avenue. He said he did like the verticality of the style but it calls for more attention at that corner.

Mr. Tyler asked if the tower could pop out more from the façade.

Ms. Ray inquired about symmetry with the building on the south side of Bridge Park Avenue or using lighting to emphasize the tower. Mr. Hunter said lighting was planned for both internal and external effects.

Mr. Tyler emphasized that this is the building people will focus on when coming across the bridge. He noted that this was Crawford Hoying's building and asked if they felt it was special enough. Mr. Yoder replied they thought it was very special and attractive, but they can always push for a better building. He said they will study the tower section.

Ms. Shelly said she understands the wrapping of the brick and thought that aspect was very nice but thought the design could be just a bit better. Mr. Hunter suggested one more level of detail could be added.

Mr. Yoder inquired about adding punctuation to the top. Mr. Briya said the details were not represented well in the rendering.

Mr. Harpham said it was important that this group thoroughly review the plans going sheet by sheet.

Mr. Briya presented the Bridge Park Avenue elevation for Building C3. He said the grading changed an additional seven feet accounting for step plates at the street level. He said they broke down the façade vertically once again with this building. He described the brick as going all the way to the top and different colored brick would be used to signify the various sections. He said these balconies have perforated metal screens. He showed where retail was on the first level, office spaces on the second level, and floors three through five were residential.

Mr. Hunter noted the significant differences between the before and after illustrations. He said with parking out from underneath the building it was a lot easier to combine the commercial with the residential. He said varying the color of brick further broke down the length of the building.

Ms. Shelly recommended not using real company names in the illustrations of the conceptual signs and sign locations.

Both Ms. Shelly and Mr. Harpham agreed this was a significantly better building.

Mr. Briya pointed out the roof amenity deck placed on the northwest corner will overlook the park and river.

Mr. Briya said Building C4 was similar to B4 because the garage is also exposed to Longshore Street and includes residential units wrapped on two sides on the upper levels but looks completely different. He presented an illustration that showed two shades of ivory brick used primarily on the building. He said metal mesh panels were used as well but only random panels had an accent of color. He indicated these perforated panels hide the crash wall and could be painted in a variety of colors. A view into the two sky bridges was also represented; one bridge connects C4 with C1 across Longshore Street and the other connects C4 with C3 across the mid-block pedestrianway. He said it is hard to represent the openness.

Ms. Ray inquired about the pedestrian experience on Longshore Street.

Mr. Yoder said it adds great variety and responds to single-family condominiums. He said it had a nice rhythm with Mooney Street and the street level planters bring more life. He indicated the main lobby is public/private similar to B4.

Mr. Hunter said the rhythm is mimicked in the panels, ties the building together, and is playful in nature.

Ms. Ray said she really liked this building, with the color and uneven screen treatment. She said it is ok for 2014, but she wondered if it would feel timeless or dated in a few years. She asked if the panels could be changed or modified in the future to evolve the architectural character.

Mr. Briya said they are still working through the colors for the decorative panels and how they adhere to the building. He said it is illustrated in both a red/blue pattern of accent color and a color variety for accents but maybe a brushed aluminum versus a high gloss may be the direction to take. Ms. Ray said the overall skeleton is timeless and she likes the accents.

Mr. Yoder indicated treatments organically change over time. He thought that as people come and go, the look will be changed.

Ms. Ray said to that point, how much freedom would each tenant have to modify their individual tenant spaces. Mr. Yoder answered that extensive leeway could be given. He said the developer will have their own criteria but anticipates coming back to the City often to gain approvals for different tenants.

Mr. Langworthy asked if all the bridges would be built to look the same. Mr. Hunter replied that was their intention. Mr. Hunter added that bridges are important logistically but should not take over the streetscape by standing out too much. Mr. Langworthy said he prefers that the bridges not differ from each other.

Mr. Yoder stated that letters might be added to the bridges to help enhance the experience and provide wayfinding and identification, but would be very subtle.

Ms. Shelly referred back to the “warehouse” building where the side elevation shows a bridge. She cautioned the applicant about the use of overhead street lighting. She added festoon lighting over Bridge Park Avenue is not necessary but could be used where the bridges span the green spaces. She again cautioned this can be overdone and where the applicant chooses to place lighting should be significant and create special places.

Ms. Shelly remarked the open space plans were beautiful. She said as a city dweller for 20 years, too much vegetation within small urban open spaces can lead to a lot of maintenance. She recommended the use of planters on multiple levels in varied containers. For an example, she said a tenant such as a florist might use topiary in the planters positioned in their area to individualize and draw attention to their space.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. He thanked the applicant for taking the time to walk through the plans and provide an overview for the ART members to consider as they review the plans.

Ms. Ray stated she would follow up with the applicant in terms of schedule over the next few weeks.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

OCTOBER 21, 2014

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

1. Informal Review - BSC Scioto River Neighborhood District - Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development

Presentation:	An update on recent developments for a proposal for a mixed-use development with residential units, retail, restaurant and office uses, as well as structured parking, including new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. The applicant is also requesting informal, non-binding feedback on proposed architectural concepts for eight buildings in Phase 1 of the proposed development.
Applicant:	Nelson Yoder, Principal, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.
Planning Contacts:	Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II and Joanne Shelly, RLA, AICP, LEED BD+C, Urban Designer.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4600, chusak@dublin.oh.us or jshelly@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission informally reviewed and provided non-binding comments and feedback on the proposed Bridge Park East mixed-use development following the applicant's request for an opportunity to inform the Planning and Zoning Commission of revisions and modifications to a previously approved Basic Development Plan/Preliminary Plat application for nine new blocks on approximately 30 acres, including new public rights-of-way for a mixed-use development east of Riverside Drive (relocated), south of John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road.

Commissioners stated that the architectural concepts for the eight proposed buildings (including two parking structures partially wrapped by residential units) lacked variety and architectural diversity. The Commissioners commented on the importance of high quality building materials, the need for architectural details, and ensuring that massing is appropriate to a pedestrian-scale environment. The Commission did not support the use of elevated walkways between the parking structure and some of the residential uses within buildings because of their tendency to remove pedestrians from the street.

The Commission requested information about the impact of on-street parking on the regional transportation network. Some Commissioners stated that understanding the Bridge Street District transportation network and traffic impacts will be an essential component of their case determinations, and stated that they would find it difficult to make decisions without all of the information available to them.

With respect to the design of the proposed Bridge Park Avenue, Commission members indicated that they would not support any project unless the adjacent right-of-way includes all streetscape elements including on-street parking, carriage walks, tree planters, cycle tracks, wide sidewalks and ample private patio space (outside of the right-of-way, within the Required Building Zone) regardless of the impacts to the right-of-way width or the Code-required building placement.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak, AICP
Planner II

City of Dublin

Land Use and Long Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road

Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 21, 2014

AGENDA

1. BSC Scioto River Neighborhood District – Mixed-Use Development – Bridge Park East (Discussion Only) Informal Review

The Chair, Chris Amorose Groomes, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were, Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, John Hardt, Victoria Newell, Todd Zimmerman, and City Council Representative Amy Salay. City representatives present were Jennifer Readler, Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Rachel Ray, Joanne Shelly, Gary Gunderman, Andrew Crozier, Sue Burness, Alan Perkins, Barb Cox, and Flora Rogers.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Ms. Newell seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Amorose Groomes amended the September 4, 2014 meeting minutes on page 5, last paragraph attributed to her inserting the word “previously” to the third sentence “the previously approved” and page 6 first paragraph change the word “consistency” to “consistent” and the fifth sentence change the word “of” to “the”.

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to approve the September 4, 2014 meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, abstain; Ms. Kramb, abstain; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0 – 2.)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor amended the September 11, 2014 meeting minutes on page 6, third paragraph change “the inspector is not asked to judge the color”. Mr. Hardt amended page 4, last paragraph should say “Mr. Hardt was asked”.

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve the September 11, 2014 meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said next is the proposed 2015 – 2016 meeting dates and asked if there were any corrections or changes.

Ms. Salay suggested that it is important for everyone to have a break or time away and asked staff to take a look at eliminating a meeting or two from the calendar.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if it would be problematic for staff to limit those months to one meeting.

Ms. Husak said there used to only be one meeting in December, but at some point, the agendas got to be too full. She said the second meeting date was added, but if they can push applicants to one of the two December dates, the other date could be cancelled. She suggested allowing for greater flexibility with two scheduled meetings, and shooting for cancelling one, but it is up to the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they can eliminate the dates and if something comes forward they can put it back on.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if they could move the March 12th meeting to the 26th and the May 21st meeting to May 14th.

Ms. Husak said March 26th is the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said to see if those changes can be made and bring the new dates to the next meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

1. BSC Scioto River Neighborhood District – Mixed-Use Development – Bridge Park East

The Chair, Ms. Amorose Groomes, introduced this application for informal review and feedback on a future application for the Bridge Park East Mixed Use development.

Ms. Husak said Crawford Hoying and their team are here tonight to give an informal update on some of the changes necessitated in their development and mentioned that Staff had originally planned to have a case before the Commission for a vote, but that is not the case any longer because of the changes. She said the applicant would like some informal feedback on their preliminary architecture which will be part of the Basic Site Plan application that is currently being reviewed by Planning. She said staff provided some discussion questions in the memo.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying, 555 Metro Place, said they are happy to be back to share some developments that they have and go over the proposed elevations and receive feedback with the design team from Moody Nolan and Brian Quackenbush from EMH&T.

Mr. Yoder went over the previous renderings, landscape plan, and the Basic Site Plan. He said the first eight buildings are the first out of the ground for the project and farthest along for design complete with samples of materials and renderings.

Mr. Yoder said the first change is the vehicular areas and open space weaved throughout the project. He said they are trying to capture open space with its own feel and flavor to be on a main street and find a way between buildings. He said they adjusted parking with eliminating underground parking with streets over parking structures because these streets could not be dedicated to the City since they were over parking structures. He said there would be maintenance issues with these streets as well, as the City was uncomfortable with taking on streets that were over parking structures. He said they were limited in alternative stormwater treatments at grade. He said they started off with about 1700 parking spaces and

by the time the engineers were finished they were down to 1200-1300 spaces due to structural complications, mechanical rooms, transformer vaults and other things happening below grade. He said because of all these things the cost per parking space increased to about 50%. He said the new proposal puts the spaces in the right places and they are up to 1800 spaces in the proposed plan. He said they have pulled the parking structures and consolidated them into two 800 to 900 parking space garages above grade, which allows natural light and ventilation.

Mr. Yoder said the two parking garages are each five story structures, which is permitted in the Code, with a speed ramp to level 4, with levels 1, 2, and 3 easily accessed from Tuller Ridge and Longshore Drive and they can be used for retail, restaurant, and office users. He said the speed ramps go to levels, 4, 5, and 6 for the residents of the buildings connected with pedestrian bridges to the residential structures which will provide a better living experience to be able to make a direct connection over to the building and avoid the use of an elevator which is good when carrying groceries, etc.

Mr. Yoder said Buildings C4 and B4 have parking and residential floors that align and have parking on the same level to connect to individual units, which gives the residential units a nice benefit of being able to park on the same level as they live and provide a better living experience.

Mr. Yoder said the at-grade streets will allow typical stormwater management measures and have freedom in the landscaping, the ability to dedicate all streets to the City and reduce the amount of waivers that will be required. He said the simpler construction will allow the project to remain on schedule.

Mr. Yoder said they have been able to straighten out the grid and tweak the dimensions of some of the buildings with added depth to the C1 and C2 buildings, reducing the size of some of the B1 and B2 buildings and eliminating the need for some waivers for the longest block by making it smaller.

Mr. Yoder introduced Russ Hunter, Designer with Crawford Hoying who has worked with him for 8 years and has been on board overseeing the design of this project for the last year.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 555 Metro Place, said he has grouped the buildings and will focus on the buildings that have not changed much and go into more depth with the parking garage buildings.

Mr. Hunter said they have a lot they are trying to figure out with the site and the many things that go into a project like this, and the Commission's feedback will be important regarding architecture for massing, scale and materials. He said they want to focus on buildings and elevations.

Mr. Hunter went through each building:

- B1 is the southernmost building that faces Riverside Drive and the building is commercial on the first two levels with four stories of residential above. He said this building sits on a large stone veneer with brick above for the next three levels, introducing a secondary element that acts as a top for the entire building using matching metal panels to come down adding verticality to the building. He said this is one of the largest buildings that gives lots of flexibility to do multiple sizes for retail/restaurant and office. He said there is a resident occupied terrace and the upper floor penthouses have 10 foot ceilings.

- B2 is north from B1, on the corner of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue being a continuation of the architectural language that was in B1. He said it is a more playful use in the massing and materials letting them break the ground and top planes. He said the tower element is at the intersection being a gateway into the project because the pedestrian bridge enters this side of the river which will focus directly on this building to the north of Bridge Park Avenue as the "beacon" that draws everyone across the river. He said this building also has a smaller

terrace level for residents only, with the building shaped like an "L". He said there is also a roof top terrace on level five that overlooks the river, with retail on the ground floor and office on the second floor. He said the floors have been stretched because of the opportunities for "For Sale" residential products on this side of the river to complement what is happening on the west side of the river.

- B3 has turned the corner and is coming up Bridge Park Avenue having retail/restaurant on the ground floor with residential on the upper four floors. He said this building was seen as a modern contemporary interpretation of a warehouse design, which opens up the units with a lot of natural lighting. He said they introduced some areas that have broken the plane to have balconies directly off Bridge Park Avenue so that the residents can stand outside and be a part of what is happening at street level, adding visual interest to the building.

Ms. Salay asked about the sizes of the balconies.

Mr. Hunter said these balconies are 6 feet deep and about 8 feet wide.

Mr. Hunter said building B3 is starting to look at metal and masonry detailing introducing metal panels/bands and brick courses bringing the industrial warehouse feel into a more contemporary look.

- C1 is at the northernmost end of the site and was originally intended as a grocery with a larger footprint on the ground floor giving flexibility to get a larger format user. He said there is a tower on the north end because this is a gateway, as it grows to the north this is a corner that is prominent and deserves a celebration of architecture. He said this building is retail/restaurant on the ground floor with four stories of residential above. He said it has the same architectural base, middle and top features, letting the top come down at the corners and breaking massing up with the balconies.

- C2, directly to the south, is the other building on the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive. He said it has the tower element as you come off the pedestrian bridge focused on the tower and is a 100 percent commercial building with restaurant/retail on the ground floor with four levels of office above. He said this building is considered the heart of the project as a beacon coming across the pedestrian bridge. He said they have introduced several areas on top of the building for upper level places for office tenants to step out on the upper levels and get the vista from across the river.

- C3 is along Bridge Park Avenue with retail/restaurant on the ground floor with office above with three stories of residential above that directly across the street from the warehouse building. He said he likes this building because the streetscape starts to narrow along Bridge Park Avenue so it feels like there is a two-sided street meant to be more urban. He said they are breaking the massing up by introducing different elements and materials to have different pieces and things happening so it does not have the same contemporary feel in the massing that the other buildings have.

Mr. Hunter said Buildings B4 and C4 are parking garages with 5 stories above ground parking with residential liners on both sides. He said there is a residential character but also is still going to be a parking garage. He said while the project is contemporary, it is not *over the top* contemporary. He showed examples of parking garages that they thought were interesting that would match the feel for what they were proposing for this site. He said it matches the scale of the residential character.

- B4 has some playful use of punched openings versus larger openings trying to bridge the gap between an open air parking garage with natural light without vast expanses of openness that can be seen as just a concrete structure. He said they are letting the residential uses wrap the

corners making the stair towers become beacons with lots of glass and light. He said they are looking at the residential portion of the building that will have to match.

- C4 is keeping the architectural style of the original plan applied to new buildings. He said it maintains verticality still using the smaller masonry units that are more appropriate with the rest of the residential scale of the project. He said the metal screens play with the elevations giving a different experience, when standing in front giving a transparent feel, while inside the garage it will be very open, and as seen from the street there is a different vision of the parking garage. He said they are using the corner elements of towers to give legible entry and exit for patrons on the residential wrapping the back the building taking on the character of the rest of the buildings.

Ms. Salay asked about the street sections and said she is confused because the preliminary plat was approved with the garages underground and when the applicant went to Council a few weeks later they changed Bridge Park Avenue with buildings closer together and a different street section. She said the renderings seen today are different again.

Ms. Husak said the street section for Bridge Park Avenue is exactly the same that was approved at City Council, what has changed is that the streets that are intersecting with Bridge Park Avenue were previously included in a preliminary plat approved by City Council as reserves for private drives. She said the issue is the City does not want to have public streets over parking garages and with that no longer being an issue with no more below-grade parking structures, those streets, Mooney and Longshore, are now going to be platted as public streets with a revised preliminary plat and a revised basic development plan application coming forward to Planning and Zoning Commission and then the plat would have to be approved at City Council.

Ms. Newell asked about the street layout with on-street parking along Riverside Drive and said she could not fathom how that will function. She asked about any traffic studies to support on-street parking because there is a lot of traffic that cycles down Riverside Drive and this seems like a safety hazard without seeing any proposals that have parking on Riverside Drive.

Joanne Shelly said Riverside Drive has always shown parking on the east side and it has now been added to the west side because they wanted to have a pedestrian scale and friendly environment. She explained that on-street parking is a passive traffic calming device. She said parking along the street gives barriers to create the pedestrian spaces that are adjacent to the buildings to the east and to the park on the west. She said this is a barrier to the high traffic and volume street, creating some spaces for pedestrians for safety and traffic calming.

Ms. Newell asked what was going to happen with all of the other traffic that is going to go through there, knowing that they cannot change the layout of the City and having a tremendous amount of traffic that goes through that section across Bridge Street.

Barb Cox said Riverside Drive will continue to have two lanes of traffic in both directions so the capacity of the roadway is still there as it is today. She said there have been concerns expressed with parking along Riverside Drive and it is one of the items in the toolbox to help with traffic and making the area feel and act different than it does today, with the planned roundabout that will slow traffic down at SR161 and Riverside Drive. She said there will be a traffic light at Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue and at John Shields Parkway and the modified traffic light at Emerald Parkway. She said there will be a series of traffic signals that will be interconnected to monitor the corridor and move traffic. She said there is not a desire to build a parking lot within the park, so the on-street parking spaces are actually going to serve the park. She said the lane on the park side along Riverside Drive will be constructed lower than the northbound lanes resulting in a stair case effect across Riverside Drive towards the river.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the expected speed limit for Riverside Drive.

Ms. Cox said the City has to leave the speed limit as it is currently until the improvements are done and in place and they can only change the speed limit via traffic studies and a speed study because it is a State Route and the conditions have to be right for the study because it is a reactive process.

Ms. Salay said it is 40 mph now.

Ms. Kramb said it is 40 mph until you get to Bright Road, then it changes to 50 mph.

Ms. Cox said they may not be able to get it much less than 40 mph, but she would have to double check the detail.

Ms. Salay said SR23 through Worthington is 25 mph and SR161 is 25 mph through downtown Dublin.

Ms. Cox said both have to do with the zoning of Central Business Districts. She noted that the Riverside improvements are the City's part of this project and is not something the Crawford Hoying folks are doing, and the design details are part of the City project.

Ms. Shelly said it is important to understand with the Riverside Drive question, is that they are creating a network and the plan for this development will increase the number of roads and intersections with other principles of building this type of community while creating multiple opportunities for people to go different directions. She said there is currently one road to go north and south on Riverside Drive and there is not the opportunity to go other directions with adding Tuller, John Shields and other "escape routes" so all of the traffic concentrated on one road will be distributed over a network of roads as part of the Thoroughfare Plan is the network grid that allows cars to go in other directions and not be concentrated in a single location.

Ms. Salay said she understands that with the Dublin residents and for people that have trips within the area, but there are those that are going through from Arlington or downtown north toward Powell or Delaware with commuter traffic.

Ms. Newell asked for a formal presentation of what and how the City is planning for traffic and said several Planning Commissioners have asked for this several times over the course of this project. She said she was surprised to see on-street parking on the plan and while would love to see the whole network, as a resident she is alarmed with comments like "I'm not sure how it will trickle down from one area to another".

Ms. Newell said the question is, with putting the parking spots along Riverside Drive, people will have to pay attention to parked cars and people coming out between parked cars, and there is the problem within Historic Dublin and while they do drive agreeably slower, when they start driving consistently slower through that area, what does it do to those traffic outlets in all the locations, because she sees it snowballing. She said no one has given a presentation to the Commission, and when she asked that question, the response was that they have not developed the traffic studies that thoroughly.

Ms. Cox said the studying the City has done will not answer the question about on-street parking in the manner that she thinks they want it answered. She said they have done extensive studies on how the traffic and grid system and all of the improvements and phasing and the development and the grid system do work to accommodate this type of volume of traffic that will come from this level of development, and that is the beauty of the grid. She said the traffic will not all show up on day one, and in the future, when they have the John Shields Parkway bridge that goes over the river, at some point they will have multiple choices and routes to get into this particular development, and they won't have to depend on just Riverside Drive and SR 161 anymore. She said they will still have two full northbound and southbound lanes as well as the southbound bypass lane, which will still be available. She stated that

even with adding parallel parking on the sides, there is still a lot of capacity on Riverside Drive to move traffic through.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said to save the traffic studies for when they have information and said to set this aside because they are talking theoretically and they know there is a lot of work to do to generate that information and it would be nice to have the information when they have to make these decisions but they do not. She said staff needs to do the necessary studies that remain outstanding and try to put these pieces together.

Mr. Taylor said he feels like throughout this whole project they have been asked to make decisions based on limited information. He said Mr. Yoder alluded to new little greenways behind the buildings off Bridge Park Avenue as being something that staff was pushing and asked why they are there and what they are intended to do and how they work.

Ms. Shelly said part of the Code requires that there are mid-block pedestrianways and they have asked for breaks between the buildings so there are opportunities for pedestrian connections through the blocks. She said in the original plan for this development, the path through the spaces between the buildings were narrow and not comfortable, serving multiple purposes that were not all focused on pedestrians. She said they were able to create the opportunity for spaces that still have yet to be detailed and once they get through the development plan and basic site plan then they would work on the details. She said at this time they are only identifying that there are spaces available for pedestrianways.

Mr. Taylor said he has two problems with those pedestrianways because when they put that requirement into the Code the intent was to break up long blocks and they have one of the pedestrianways in the first quarter of the block so it is only 80 feet back from Bridge Park Avenue and it is on both sides, so he sees these things drawing pedestrian traffic off of the main retail corridor onto the side areas, contributing to a lack of vitality on the streets. He said if the Code requires mid-block pedestrianways in those blocks between C4 and B4, they should be in the middle. He said he is not in favor for where they are because they are going to hurt Bridge Park Avenue.

Mr. Taylor said that the front property/right-of-way line on Riverside Drive is closer to the curb in the second plan than the first, if it is true, he asked by how much is it closer and why.

Ms. Shelly said it is correct because the original development was going to require a waiver for the building not being within the RBZ.

Mr. Taylor said these questions are not really for staff, they are more addressed to Mr. Yoder. He said when Mr. Yoder was here before they had quite a lively discussion about the streetscape and the details of that and he and Mr. Yoder had a direct discussion about Riverside Drive and he thought he was very clear at that meeting, that was kind of a third rail for him, and he anticipated it was going to have a ton of activity on it. He said if they are going to make a mistake on sidewalk size and if they were going to make a mistake on where the building was relative to the street, it was to be too big, not too small. He said now they have this thing squeezed down to nothing or relatively nothing on what he thinks is the most important part of this whole development in terms of streetscape because this is the part where all the activity will be across from the park. He said he does not think making it a technicality that there was or they can move the RBZs and can give waivers to do whatever it takes to get that. He said he is alarmed that for whatever reason they are pinching the public realm and this Commission is here to protect that public realm.

Mr. Yoder said that the building has not moved since the last review. He said the area that got smaller was on lot 2, which is the building they needed to have a waiver for because they pushed the building all the way back to the point where between the edge of the curb and the face of the building they would have 40 or 50 feet.

Mr. Taylor said he and staff disagree then because staff just said the building is closer in that location of block C.

Mr. Yoder said block C has not been moved.

Mr. Taylor asked how far the building front from the curb on block C is.

Mr. Yoder said as they work their way from north to south there is going to be a variety of experiences along Riverside Drive which is strong with large, deep patios.

Mr. Taylor said that is private space, he is asking about groups of people walking down the sidewalk strolling and enjoying all that stuff that is likely to happen in that location across from the park.

Mr. Yoder said the amount of space between the curb and the face of the building has a 10-foot sidewalk, 8-foot planter, and a 3-foot carriage walk and is approximately 30 feet and all of it is public. He said any patio spaces would be indoor/outdoor 365 days a year, some with roll up doors internal to the buildings.

Mr. Hunter said this is the shopping corridor that runs through this section to Bridge Park Avenue.

Mr. Taylor said when people use urban districts they stroll along the front of buildings and they have an opportunity to allow plenty of space for that to happen and if they are going to make the sidewalks the wrong size they should make the distance between the street and the building too big and not too small. He said this is a concern of his.

Mr. Taylor stated that he noticed in the original version, there was parallel parking on both sides of the first block of Bridge Park Avenue, and it is now gone.

Mr. Hunter said Engineering had requested that change.

Mr. Langworthy said there is a turn lane for access to Riverside Drive, from Bridge Park Avenue.

Mr. Taylor asked what the sidewalk areas used for in the first block or the uses anticipated in B2 and C2.

Mr. Hunter said these are both restaurants.

Mr. Taylor said they have been looking at the Bridge Street District since October of 2008 and having a wall of cars to separate the moving traffic lanes and a restaurant is something that makes people feel comfortable, and at this busy corner there are two restaurants without that wall of steel. He said he does not understand why they would give up those parking spaces and still have them pushed up to the front and is there not another way to solve it.

Mr. Taylor asked the status of the pedestrian crossing that was a big issue at the beginning when they talked about how to get between the park and this side of the street with the bridge and round-about; other than traffic lights, he asked if there is any other method that is being thought about to make it convenient and safe.

Mr. Langworthy said the light cycle will have an all red cycle for pedestrian crossing, so all three ways will be stopped at the intersection for pedestrian movement.

Mr. Taylor said that is the kind of information that they need to see to make decisions on building elevations.

Ms. Husak said this is not intended to be a meeting where they are making decisions, this is a meeting to get feedback from the Commission and Staff has received the feedback that there is to be a presentation to address all the outstanding traffic questions.

Mr. Taylor said that it is important during the informal to be direct because that is how the message gets delivered. He said he does not like any of this stuff or anything about it. He said all the buildings look cheap and from what he sees contemporary buildings in this case is an excuse to make them less expensive and they are almost the same building with the backs looking like the backs of apartment buildings or the fronts look like the back of apartment buildings. He said he does not like the scale of the first floor on most of them and the use of spandrel glass makes him think this was designed in 1962, being that they do not do spandrel glass anymore on buildings like this. He said the building with the tower does not fit with anything, and he does not like how it is articulated.

Mr. Taylor said the Commission has talked about parking garages for five years and if they are going to have them they are not going to look like parking garages, and even being that it looks like a nice parking garage that is not remotely good enough. He said he was disturbed by the comment that as they got closer to Riverside Drive it "gets a little more urban" and in his opinion, the *whole development* is to be urban and there should not be "degrees of urban-ness," and pacifying drivers is the last thing they want to do. He said he is confused by the idea that it is easier to drive up to the top floor of the parking garage and carry groceries across the parking garage and get into a sky bridge connecting to the units. He said he cannot imagine anything that is more the opposite of urbanism than sky bridges, and if that is something that appears in this development, it will never get his approval.

Mr. Taylor said he is interested in knowing where signs will be going. He stated that with the City spending millions of dollars moving Riverside Drive to clear the riverfront in front of these buildings, these buildings have not earned that place yet and are not good enough for the best setting for buildings in this city, and maybe in the region, and they have got to be a lot better than these are.

Mr. Yoder asked why the buildings look cheap.

Mr. Taylor asked that he wait until he hears the other Commissioners' comments and see if there are things in common and they can address them later.

Ms. Newell said massing of the buildings were well handled, but when looking at the buildings together, all of the buildings except the warehouse building appear color blocked. She said it is the one building that is different than the others, but when looking at them together there is a pattern of color blocking from each building, that they all have a sameness of development. She said they all envisioned for the Bridge Street District that there would be a uniqueness of buildings developed at different times. She said the buildings should be completely different in character and style. She said with the first buildings to be developed having so much repetition and sameness they are not getting the architectural variety that they are looking for. She said the two anchor buildings with tower features could have been developed better than it is so the interest is heightened more.

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, said the elevations do not give the detail yet, the intent of the Arriscraft material at the water table and the lower portions of the buildings is to break them up with some reveals with different unit sizes. He said Arriscraft is a quality product and has been used on a number of newer products within Dublin. He said the Arriscraft is a man-made product but does have the characteristics of a natural stone with veining and different coloration. He said the intent is to play with sizes as well as textures. He said a lot of the openings and smaller details are not represented and will be further down the road.

Ms. Newell said the Arriscraft product is a quality material with a variety within the product in specialty shapes, monolithic units and they look like stone not split face or block, but she is concerned with how they are using it and the details of the application on the buildings. She said all the elevations have the exact same pattern of store fronts with a glass box with doors with no variety. She asked if that was the intention.

Mr. Hunter said the intention is that whatever the tenant wants to do they are able to do it, and it is their space and it will compliment what is being created while having their identity and there may be tenants that will have a finished streetscape and have their own stamp on it.

Ms. Newell asked if the building terraces are going to be landscaped or flat paved surfaces.

Mr. Hunter said they are going to do a combination of pavers and synthetic grass or introduce some green roof elements and planters with trees.

Ms. Newell asked that they show that on their presentations of the buildings because it is important in adding to the architecture of the building. She said she would like to see more distinct character between the buildings.

Ms. Newell said they noted that vinyl windows are being proposed in the residential units and those are not permitted in the Code.

Mr. Hunter said they would seek a waiver for the windows.

Mr. Hardt said that the buildings look too much like each other and the expectation is that these buildings look like they were built at different times by different developers and designed by different architects. He said Ms. Newell was on track with the specifics with the use of colors on the buildings, the vertical elements with the balconies squeezed in between them is on almost all of the buildings, and any one of the buildings are competent, but altogether they are not what the Commission is after. He said he agrees with Mr. Taylor that the investment that the City is making to create this site in this location in the city demands something remarkable and he does not think these buildings are remarkable in the way they are presented. He said the Arriscraft is a quality material but he is concerned about it because where it meets up with the sidewalk, the salt will damage it.

Mr. Hardt referred to the upper stories of the buildings and said there is an indication on the elevations they are proposing to use stucco that matches the metal panels and that speaks to the comment about cheapness. He said if metal panels are the appropriate architecture and aesthetic, then that is what they should be using, and not mimic them with less expensive materials. He agrees with the comments regarding the vinyl windows. He said he understands the comments on the tenants having the freedom to detail the storefront as they want, but with the buildings having 20-foot storefronts with 2-foot masonry piers in between them and that is duplicated on each building, there is a certain sameness and lack of character at the street level that seems to be missing.

Mr. Hardt said he agrees with Mr. Taylor's comments on pedestrian sky bridges connecting the apartments with the parking garage, and that type of construction is the antithesis of walkable urbanism.

Mr. Hardt said when the preliminary plat came through he wanted to see the streetscape developed and delivered in the way that the City and public and studies anticipated it, with 12-foot clear sidewalks and the cycle track and carriage way and all the things that MKSK recommended. He said he did not see that in the preliminary development plan but did ask to see it going forward. He said the proposal that was presented to City Council went in the other direction and he stated that he expects that the sidewalk in the public realm and the streetscape and public space be built as envisioned with all the components even if the right-of-way has to get bigger and he will not support this project in any form until that is

demonstrated. He said they have invested too much time and money in this plan and the City needs to dictate what the streetscape looks like so there is consistency in the functionality and form throughout the development.

Ms. Kramb said her biggest concern is with the Bridge Park street section that only has a 5-foot sidewalk and there is no way she can support a 5-foot sidewalk. She said with respect to architecture, she would not support that large of a parking garage and the way they look is too gigantic and asked how they are classified.

Ms. Husak said they are classified as corridor buildings.

Mr. Yoder said the garages can be 5 stories plus parking on the roof, according to Code.

Ms. Husak said they are not considered stand-alone parking garages.

Ms. Kramb said she cannot support rooftop parking and does not want to see cars parked on the top of these buildings when she is walking down the street. She said they cannot look like parking garages. She said the smaller buildings are going in the right direction and the warehouse building is the best of the buildings. She said the residential portions of the buildings are the portion she does not like because it is very repetitive.

Ms. Kramb said when they come back she will want to know how many residential units are in each of the buildings and what is expected in uses on the ground floors and the parking per buildings and how many are for residential and commercial/offices. She said she would like to know if buses are accommodated on the streets. She would like to know where signs will fit on the buildings. She wants to know how much will be residential for sale units and the price points and the number of rental units. She said she is not in favor of a sky bridge connecting the buildings and the mid-block pedestrian ways need to be closer to the mid-block to break up the two gigantic buildings.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the windows will function on the buildings.

Mr. Hunter said they are required by Code to function.

Mr. Zimmerman said there are different vinyl window qualities. He said with respect to the overall development, there should be something that draws someone across the river from the Historic District and possibly it could be the lighting from the different uses or something seen on the windows that will draw them to come over. He said the garages have a different feel to them, and they are going in the right direction. He said the warehouse building is going to be the biggest draw. He said he agrees with Mr. Taylor with regard to the sidewalk and public spaces to make these spaces bigger now to accommodate the pedestrians and the dining experience along the streets.

Ms. Salay said the parking garages make her very nervous and it is difficult to get a great looking parking garage. She said these are going to be important roadways, and these parking garages have got to be the best looking and most heavily disguised parking garages and no one should know that it is a parking garage from the outside because this is the premier location and the best seat in the house for Bridge Street. She said this project sets the tone as the first ones in, and the bar needs to be set high.

Ms. Salay referred to the architecture and said seeing the materials in person does make her a little more comfortable, but she does not understand metal panels and how they are going to have the quality that is expected, knowing that metal panels do not age well. She said she prefers brick and stone. She said there is a lot of repetition in the buildings and architecture. She agrees with the point to incorporate transit, because it will be needed. She said to have more space on the sidewalks and higher quality materials and windows.

Ms. Salay apologized to staff and said traffic has been reported to City Council, and they have developed over the years a great respect for the City's traffic engineers and their studies and recommendations. She said that whatever they have said was going to happen has always happened, and she has a high level of trust in the beauty of the grid. She said they do not want traffic flying through Riverside Drive especially with this shopping corridor. She said it would be a great idea to have an evening with the Engineering staff and present the vision for traffic in the Bridge Street District. She said Council had a presentation from the consultant regarding streetscapes and combined with something from the traffic engineers they can have a session focused on streets and traffic. She said she is not as opposed to sky bridges in the back of the buildings because they are not front and center.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she agrees with the comments from the Commissioners and she does not believe this is meeting the intent or the vision of the Bridge Street Code. She said the buildings look like they ran out of the good stuff about 5 stories in the air and they had to get other things to finish the top story. She said she is not in favor of this kind of architecture. She said when they name streets such as these, they are regal names that deserve regal buildings. She said when she travel around the country, the new buildings all look like these buildings, and she fears that they will get something like Metro Center with four glass buildings and they are buildings that are very reminiscent of the early 1980s and these are going to be thought of as "very 2010s," and she does not want that repetition in this district. She said the street names should have buildings similar to their names, such as Long Wharf Road should have a building like a wharf or Park Avenue should have a grandiose estate like a beautiful building that is classic and timeless.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she does not see any stone on any of the buildings and if this is the core of the City it should look like the genesis of our City and there should be some buildings that are representative of who they have been and where they are going. She said that kind of representation is not in this proposal. She said they need timeless buildings. She said her vision is that this district does not look like a development but like a city with buildings that will mesh together and there is nothing authentically urban about this, but is very suburban density.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said when they return she is interested in seeing the number of units per building, the square footages, number of "for sale" and "for rent", and the full development of where the structural soils in the planting areas will be. She said there is a critical mass required of underground access to canopy with a minimum structure underneath. She said she is hesitant on sky bridges and she will hold her judgment on that until she sees more information. She said the City needs to have and take ownership of the public realm and decide what the public realm needs to be and they need to figure out what the streets need to look like and let applicants know. She said in her opinion, they have failed holistically on this point.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone from the general public would like to make any comments. [There were none.]

Mr. Yoder thanked the Commission for their comments and feedback. He said it is their goal to deliver a high quality, timeless project. He said the issue with parking moving from below ground to above ground is not a question of saving money, it will bring the cost of the parking within reason and a matter of survival and whether the project moves forward. He said the connections of the parking to the other parts of the site and this is a critical part of making the spaces marketable and the bridge connections can capture convenience for residents.

Mr. Taylor said the reason he is against sky bridges is because it takes people off the street and the whole purpose of this district is they are trying to create dense walkable urbanism and when they take all the residents of the building and tell them they don't have to walk on the street anymore it takes away a lot.

Mr. Yoder said if someone is renting a 6th floor unit overlooking the park, and you ask them to fight with retail/restaurant traffic on the lower levels of the garage it makes it difficult to the residents to get their groceries down 4 flights down the elevator of the parking garage, then cross the street and travel up 4 flights to their unit and there will be activity on the street without inconveniencing the user experience of the residents as they live here on a day to day basis.

Mr. Yoder said the materials presented were chosen because they were informed that the Arriscraft material is durable to salt, as stone will be eroded by the salt. He said they had the idea of stone and brick and was trying to present something that is as durable as possible. Mr. Yoder said the comments regarding buildings looking the same is partially due to the limitations of the materials palette with brick, glass and stone being their only choices, and the idea that stucco and metal panels not being encouraged will create more sameness between the different buildings.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said to come back with creative and great ideas with the use of natural materials that are not presented.

Mr. Yoder said another meeting on the streets makes sense and the give and take on the streetscape has happened to inform the results of a consultant working within a vacuum with reality and a tenant perspective. He said they have seen the same streetscape proposed in Grandview, downtown in the Arena District, and now rolled out for Dublin signature streets. He said the idea of several miles and hundreds or thousands of trees that would have to be in planters with lots of factors with ongoing maintenance issues as well as the logistics of having a shopping corridor flow with restaurants with outdoor seating along with the planters outside of the retail space is not great. He said in some places a tree grate or a raised planter works, but without a great relationship with what is going on inside the building and out on the street a raised planter can be appropriate but when there are miles across Dublin here is big issues to think about for the city. He said putting obstacles in front of the shop fronts doesn't make a lot of sense. He said they have been trying to help inform that process with the real issues and are helping to find a good solution.

Ms. Salay said the vision report that was approved in 2010 should be used as a reference for examples of buildings that they are looking for which might get them more in line with the vision for the district.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicants for their time.

Communications
Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any communications. [There were none.]

Commission Roundtable Discussion
Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any roundtable issues to be discussed.

Ms. Salay said they are looking for a City Manager, the first look at candidates is on October 28th and possibly continue through October 29th beginning at 4:30 pm and she may be late to the meeting.

Ms. Kramb said she will be unable to attend the November 13th meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she assumes there will not be a review for the Riviera application at the November 13th meeting.

Ms. Husak said they are expected to file an application for that meeting.

Mr. Hardt will not be in attendance either on November 13.

Ms. Salay said they cannot hold up development for everyone to be present knowing that there will be other opportunities for input. She said they cannot always be at every meeting and that is understood.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on December 4, 2014.

Mr. McDaniel noted that Resolution 80-14 was approved under the consent agenda. It related to access to Liberoptics. Several discussions were held with Ohio Health, and Mr. Hagen offered to provide an update on their activities.

Mr. Hagen shared a PowerPoint Presentation, telling the story of the Ohio Health presence in Dublin and providing statistics on their growth in Dublin over the past six years, particularly in employee numbers and Dublin resident numbers. The total salary of the associates working in Dublin has gone from $35 to $80 million. In terms of facility expansions, in 2006 Ohio Health had 70,000 square feet in Dublin. Currently, they have 570,000 square feet. The hospital and health center combine for about 360,000 of that number; the other Ohio Health locations in Dublin comprise another 200,000 square feet. He commented on the great partnership between the City and Ohio Health. At Dublin Methodist, they provided $16.6 million of charity care in the current fiscal year. He commented on a number of their successful programs. They are now the sixth largest employer in the City of Dublin and 2,000 babies will be born at Dublin Methodist this year. They have consistently ranked by Truven Health Analytics as among the 100 Top Hospitals in the country. There are 14 criteria evaluated for this, based on publicly available data through Centers for Medicare and Medicaid. Dublin Methodist has been eligible for and has been on this list for the past three years. Ohio Health had five hospitals in the Top 100 list. They have a great development board, and Mr. McDaniel has been active with that. The community has been very supportive of their development activities as well. They recently received a gift of $250,000 from an anonymous donor for a cath lab and LabCorp provided a $7,500 gift for community education activities. He provided information about the many other recognitions that Ohio Health has received.

For Dublin Methodist, their maternity unit has been expanded; they have added operating rooms and will soon have a total of eight; they have moved into robotic surgery for urology and gynecology. They have added radiation oncology. They are involved in the stroke network and electronic ICU for the system. In the next 12-24 months, they will build out the fourth floor west tower, providing another 20 beds. They have a longstanding relationship with Ohio University College of Medicine. With OU having located their family medicine program to the Dublin community in close proximity to Dublin Methodist, they will become a teaching hospital, adding another dimension to the facility. The teaching will take place in primary care specialties. OU recruits from Ohio and the doctors tend to remain in Ohio.

He thanked Council for allowing him to share their story tonight.

Mr. Reiner stated that he is pleased that Dr. Miley has moved to Dublin Methodist Hospital.

Ms. Chinnici-Zbercher stated that when the hospital first opened, she felt Dublin was truly a full service community. She did not envision the incredible medical corridor that has now developed due to Ohio Health's presence in Dublin. It is exciting to hear of the partnerships announced between Ohio University, Dublin Methodist and the Cleveland Clinic. Congratulations to all!

Mayor Keenan commented on the importance of having these reliable emergency and medical services in the community. His family utilized the hospital in a very serious family health situation several years ago. The outcome was very good because of the attention and excellent care received.

- Preliminary Plat - Bridge Park East

Ms. Husak stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Preliminary Plat for seven blocks on approximately 30.9 acres of land, coinciding with seven developable lots with new public rights-of-way to establish the street network, block layout and dimensions for a portion of the BSD Scioto River Corridor. Council recently approved a Code amendment to establish the neighborhood district within the Bridge Street

District. Ms. Husak noted that additional internal access will be provided as a part of this plat from private drives and dedicated reserve areas. The plat also includes the vacation of the east/west segment of Dale Drive as well as the realignment of portions of existing right-of-way. She reviewed a slide depicting the plat and the boundaries of the land; how this area fits within the Scioto River Neighborhood District, shown in orange; and a graphic depicting the major road networks incorporated within that portion of the development. At the end of the pedestrian bridge landing is a shopping corridor.

The Planning and Zoning Commission (P & Z) reviewed and approved the Basic Development Plan for all of the blocks listed on the slide, essentially approved the cohesiveness of the framework of the future mixed-use development proposed by Crawford Hoying; evaluated whether it set the tone for the public realm; and provided the preliminary analysis for the placemaking foundations of this neighborhood district. The Basic Development Plan review is one of several steps in the detailed project review of this proposal.

Simultaneous to that, the Commission reviewed the preliminary plat, which sets up the initial steps for public roadways as well as private roadways within the development. The Commission recommended approval of the preliminary plat to Council.

Ms. Husak stated the upcoming steps for the Bridge Park development as proposed by Crawford Hoying are development plans reviews, which are in phases. Currently, internal review is being conducted of phase one. Staff expects that a final plat for phase one will also be included for review at Planning and Zoning Commission and subsequently at City Council. This is followed by Basic Site Plan reviews. Staff is currently reviewing one of those for blocks B and C. Staff is expecting those Basic Site Plan reviews as well as final site plan reviews to occur in a block by block phasing.

Ms. Husak presented an overview of the plat, which includes the grid street network set aside from the Bridge Street Code. It includes seven development blocks, three new public streets – Mooney Street, Tuller Ridge Drive, and a street yet to be named. It was reviewed by the Commission as Broadstone Avenue. The applicant is proposing to name it Bridge Park Avenue. Staff has some hesitation about naming a street after a development in this manner. Another name contemplated was Park Avenue. The applicant and staff are seeking Council feedback.

The future mixed-use shopping corridor extends from Riverside Drive to the east and is the first section of Bridge Park Avenue. The preliminary plat is part of that development as well. The public streets are in green. The yellow streets are the reserves, which are essentially private streets within the development that are built above parking garages. They are built to public standards and there will not be any difference in the feel of those streets. Because of their location on top of parking garages, staff has decided they should not be dedicated as public streets.

Ms. Salay stated that there was discussion earlier tonight about maintenance of private streets, both long term and day-to-day. She asked her to describe how those responsibilities will be handled.
Ms. Husak responded that she will provide those details at the next hearing. These are located in City-owned reserves and there is some partnership in terms of maintenance. In addition, they are being constructed like public streets.

Outlined in red is the shopping corridor that is listed in the neighborhood district as one of the areas where there is expectation of high use by pedestrians. The preliminary plat review criteria are all part of the Subdivision Regulations. They essentially speak to the contents of the plat, is the information correct, are all the site

conditions listed, is the correct amount of right-of-way dedicated and in this case also vacated. This plat includes reserves with private drives; grading and utility information; preliminary open space information; tree survey; and street sections. The street section for the private drives is shown, including 11-foot travel lanes, 8-foot parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street, and walkways and planting zones within those areas. For Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge Drive, shown in yellow, a 65-foot right-of-way is provided with two 11-foot travels lanes, 8 feet of parallel parking on both sides, a carriage walk allowing for door swing for people exiting vehicles; sidewalk area where street trees are accommodated; and 6-foot sidewalks, all incorporated within the right-of-way.
Bridge Park Avenue changes somewhat in character, depending on whether one is in the shopping corridor area or more to the east. The street section as approved by the Commission shows two or three 11 foot travel lanes, depending on whether or not there is a turning lane incorporated; eight foot parallel parking spaces on both sides; the carriage walk of three feet; a five foot planter area; a five foot cycle track; and a six foot sidewalk. All are incorporated within the right-of-way. For the portion near Riverside Drive, that equates to about 87 feet of right-of-way area.

Mr. Reiner stated that the memo shows the original section with an 87-foot right-of-way at the top; underneath is a revised section of Bridge Park Avenue at 80-foot right-of-way. In that, the cycle track is eliminated. He asked for clarification.
Ms. Husak stated that she plans to have the applicant address that at the end of her presentation.
Vice Mayor Gerber asked if this change is the applicant's suggestion or staff's suggestion.
Ms. Husak responded that there was discussion at the Commission about what all can be incorporated within the right-of-way in terms of pedestrian activity, in terms of the need for adequate space within the right-of-way and outside of the right-of-way for amenities such as patios, walking areas. The Commission wanted to ensure that bicycles and pedestrians can navigate safely through that area and that there is a sufficient walkway also provided. Since the Commission meeting in early August, staff has been working with the applicant to determine ways to accommodate the requests of the Commission, while also making sure that this vibrant urban space is created as envisioned in the District – specifically within the shopping corridor areas. The applicant and staff are seeking feedback on whether or not the 80 foot right-of-way would accommodate all of the requests of the Commission while meeting the objectives of the Bridge Street Code.

Mr. Reiner stated that the original intent was to make this a bicycle-friendly community, with a crossing on the pedestrian bridge. The cycle track is on just one side of the roadway, correct?
Ms. Husak responded that the street section approved by the Commission includes the cycle track on both sides of the road – a five-foot cycle track in the 87-foot right-of-way section. The 80-foot section also accommodates bikes within the right-of-way -- either in the street and also within the sidewalk area. There will be a delineated paver section where bikes could be located. The thought was that the serious cyclist who wants to travel through the District is not likely going to ride their bicycle in the areas with heavy pedestrian activity.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked for clarification. One indicates "Original Section Bridge Park Avenue 87' right-of-way." At the bottom, what is shown removes seven feet.
Ms. Husak explained that in the original 87-foot section, there was a three-foot carriage walk on both sides of the on street parking areas. Instead of providing trees within raised planter areas, the applicant was able to put trees in paver areas, which are flush with the sidewalk. There would then be tree grades that allows people to open car doors to exit, without a designated area for that to happen. In addition, a

raised curb could have been a potential hazard in terms of people tripping. It is now all at the same grade level.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that makes sense to her. Regarding the cycle track sidewalk on the top one, it is now combined to be called "brick sidewalk" and went from 11 feet to 10 feet.
Ms. Husak stated that this is due to the removal of the raised planter and the tree now being flush with the grade. There is now a total of a 12-foot area and the concept is that the area could be shared with bikes. Most likely, people will bike there, park the bike and then walk.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher commented that the seating area for restaurants looks to be expanded in the revised drawing.
Ms. Husak stated that is correct, and this allows for people to dine and sit outside of the right-of-way.

Vice Mayor Gerber asked for clarification. Is the original version what Planning Commission reviewed and approved, and the revisions are being proposed by the applicant tonight?
Ms. Husak responded that is correct.

Ms. Salay confirmed that the Commission has not reviewed the revised plat. Staff, the applicant and the Commission had different concerns about where all the activity would be located and how enough space would be available for restaurants, pedestrians, cyclists, cycle track, etc. What she believes has now happened is that a better alternative has been offered for door swings as well as adequate room for those dining. This is for the major street that leads down to the pedestrian bridge, and is anticipated to be a very busy area.

Mayor Keenan asked if the Commission had input on this, given the revisions proposed in response to their suggestions.
Ms. Salay responded affirmatively. The Commission has not viewed this version, but it is reflective of the applicant's efforts to address the Commission's concerns.

Vice Mayor Gerber stated that he is trying to clarify the process. He understands that the Commission reviewed the preliminary plat, but it is of concern to him that unless there was a condition by the Commission to continue to work on this plat, he is confused about why the Commission did not review this first.
Ms. Salay responded that she believes this is the evolution of a project and reflective of an applicant who is working very hard to move through the City's process. Staff did indicate tonight that they are seeking feedback on a number of items, as well as the name of the road.

Ms. Husak stated that there were conditions that the Commission included for the Basic Development Plan that went forward. One of those was that the modifications to the street section described in this report are incorporated as part of the development plan review. The report included information about the Commission discussion, which led to those revisions. The condition at the Commission level should have been revised to reference the discussion at the Commission. That condition essentially needs to be addressed through the development plan and the final plat. The applicant is waiting to make modifications to this development plan based on Council's input regarding the preliminary plat. They will then model their development plan and final plat on that.

Mr. Reiner stated to him, the cycle track is an important aspect, as it provides circulation around the space and down and back to the river. He would suggest the raised bed is lowered, as in the revised plat, picking up some more feet and allowing a cycle path to come back into existence. This also provides some more space for the

outdoor pedestrian zone. The original intent was to accommodate bicycles to travel in this pedestrian and bicycle friendly area. He does not want this cycle track deleted without the Commission reviewing it.
A compromise to facilitate this is to drop the raised bed, pick up the extra footage. reinstitute the cycle track and also provide additional footage for the pedestrian zone.
Ms. Husak clarified that the cycle track is not removed; there remains the ability to accommodate cyclists, essentially on a portion of the brick sidewalk. The applicant will provide delineation indicating two portions to this walk, one which a cyclist would likely use if they use the shared-use path.
Mr. Reiner stated he looked at the Gay and Fifth development in downtown Columbus with the raised beds. It is very attractive. But he would be willing to make a change as he has suggested to pick up some more pedestrian zone and ensure a cycle zone is accommodated. The change from 87 to 80 feet is significant in terms of accommodating all the users.
Ms. Salay stated that what is lost in footage for door swing and dedicated bicycle areas is a gain for outdoor eating space. There will still be delineation on the pavement to handle the pedestrian and cyclists sharing the space.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher suggested that she recommends to the applicant that, in light of this description, and although she understands why they removed the cycle track and sidewalk language, since it will serve that purpose it should be reinstated in some way with the words. As shown, it appears it has been removed and bicycling is a major foundation of the District.

Mr. Reiner suggested that if three feet are picked up on either side of the door swing, and that space is added back into the pedestrian or cycle part of it, it would solve the space issues.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher responded that it is not removed; it is now in the dining portion space.

Mr. Peterson stated that he shares some of Vice Mayor Gerber's concerns. He would like to have input from the Commission on these revisions. He agrees with Mr. Reiner that the cycle track should be reinstated; he supports the broader outdoor area for seating and dining. However, he does not believe he is qualified to weigh in on all of this, based on the drawings presented. He would prefer that the Commission would have had the opportunity to review these details.
Ms. Grigsby stated that most of the changes made were based on the feedback in the Commission review process. Many staff meetings followed that review, and many options were considered for dividing the space to accommodate all of the needs – outdoor dining, cycle track, pedestrians. The cycle track and sidewalk will now be accommodated in the same area, and there will be a demarcation – perhaps granite or other material-- that indicates the bike area versus the pedestrian area. When bikes are in the area, there will be more space available to all users. The Commission will review the final development plan.
Vice Mayor Gerber reiterated that he does not understand how this process unfolded. Does the Bridge Street Code allow for modifications by Council without recommendation by the Commission?
Ms. Grigsby responded that in other preliminary plat processes outside of Bridge Street, they are typically done as consent agenda items. In many cases in the past, Council would make changes to the preliminary plat. Legally, she believes it is allowable for Council to make these changes under the Zoning Code as well as the Bridge Street portion of the Code.
Ms. Readler confirmed that the plat process was not altered with the Bridge Street Code. The Commission makes recommendations to Council, and Council has the latitude to vary from those recommendations.
Vice Mayor Gerber asked for confirmation that Council will review the final plat.

Ms. Readler responded affirmatively.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted she is excited that this is taking shape. She asked about the timeframe for the final development plan.
Ms. Husak stated that a special meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission is scheduled for October 21, 2014 to review Phase I of the development plan and the basic site plan for the first two blocks immediately adjacent to the section under discussion tonight.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated she supports the name "Bridge Park Avenue" for the street name.

Wallace Maurer, 7451 Dublin Road withdrew his request to speak. He will review the basics of the project online.

Nelson Yoder and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place North addressed Council.
Mr. Yoder noted that Mr. Hunter has been the Design Director for Crawford Hoying for 18 months. Mr. Yoder noted that he worked with Mr. Hunter for 8 years at a large architectural firm in Columbus. His experience includes Easton Town Center, Greene Town Center, and other master planning.
Mr. Hunter shared a presentation regarding the work he has done for this project, working through a higher level of detail with staff in response to the Commission's comments. Bridge Park is a mixed-use development, but at its core it will be a dining destination. The goal is for a first-class pedestrian experience in an urban environment. They looked at comparables throughout the Columbus area, including the height of buildings and street envelopes. He shared his findings with Council by displaying a number of pictures Council illustrating a variety of patio eating areas around the Columbus area to illustrate the range in sizes. He summarized that they believe what is proposed is a better solution for all of the reasons already outlined.

Council members thanked them for their input.

Mr. Reiner moved to approve the preliminary plat as submitted.
Ms. Salay seconded the motion.
Vice Mayor Gerber asked for clarification. Does "as submitted" mean what was submitted to Council over the weekend, or what was presented tonight?
Ms. Husak stated that the motion should reflect that the revised sections of the preliminary plat as presented tonight are being approved.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher moved approval of the preliminary plat for Bridge Park East with the revised design as presented this evening.
Mr. Peterson seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.
Vice Mayor Gerber noted his objection to the process.
Mayor Keenan stated that Council has worked hard to keep the process moving, and this advances the project forward.
Mr. Reiner noted his support is based on the inclusion of the cycle stripe.

Ms. Salay added that she supports the name "Bridge Park Avenue."

- Adoption of 2015 Council Regular Meeting schedule

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher moved approval of the proposed schedule.
Mayor Keenan suggested that a revision be made to the scheduled date of the first meeting of the 2015. It is proposed as Monday, January 12 – the date of the National

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

AUGUST 7, 2014

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

2. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project
14-070BPR/PP **Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road**
Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat

Proposal:	A request for preliminary review for seven new blocks for future development on approximately 30.9 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D) for a Basic Development Plan. This is also a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat Review under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.
Applicant:	Nelson Yoder, Principal, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4656; rray@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #1: Mr. Taylor moved, Ms. Kramb seconded, to recommend **approval** of the following Development Plan Waivers:

1) Maximum Block Size (Block 'D') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a): To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block 'D' (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±594 feet on the west and 607 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,886 feet).

2) Maximum Block Size (Block 'H') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a): To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block 'H' (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±630 feet on the west and 686 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,945 feet).

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Development Plan Waivers were **approved**.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes

2. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project
14-070BPR/PP **Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road**
Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat

MOTION #2: Mr. Hardt moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend **approval** of the Basic Development Plan with the following ten conditions:

1) City Council approval of the area rezoning to the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District;
2) That the applicant selects building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
3) That the applicant works with the City to establish a Development Agreement for this project;
4) That the applicant dedicates the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
5) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering details as part of the Development Plan Review;
6) That the applicant coordinate with the City and Washington Township Fire Department to ensure fire accessibility throughout the site as part of the Development Plan Review;
7) That the applicant work with the City to plan for future transit stop locations for appropriate areas of this development;
8) That the applicant provide the remaining one-foot (for a total of 12 feet) clear sidewalk area as part of the public streetscape along appropriate portions of the Shopping Corridor;
9) That the applicant describe the intent for the required BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review; and
10) That the applicant provide an outline of the details for each open space type, including the intended uses, exact acreages required and provided, and general program, at the Development Plan Review, with determinations as part of the Site Plan Review.

* Mr. Nelson Yoder agreed to the above ten conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The application for Basic Development Plan with ten conditions was **approved.**

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes

MOTION #3: Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend **approval** of the following Preliminary Plat with six conditions:

1) The modifications to the street sections described in this report are incorporated in the plan as part of the Development Plan Review;
2) That the proposed utility easements be provided on the Preliminary Plat prior to review by City Council;

2. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project
14-070BPR/PP **Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road**
Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat

3) That the applicant dedicates the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
4) City Council approval of the Plat modification of the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent;
5) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to City Council submittal; and
6) That the City and COTA resolve the issues associated with the acquisition and relocation of the Dale Drive Park and Ride facility before the Final Plat is recorded.

* Mr. Nelson Yoder agreed to the above six conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Preliminary Plat with six conditions was **approved** to be forwarded to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes

MOTION #4: Mr. Hardt moved, Mr. Taylor seconded, to require the Development Plan Review by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Planning and Zoning Commission will be the Required Reviewing Body.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.Dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 7, 2014

AGENDA

1. Avondale Woods **Avery Road**
12-084Z/PDP/PP **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)**
Preliminary Plat (Approved 7 – 0)

2. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project
Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road
14-070BPR/PP **Basic Plan Review (Approved 7 – 0)**
Preliminary Plat (Approved 7 – 0)

3. Perimeter Center, Subarea C – The Spa at River Ridge **5555 Wall Street**
14-072AFDP/CU **Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)**
Conditional Use (Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair, Chris Amorose Groomes, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Victoria Newell, Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, John Hardt, Amy Salay, and Todd Zimmerman. City representatives present were Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Jennifer Readler, Alan Perkins, Claudia Husak, Rachel Ray, Joanne Shelly, Devayani Puranik, Dana McDaniel, Paul Hammersmith, Terry Foegler, Logan Stang, Andrew Crozier, Nikki Martin, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote
Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote
Ms. Kramb moved, Ms. Newell seconded, to accept the June 19, 2014, meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Salay, abstain; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes. (Approved 6 – 0 –1)

Motion and Vote
Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to accept the July 10, 2014, meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there were two cases on the consent agenda, Spa River Ridge and Avondale Woods but both Ms. Kramb and Mr. Zimmerman had questions on the Avondale Woods case so it was pulled. The Chair determined the cases would be heard in the following order: Spa at River Ridge,

Avondale Woods, and Bridge Park East. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.]

1. Avondale Woods **Avery Road**
12-084Z/PDP/PP **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat**

The Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for a new residential subdivision with a maximum of 360 single and multiple family units on 120 acres on the west side of Avery Road, south of the intersection with Rings Road. She said the Commission will forward the recommendation on this to City Council. She said two motions are required: 1) Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan; and 2) Preliminary Plat. She asked the two members that had questions if they needed a presentation. Ms. Kramb and Mr. Zimmerman both said they did not need a presentation as they just had a series of questions for clarification. The Chair asked if anyone else needed to see a presentation. [There were none.]

Amy Kramb inquired about the fence height. She said she could not find any reference to a fence in the development text but in the Planning Report there is a six-foot fence mentioned for along the railroad tracks.

Claudia Husak said it can be found in the buffering landscaping section.

Ms. Kramb said it mentions six feet of "screening" that can include a fence but it does not mention the height of the fence. It was stated that since there is no mention of a maximum height for a fence, a discussion ensued among the members and staff that included all the different fences and buffering in the different areas of this site.

Ms. Kramb also inquired about the development text that allows for entry signs at every subarea but it does not specify the number or size of signs.

Ms. Kramb said there was no mention anywhere about tree replacements and asked if Code was just being followed to which Ms. Husak agreed.

Ms. Kramb said because this is going to be in phases, and Scarlet Lane is stopping to the north and to the west, she is curious as to how those roadway ends would be treated.

Todd Zimmerman referred to page 11 of the Planning Report. He questioned the limit of 185 units when the road network is in place.

Ms. Husak said there was a phasing plan on page 12 in the development text and Phase 1 was identified as the attached residential just north of the entrance. She said Phase 2 is the single-family lots around the central green. She thought that the 185 were all single-family units and this multi-family.

Mr. Zimmerman referred to Subarea B and asked how many one-car garages are in the plans.

Ms. Husak said she did not have that information at this time. She said the development text requires two-car garages for all of the three-bedroom units but how that is mixed up is not known.

Mr. Zimmerman inquired about the windows to carry a grid pattern throughout and wanted to make sure it was for all four sides of the single-family units and not just the front.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the applicant to approach the podium and begin by stating their name and address for the record.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, New Albany, Ohio, 43054, said she wanted to split the four issues mentioned: fencing, entry signs, tree replacement, and street phasing. She wants to talk through the fencing to get a consensus. She said they are going to do tree replacement. She asked if the street phasing was answered.

Ms. Kramb said she got the phasing and was more curious about the termination treatment but understands that will come up at the Final Development Plan (FDP).

Ms. Menerey asked if it was ok that it was decided at FDP and Ms. Kramb said she was comfortable with that.

Ms. Menerey confirmed there is a mix of garages and encouraged Mr. Zimmerman to look at the plan. She said their client, Jim Lipnos has agreed with the window grid pattern on all four sides.

Ms. Menerey asked to discuss the fencing issue. She asked if the Commission was ok with mounding/fencing of a minimum of 6 feet and maximum of 8 feet, the applicant was in agreement with that. She offered this be left for the FDP.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested this be decided later.

Victoria Newell suggested adding one line that states the fence as an individual component cannot exceed a height of six feet to which everyone agreed to the solution.

Mr. Zimmerman asked who was responsible for the maintenance of the fence.

Ms. Menerey said it was the applicant.

Chris Cline, applicant, said they are comfortable with the Commission passing on this until the FDP but would like flexibility to do a good quality job.

Ms. Amorose Groomes concluded that the Commission would like to see the whole plan at the Final Development Plan and asked if Ms. Husak could write the conditions based on their discussion.

Ms. Kramb inquired about patios and where they could possibly be placed.

Ms. Menerey said this goes back to the 2010 – 2012 period when they finally got some footprints in front of the Commission. She said those units are double-sided. She said as seen on the site plan, they feel like a two-sided unit and explained further what she meant. She said the front is not intended to have a six-foot fence but a four or six foot fence could go on the back for a little privacy.

Ms. Kramb noted that when driving by, all that would be seen are the garages and privacy fences.

Ms. Menerey asked the Commission if they would prefer a four-foot fence be stipulated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that before they are willing to issue the ability for fences, they want a lot more detail and again is in favor of deciding at the FDP to which Ms. Menerey agreed that a condition should be written to state that.

Ms. Husak summarized that the condition should state that any kind of exterior amenities, including patios and fences, will be part of the Final Development Plan to which everyone agreed.

Ms. Menerey referred back to the entry feature issue.

Ms. Kramb thought there should be a limit to the size and numbers of these entry features.

John Hardt thought it would fall under the same conversation as the site amenity statement.

Mr. Cline said their intent was not a large intrusive sign but one that tastefully identified the neighborhoods.

Amy Salay suggested something should be written so that any materials used must be of natural quality to endure the elements and not burden the neighborhoods with all the open space they will need to maintain.

Both Ms. Kramb and Mr. Zimmerman stated all their questions were answered satisfactorily.

Ms. Salay asked what parts of this development are going to be maintained and deeded to the City as public parkland and what is going to be private.

Mr. Cline said there is a table in the text that spells out who owns what and who maintains everything.

Ms. Salay said there are very few homes that are required to maintain a large amount of open space in a couple different areas of our community. She said when things are decided at Commission, they do not know how it will all shake out and how much it will cost to maintain this private open space. She said neighborhoods find themselves burdened with high fees and struggle to maintain these areas. She thought the way it is written opens it up to too much interpretation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred to the table and stated which areas were owned by the City but the maintenance on the various areas differed.

Ms. Salay maintained it could still be problematic. She asked if Mr. Hahn, of Parks and Open Space, could consider what the City is going to be doing and what it is the private sector is supposed to be doing so that it could be spelled out - how areas are to be maintained and if it would come back to Council.

Ms. Husak said Mr. Hahn did send a mark-up map to staff that was forwarded to the applicant.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any further questions or concerns from the Commission. [There were none.] She asked the public to speak with respect to this application. [Hearing none.] She asked Ms. Husak to reveal the conditions.

Ms. Husak said there would be two motions: 1) Rezoning and the Preliminary Development Plan; and 2) Preliminary Plat. She said for the first motion there were 10 conditions and noted the first 8 on a slide with no changes. She said conditions 9 and 10 were retained from the Planning Report. She said conditions 11 through 15 were added per the discussion:

11) That the development text be revised to require a divided light grid pattern for all windows on all four sides of the buildings of all subareas;
12) That the development text be revised to limit the height of a fence if used as part of the landscape buffer to six feet;
13) That the western buffer along Subarea A not be permitted to include a fence;
14) That all details for outdoor amenities including decks, patios, and or fences for the multiple family units be included for approval at the Final Development Plan stage; and that the development text be revised to reflect this requirement; and
15) That the entry feature details be submitted for approval at the Final Development Plan stage for each section and also that the development text be revised.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if he agreed to those 15 conditions as amended.

Mr. Cline agreed.

Motion and Vote
Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to recommend approval of the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan with 15 conditions:

1) That the development text be revised to eliminate a fence as an option to indicate demarcations between open spaces and rear lot lines and require their approval at the Final Development Plan stage;
2) That the development text be revised to address unit separation and require a minimum distance between units of at least 12 feet required for all multiple-family subareas;
3) That the front setbacks for Lots 37 through 40 to be separately addressed in the development text;
4) That the development text be revised to require front-loaded garages to be located behind the front façade of the home;
5) That the applicant continues working with Engineering on the roundabout design details in Subarea D, prior to submitting for a Final Development Plan;
6) That the applicant works with staff to further review the proposed street names for the development;
7) That Lot 58 be eliminated from the proposal;
8) That the development text be revised to eliminate vinyl as a permitted primary building material;
9) That the roundabout center and splitter islands be included as HOA maintained reserves on a plat; and
10) That the applicant enters into an infrastructure agreement with the City, prior to submitting the first Final Development Plan, for the development thresholds and public project contributions and that the infrastructure agreement details be referenced in the development text.
11) That the development text be revised to require a divided light grid pattern for all windows on all four sides of the buildings of all subareas;
12) That the development text be revised to limit the height of a fence if used as part of the landscape buffer to six feet;
13) That the western buffer along Subarea A not be permitted to include a fence;
14) That all details for outdoor amenities including decks, patios, and or fences for the multiple family units be included for approval at the Final Development Plan stage; and that the development text be revised to reflect this requirement; and
15) That the entry feature details be submitted for approval at the Final Development Plan stage for each section and also that the development text be revised.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote
Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the following Preliminary Plat with one condition:

1) That the plat be revised to include the roundabout center and splitter islands as reserves and a table listing each reserve size and intended maintenance responsibility.

Mr. Cline agreed to the condition as written in the staff report.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

2. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project
Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road
14-070BPR/PP **Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for a preliminary review for seven new blocks for future development on approximately 30.9 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Rachel Ray presented the aerial photo that shows the site, which is on the east side of the 'to be relocated' Riverside Drive, south of the 'now under construction' John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive and the connector roadway to Dale Drive, and north of W. Dublin-Granville Road.

Ms. Ray said given this project's size and complexity, there are a number of aspects related to this project and the properties involved that will be addressed as part of the upcoming development agreement. She said resolution is expected before all final development approvals can be secured. She said one of the elements related to the real estate matters associated with this project relates to the existing COTA Park and Ride site on the north side of Dale Drive. Given the future roadways planned in this area, she said the City has taken the lead to work out an agreement with COTA on the land development and also identify potential locations for an alternative facility that would maintain consistent services for their ridership. Ms. Ray said the applicant for the Bridge Park project erroneously submitted an application form that suggested they had authorization to file an application on behalf of COTA. She said Staff is making it clear on the website that COTA is not a party to this application. However, she said COTA is involved in separate discussions with the City on development-related matters.

Ms. Ray said Dublin City Council has not approved a development agreement for this site, though it is in the works. She said Staff is working with the developers as well as the property owners adjacent to this site and finalizing the development agreement is a condition of approval recommended by Planning.

Ms. Ray gave a brief overview of her presentation. First, she said she will provide a background on the development context and everything that has happened regarding this site, leading up to the case that is before the Commission this evening. She said she would also provide an overview of the review and approval process and what the Commission can expect to see with future applications. She said she would next provide an overview of the applications that are before the Commission this evening, which include the Basic Development Plan, as well as the Preliminary Plat. Then, she said she would provide a brief overview of the recommendations that the ART has made to the Commission, followed by the summary of the recommendations that are made. She reported a total of four motions will be required.

Ms. Ray said the first step in the process is a City-sponsored Zoning Code Amendment and Area Rezoning of land that includes the project area. She said previously, the project area was a series of separate parcels with three different zoning district classifications that are now going to be included in a single neighborhood zoning district designation. She presented the project area outlined in red in the proposed zoning map as well as the proposed neighborhood district graphic that is associated with the Zoning Code Amendment. She reported on July 10, 2014 the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval to City Council for both the Area Rezoning as well as the Zoning Code Amendment. She said both items are scheduled for a first reading by City Council on August 11, 2014. She stated another one of the conditions on tonight's application is subject to Council's approval of the zoning actions related to this area.

Ms. Ray said in terms of process, the purpose of this application for Basic Development Plan Review is to evaluate, at a conceptual level, the cohesiveness of the framework that will enable the Bridge Park East

mixed-use development. She stated the application includes an analysis of the project based on the Principles of Walkable Urbanism and the Community Plan's (Bridge Street District Area Plan) objectives for this area. She said the development framework included with the Basic Development Plan sets the tone for the public realm, which is comprised of the street network and block layout. She said the Development Plan also establishes lots and parcels for development. She reported the applicant has begun to conduct a preliminary analysis of the applicable placemaking foundations described in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood zoning district requirements. She emphasized this application is not intended to provide a determination on all project details associated with the public or private realm; further details will be determined at the Development Plan Review, Basic Site Plan/Site Plan Reviews, and Final Plat stages.

Ms. Ray explained the next step following this application is the Development Plan Review to determine the detailed elements of the public realm, which Staff expects to generally correspond with the timing of the Final Plat (first section). She said Preliminary and Final Plats require review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission as well as City Council.

Ms. Ray said the applicant may then proceed with filing an application for Basic Site Plan Review, which is a higher level, conceptual look at the above-ground elements of the project: the buildings, site, landscape, parking, signs, and architecture. She said the last step prior to building permitting is the Site Plan Review, which is a highly detailed review of all those above ground elements just mentioned.
Ms. Ray began presenting an overview of the proposed Basic Development Plan (BDP) that includes:

- A grid street network;
- Seven development blocks (Blocks A, B, C, D, F, G, H) subdivided by private access drives and mid-block pedestrianways (Block 'E' is the designation currently applied to land north of John Shields Parkway, east of Riverside Drive, and is not included with this application);
- Three new public streets (Broadstone Avenue – *referred to Park Avenue in the past*, Tuller Ridge Drive, Mooney Street);
- A future mixed-use shopping corridor designated along portions of Broadstone Avenue and Riverside Drive; and
- A Preliminary Plat for the project site that includes the reconfiguration of rights-of-way for John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive and the necessary vacation and reconfiguration of the right-of-way for the east/west portion of Dale Drive.

Ms. Ray stated that potential street names have been applied to all proposed streets; final street names will be determined prior to City Council review of the Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Ray said the Code analysis for the BDP centers on three main sections in the BSD zoning regulations, the first of which being Code Section 153.060, the <u>Lots and Blocks</u> requirements. She explained this section includes maximum dimensional requirements for block size, requirements for access, and mid-block pedestrianways. She explained that five of the blocks meet the block size requirement – not exceeding 500 feet on any one side, nor the entire perimeter exceeding 1,750 feet. However, she said two of the blocks on the north side of the project area *do* exceed that requirement; therefore, Waivers are required. She indicated the intent of the maximum block length provisions is to prevent the creation of 'superblocks' to adequately distribute traffic and provide pedestrian permeability through the development. She explained that because the development does include the series of private drives, block size is measured from right-of-way to right-of-way and because the private drives break up the blocks, Planning believes the intent of the requirement is met. She summarized, for the two Waivers requested for those two blocks, approval is recommended. She said the proposed 80-foot greenway along the south side of the John Shields Parkway right-of-way also adds to the length of the blocks, creating a special circumstance.

John Hardt inquired about the revised Code language for this new BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District that the Commission voted on several weeks ago that included a provision that said if there is a private

street going through a block that is constructed, then it should be used to measure block size. He asked if they are being asked to consider these Waivers simply because the new regulations are not yet applicable.

Ms. Ray said that the Code provision that Mr. Hardt is referencing was intended to apply only to the block adjacent to the roundabout.

Mr. Hardt noted the specific paragraph that addresses the block on the roundabout and noted a separate paragraph that says "…for the purposes of measuring block length, the limits of private street sections designed and constructed to public street standards in the final development plan shall be used in lieu of right-of-way" – under the whole subheading of calculating block length. He said he wanted to understand why they were approaching things the way they are. In his opinion, he said if that language were enforced today, it would effectively result in those private streets dividing the blocks that currently exceed the requirements, and a Waiver would be unnecessary.

Ms. Ray said she would check the language, but ultimately, the block size is something Staff supports. Ms. Ray presented a graphic that showed mid-block pedestrianways that would be provided through the blocks that require them due to their lengths exceeding 400 feet.

Ms. Ray said the second main section of the BSD Code analysis is Code Section 153.061, Street Types. She presented an illustration of the street families and bicycle facilities. She explained that many of the elements of the street network map depicted in the Code were incorporated into the Thoroughfare Plan, which was updated last summer. She pointed out the regional roadways indicated on the map with the expectation that as development occurs, the neighborhood streets would fill in consistent with the Lot and Block requirements and Street Type requirements of the Code. She pointed out the proposed District Connector streets, which are also principle frontage streets (the "front doors" of the project) as well as the Neighborhood Streets. Again, she said this project involves a combination of a public and private street system. She stated the existing streets bordering this development will not be dedicated as part of this project but will include minor right-of-way adjustments, lot line adjustments, and other adjustments to better coordinate with the project, now that a preliminary design has been established. She explained that includes Riverside Drive, John Shields Parkway, and the Dale/Tuller connector. She added many of the neighborhood streets shown on the plans are going to be privately owned with public access easements. She said several of the streets are going to be constructed over below-grade parking, which she pointed out on the slide. She said the intent for the private drives is that they are to be constructed as a seamless extension of the public street network. The pedestrians, she said, should not notice a difference between the public and private streets. She said long-term maintenance, serviceability, and access elements will be addressed through the Development Agreement. She indicated that Planning recommends the Reserve 'I' private drive is dedicated as public right-of-way to accommodate fire access for that portion of the site.

Ms. Ray noted the Bicycle Facilities. She referred to the cycletrack network map that was presented to City Council as part of their recent streetscape discussions and pointed out the typical section for Broadstone Avenue. She asked the Commission to focus on the one-way, five-foot-wide cycletrack proposed on each side of the street to connect into the regional network. She said as this bicycle facility transitions over to Riverside Drive, it turns into one, two-way, eight-foot-wide cycletrack. She said they expect there to be bicycle facilities in the park as well but as far as the cycletrack goes, it is a continuation of the network that will be provided along this side of Riverside Drive, adjacent to the project, leading up to John Shields Parkway.

Ms. Ray said another aspect of the street network is to identify potential locations for transit stops and other related infrastructure as the development progresses, and Planning has added a condition that the applicant continue to work with the City and other interested parties.

Ms. Ray said the third and final section of the BSD Code analysis for Basic Development Plan Review is Code Section 153.063, the Neighborhood District Standards. She said consideration of this section includes placemaking elements such as the shopping corridor, the pedestrian-oriented streetscape, street terminations of the terminal vistas, as well as gateways, and in the future, sign plans and the distribution of open space. She presented a conceptual graphic that the applicant prepared to start thinking about how the private development is going to interface with the public realm but said the applicant would want to speak to this more in their presentation. She focused on the shopping corridors from her slides that showed portions of "Broadstone Avenue" and Riverside Drive. She said the Neighborhood Standards require a minimum of 12 feet of clear sidewalk area, so between the six-foot-wide sidewalk and the five-foot-wide cycletrack area, that totals 11 feet provided within the right-of-way. Therefore, she said the applicant would need to provide one additional foot within the Required Building Zone area, outside of the right-of-way. Again, she expects this to be heavily coordinated with the location of public open spaces with the pocket plazas as well as the private open spaces such as seating areas, restaurant patios, etc.

Amy Kramb inquired about the rendering provided in the Commission's packet. She requested confirmation that any portion of the building footprints and uses shown on the left-hand side of the rendering (toward the northern portion of the project) is conceptual and not before the Commission for a decision on the uses and layout. Ms. Ray said that was indeed correct; the focus is on the public realm and street network.

Ms. Ray explained the Preliminary Plat portion of the project. She said this development involves the subdivision of land as multiple parcels/lots and blocks for development, in addition to: the dedication of rights-of-way; reconfiguration of lot lines; the vacation of right-of-way of the east/west portion of Dale Drive; and establishes the reserves for private drives. She said the Preliminary Plat includes this information in addition to a preliminary Master Utility Plan and Tree Survey. She said the Preliminary Plat incorporates typical street sections coordinated with the City.

Ms. Ray explained that *Broadstone Avenue* is the east-west District Connector intended to provide a future road connection from Sawmill Road to Riverside Drive. She said the road currently connects Shamrock Boulevard and Sawmill Road at existing Village Parkway. She said the proposed 76-foot street section includes:

- two 11-foot travel lanes;
- eight-foot parallel parking spaces on both sides of the street;
- three-foot carriage walks;
- five-foot planter zone;
- five-foot cycletrack; and
- six-foot sidewalks.

Ms. Ray said *Tuller Ride Drive* is a Neighborhood Street that runs east/west and connects the existing realigned Tuller Ridge Drive (realigned as part of the Dale/Tuller connector road project currently advancing toward construction) with Riverside Drive.

Ms. Ray stated that Mooney Street is the Neighborhood Street that runs north/south and connects the existing, dedicated Mooney Street north of John Shields Parkway, south through the Bridge Park East development to the future Banker Drive extension. She explained the 65-foot right-of-way for both streets (Tuller Ridge and Mooney) accommodates all required streetscape elements, including private access drives, which are 22 feet in width that will provide vehicular and pedestrian access through the site and are designed with:

- two 11-foot travel lanes
- eight-foot parallel parking spaces;
- two and a half-foot carriage walks;

- five-foot planter areas; and
- six-foot sidewalks.

Ms. Ray presented a slide that illustrated how these would be constructed over parking structures in some areas.

Ms. Ray said on July 31, 2014, the ART made their recommendations to the Commission on this application and reiterated to the applicant that following the Commission's review and feedback on the Basic Development Plan this evening, Staff's intent is to dig down deeper into the details of the physical aspects of the project as well as working toward resolution on the Development Agreement and related issues. In particular, she said, one aspect relates to the open spaces. Ms. Ray noted that the applicant has begun to share concepts that demonstrate a variety of open spaces, many of which are in the form of high quality, **private** open spaces such as rooftop terraces and gathering spaces. She said clearly this project will create a need for other **public** open spaces as well. Therefore, she said the applicant will need to continue to work with the City to identify and provide that required open space within the walkable distance requirements of the Code, consistent with the open space character and network consideration described in the Neighborhood Standards section.

Ms. Ray said the City will need to work with the applicant to integrate measures for stormwater quality management into the project as well. She said that the Fire Department is requiring a portion of area noted as a private drive to be public, and will also need to coordinate with the applicant on the design of the garages to ensure their ability to support fire apparatus.

Ms. Ray said the Building Department has encouraged the applicant to start thinking about building services including loading and trash collection as early as possible to ensure that they are well incorporated into the plans, given the tightness of the urban environment.

Ms. Ray summarized that four actions are required of the Commission at this meeting tonight, three of which include recommendations from the ART:

1) **Development Plan Waiver Review –** 2 Waivers
   ART Recommendation of Approval
2) **Basic Development Plan Review**, based on the review criteria of §153.066(D)(3) for Development Plan Review
   ART Recommendation of Approval with Conditions
3) **Preliminary Plat Review**
   ART Recommendation of Approval with Conditions
4) **Required Reviewing Body Determination** for Development Plan Reviews

Ms. Ray said two of the blocks exceed the maximum block size requirements of Code, principally due to the location of the John Shields Parkway greenway and the configuration of the adjacent roadways. She reported that the ART has found that all the required criteria have been met, as well as the intent of the regulation, and therefore approval of the two Waivers is recommended.

Ms. Ray stated that, in terms of the second recommendation, the Basic Development Plan Review requires a determination from the Commission within 28 days from the date of submission of a complete application. She demonstrated on a slide how all the criteria for the Basic Development Plan Review had been met or met with conditions. Ms. Ray listed the 10 conditions:

1) City Council approval of the area rezoning to the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District;
2) That the applicant selects building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
3) That the applicant works with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;

4) That the applicant dedicates the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
5) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering details as part of the Development Plan Review;
6) That the applicant coordinate with the City and Washington Township Fire Department to ensure fire accessibility throughout the site as part of the Development Plan Review;
7) That the applicant work with the City to plan for future transit stop locations for appropriate areas of this development;
8) That the applicant provide the remaining one-foot (for a total of 12 feet) clear sidewalk area as part of the public streetscape along appropriate portions of the Shopping Corridor;
9) That the applicant describe the intent for the required BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review; and
10) That the applicant provide an outline of the details for each open space type, including the intended users, exact acreages required and provided, and general program, at the Development Plan Review, with determinations as part of the Site Plan Review.

Ms. Ray noted a few of the recommended conditions are details to correct notes on the plans, such as the selection of permitted building types; while others are reminders for the applicant on the items for which a much greater level of detail will be expected as part of the Development Plan Review, such as open space, gateway treatments, and public improvement details.

Ms. Ray said for the third Commission action, approval is recommended to City Council with six conditions, including an additional condition added since speaking with COTA over the past few days, that was shared with the applicant prior to this meeting. She said the six conditions are as follows:

1) That the modifications to the street sections described in this report are incorporated in the plan as part of the Development Plan Review;
2) That the proposed utility easements be provided on the Preliminary Plat prior to review by City Council;
3) That the applicant dedicates the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
4) City Council approval of the Plat modification of the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent;
5) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to City Council submittal; and
6) That the City and COTA resolve the issues associated with the acquisition and relocation of the Dale Drive Park and Ride facility before the Final Plat is recorded.

Ms. Ray said the other conditions are technical in nature and require any minor corrections to be made prior to review by City Council. Condition four relates to the manner in which street rights-of-way are drawn at corners – that the intersections occur with a 90-degree angle instead of a "chamfered" corner as required by the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray concluded that the Commission shall also make a motion to require Development Plan Review, the next step in the process, by either the PZC or the ART as the reviewing body, with consideration of the factors listed on the screen.

Ms. Ray reiterated that the street network, block framework, site, building, and open space designs for the Bridge Park East mixed-use development *must* serve as examples of desirable BSD development, and this can only be accomplished through exacting attention to detail, thorough and well-coordinated planning, and adherence to applicable Code requirements. She said Staff is happy to work with the applicant weekly, if not on a daily basis in many instances to work through a lot of details that she

highlighted for the Commission this evening. She asked the Commission to think about this application as the first of a series of opportunities to continuously refine the project to ensure that the result is a distinctive, high-quality mixed-use urban neighborhood with a sense of community that will stand the test of time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant to step forward and state their name and address for the record.

Nelson Yoder, 555 Metro Place North, Dublin, Ohio, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, thanked the Commission for having them back this evening. He said this is just the first step of many – which can be frustrating to those of us that are eager to get into the meat of the exacting of detail that Ms. Ray mentioned, which is what they are focused on each and every day and are looking forward to sharing with the Commission. He reiterated that tonight is about the "big picture" and location of streets and welcomes feedback from the Commission. He apologized to COTA for misrepresenting the zoning application. Mr. Yoder said they understood all along that COTA and the City of Dublin were involved in negotiations. He apologized for the record for the oversight.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment.

Laura Comek, attorney for COTA, 500 W. Broad St., Columbus, Ohio, 43215, thanked the Commission for the time and consideration. She said this process is moving at a great speed and without certain details that COTA as a political subdivision, as an ongoing prior business still needed to work through. She thanked Jennifer Readler and the City's administration for working with them and requested the COTA property to be taken out of any plan approval and COTA removed as an applicant. She said they are working with the City on future plans and what they can do to facilitate transit service in this area.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission looks forward to COTA helping their community and finding a great place to service the residents.

Mr. Yoder added that Crawford Hoying really embraces the idea that COTA provide service for the project and sees them as potentially being an integral part of the project.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if anyone else wanted to speak with regards to this application. [Hearing none.]

Amy Kramb confirmed that the street sections were consistent with what had been reviewed by City Council back in June. Ms. Ray agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested starting with the <u>Development Plan Waivers</u>.

Ms. Ray took the opportunity to address Mr. Hardt's question from earlier. She stated that she had reviewed the Code section he had referred to. She explained there is a specific section related to block access and street layout with three subsections beneath that, one of which relates to the frontage along Riverside Drive that mentions what Mr. Hardt was referring to, how private drives can serve as the public right-of-way, essentially. She said there is another one that states for the purposes of measuring block length, the limits of private streets sections designed and constructed to public standards and approved with the Development Plan shall be used in lieu of right-of-way. She explained she interpreted these sections more conservatively, that the first one she read did not apply to the blocks to the north, but said it could be read as not necessarily being required. She stated for the purposes of clarity, Planning preferred to review it as a Waiver.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited comments about these two Waivers as requested. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion, Ms. Kramb seconded, to approve the following Development Plan Waivers:

1) Maximum Block Size (Block 'D') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a): To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block 'D' (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±594 feet on the west and 607 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,886 feet).

2) Maximum Block Size (Block 'H') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a): To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block 'H' (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±630 feet on the west and 686 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,945 feet).

The vote was as follows: Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the next motion was for the Basic Development Plan with ten conditions and asked the Commission if they had any questions or comments.

Ms. Kramb inquired about Mooney Street because of its termination at the south end of this project, which is not included as part of the Basic Development Plan Review. She asked if Mooney Street was eventually being extended to the south.

Ms. Ray stated that the first section of Mooney Street is being constructed as part of the Vrable skilled nursing project. She pointed out that the road would continue south through the project to "Reserve I," which Staff recommended be made a public roadway – the extension of Banker Drive. Ms. Ray explained that the east/west portion of Banker Drive between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street would continue to be a private access drive because it will be constructed over a parking structure.

Ms. Kramb confirmed that Mooney Street would end at Banker Drive, and asked how the transition to the block adjacent to the roundabout would look.

Ms. Ray said that is a development detail that will need to be worked out but it would not be an abrupt transition. She said as part of the Development Plan and Final Plat, Planning will look at phasing to make sure that the road terminates in a logical location with an appropriate transition.

Ms. Kramb asked about the "little Y" section shown on Block B on the plans, and Ms. Ray identified it as a mid-block pedestrianway. Ms. Kramb confirmed that they are not being asked to approve exact locations of all the little alleys. Ms. Ray said that was correct; the locations and dimensions may change slightly as the plans advance further to the Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews.

Richard Taylor said that while the Waivers seemed to be within the spirit and intent of the Code regulations, he said he was concerned with the street sections that state the sidewalk varies as far as the distance from the sidewalk to the building front. He said he was less concerned about that situation on the private streets and more concerned about that on Riverside Drive and Broadstone Avenue. He said the travel lanes are great, the parallel parking lanes are great, he understood the carriage walk and the planting zone, and he understood that there would be a cycletrack and a sidewalk for which that is designed to feel like one big sidewalk that bikes will happen to use a part of it. But from the edge of the six-foot sidewalk to the building front, he said the Commission had always imagined having a lot of outdoor amenities. He asked what is going to happen in that space, and what kind of process is being used to decide how far back the buildings are going to be pushed.

Mr. Yoder responded that the developers had been envisioning some of what was being shown on the street sections such as outdoor dining at strategic locations all along the corridor, trying to prepare for flexibility to accommodate tenants from day one, but also those that may come along later. He explained that was their overall detailed look at the buildings and how they interface with the streets. Once these lines are fixed, he said they will work to accommodate between the proposed buildings and the edge of that right-of-way the ability to have outdoor seating.

Mr. Taylor asked which lines are fixed. Mr. Yoder answered both the locations of the rights-of-way and the building faces.

Mr. Taylor said he was fine with everything between the right-of-way lines; he is concerned with what happens beyond the right-of-way.

Mr. Yoder said they would like to accommodate a double row of seating for a full service restaurant location, and most full-service restaurants will end up needing enclosures such as guardrails or fencing around these seating areas. To accomplish all these things, he said the 12-foot open walkway, the railing required, and then seating, is part of the detailed review they are going through right now. He explained they are going through a leasing plan, working internally and with Staff, and will be presenting to the Commission where along Broadstone Avenue, and some of these other streets, that are appropriate places now or potentially in the future to function as outdoor seating areas. He said there will also be entries for storefronts providing a little bit of relief along the streetscape. He said some areas could be inside/outside space using roll-up doors so there is a mixture of some spaces truly out on the sidewalk. He recommended a variety for the energy and excitement. He explained, as they develop the final leasing plan, the developer will have some areas that can serve as locations for benches and relief for other little pocket plazas along the streetscape. Mr. Yoder said streetscapes have been a big part of the last few weeks of work they have been focusing on internally as well as with Staff to define a network of open spaces. He stated that the public realm the developers are creating between the building faces on Broadstone is really going to make or break the development.

Mr. Taylor said, what Mr. Yoder just said implies that along Broadstone, some buildings might be closer to the right-of-way and some might be farther away. He asked if the buildings will be easily convertible to other uses. He said you might have something different than what you initially planned as a restaurant. Mr. Yoder said that was true.

Mr. Taylor asked if it would make more sense to establish a distance and set the buildings all at least that far back and that would represent enough distance to accommodate any future outdoor amenities.

Mr. Yoder said part of that future flexibility can play into the partial inside/outside spaces; if a tenant happened to move into an area that did not have as much area out in front of the door, those are spaces that can help dictate the design of that space and that will create natural variety along that streetscape as well. He said there will not be a wall of buildings that are completely consistent. He said they have opened up the aperture of the bottom of the hill so a lot of what is being shown varies that when you are coming down Broadstone from the east and you approach the river, the buildings are opened up a little bit to provide more open space at that location to accommodate more outdoor seating and public gathering spaces.

Mr. Taylor said that will probably be the thing he is most interested in seeing as the developer brings buildings forward. He said he now sees a tighter realm than he had imagined.

Mr. Taylor said there was a specific distance shown on section C at Riverside Drive at just under 10 feet beyond the cycletrack. He stated that he expects this area to be the most visible part of the development, directly across from the park, and if there is traffic on the street, this is going to be where a lot of action happens. He said that 10 feet beyond the cycletrack to accommodate the sidewalk right up

to the building front does not seem like nearly enough space to allow for the kind of activity he imagines might happen there.

Mr. Yoder said where the right-of-way can happen or that additional space can happen that comes out of where the buildings are located relative to the right-of-way, first of all.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the building had to be located immediately adjacent to the right-of-way.

Mr. Yoder said the building location can vary, and referred to the cycletrack and planters. He said they have been discussing this internally and with Staff to make sure there is enough space between where the new buildings want to be relative to the park and where all the activity is happening.

Mr. Taylor said, in urban areas, people like to walk across the face of buildings like that, look in the windows in a much more urban setting. He said he was concerned about allowing plenty of room there, and didn't want it to become a bottleneck. He said again, he will be anxious to see what the developer comes up with for that location.

Mr. Taylor said the beauty of the building construction is that the first few floors will be easy to redo if and when a tenant wants a different use in that space, and that is what the Commission asked for when they specifically asked for a walkable urban environment.

Mr. Taylor said he sees wonderful street trees but asked if there will be street lighting and other street elements and asked where they would go, because those things can clog up sidewalks really quickly.

Ms. Ray said those elements are part of the streetscape planning that Staff has been involved with and shared with City Council a few weeks ago. She explained that would be in the same planting zone as the trees, so there would be tree, light fixture, other types of street furnishings like trash receptacles, benches, etc. in that same zone.

Mr. Taylor noted that transit stops, if not designed appropriately, have a tendency to be fairly awful. He said they are constructed with storefront aluminum framing and Plexiglas, and benches, with hand-bills posted on them. He asked if there are going to be transit stops that are going to be covered, he recommended that those be well designed and look special as opposed to just letting COTA come in and drop in their off-the-shelf version.

Amy Salay said her sense would be that the City would be participating in those discussions and they would expect to see very attractive transit stops.

Ms. Salay said Ms. Ray had mentioned in her presentation the need for another foot of sidewalk area on Broadstone Avenue and asked her to clarify.

Ms. Ray stated that the Code requirement for the shopping corridor is a 12-foot-wide clear area. She said currently it includes the five-foot cycletrack and six-foot sidewalk that equals only 11 feet of clear area. Ms. Ray said their expectation of the use of the cycletrack is that it will be used intermittently and should function as an active, spill over area. She thought most active, commuter cyclists will be in the street depending on the time of day and their destination; while most casual riders will be traveling at lower speeds and will be more interested in using the cycletrack.

Ms. Salay asked if that would require the developer to move the building back. Ms. Ray said potentially and explained they had been working with the applicant to begin thinking through the building footprint locations and pointed out that in most cases, they should have space for one additional foot, if not more, in most of the areas.

Ms. Salay said her recollection, along with another Council member, was that when Shopping Corridors were discussed along with the cycletrack loop, they were considering the City's bike path system in this urban environment. She said she was not considering this shopping corridor accommodating a cycletrack. She said her interpretation of connecting with the overall network, while introducing bicycle traffic that might not otherwise be there or should not be there, if there is outdoor dining, and shopping and lots of pedestrian activity that is the goal, a cycletrack in this area may not be the best idea. She explained she just spent 10 days in Boston, MA with her daughter, doing all sorts of touring and paying attention to a true urban landscape. She said almost everywhere, they separate their pedestrians and their cyclists. She said she does a fair amount of bike riding on the City's shared use system, and it is kind of scary when approaching pedestrians at a pretty good clip. She said it is scary if they have a dog on a leash or a child in a stroller, or a child by the hand, and explained that she has to slow way down to make sure everyone is aware of one another. So, she said when she sees those bike facilities and pedestrian facilities right next to each other, she gets concerned about everybody's safety. She said all Council members have met with the Crawford Hoying folks and this was discussed. Upon reflection, she said they had discussed not mixing cycle tracks in these heavily pedestrian use areas. She reiterated that Mr. Yoder said this would be a heavy activity area and with the bridge connection that will have bicycle facilities as well, she wonders if some of that right-of-way can accommodate everything they want as well as a cycletrack.
Ms. Salay inquired about the sidewalk and planters intended.

Joanne Shelly explained the planter boxes have been designed as part of the details in the streetscape guidelines. She said the idea is the planter boxes will actually be at grade with a six-inch granite curb around the perimeter of each tree box. She said the developer and Staff have been working very closely with MKSK and Parks to determine the appropriate size for each of the various street sections. She noted that along the Broadstone Avenue area, the tree boxes are probably smaller in length but the width remaining the same, surrounded by a granite curb and in-filled with appropriate perennials and bulbs seasonally adjusted.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for clarification on the varied lengths. Ms. Shelly thought that along John Shields Parkway, as it is currently designed, the planter boxes are eight-foot in length and five-foot wide. She anticipates the minimum size would be five-foot by five-foot in size with connection underneath with structural soil and pavement, etc. so the trees and plants will thrive along that area. She stated that in urban environments, such as this, the planted area just becomes trampled by people as they step sideways to avoid or pause, so Staff is trying to create an appropriate level of open space for a tree to grow in but understanding they need to create enough hardscape that they are not damaging the tree.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired about the estimated distance between planter boxes. Ms. Shelly said Code requires the trees be placed 40-foot on center, which is typical for city streets.

Ms. Amorose asked her to clarify if they would just be tree boxes and not other shrub boxes or planting boxes. Ms. Shelly thought the intent was to be individualized per the tenant. She said the City's view is that we provide the basic infrastructure and then allow the areas between the buildings in that segment to create additional amenities so they are varied, giving each individual building its own character.

Mr. Yoder addressed Ms. Salay's comments about the cycletrack idea. He said the developer believes that having bicycles zipping through this area, which should be an active urban corridor with outdoor dining, people walking to and from parallel parked cars, a lot of activity, etc., the developers agree it is not the best place to have a cycletrack. He said it still allows for a nice pedestrian realm. He said they just visited Greenville, SC as an example that has a street wall of about 85 feet between building faces, which is very consistent with historic downtowns. He thought they could get the buildings close enough together that the outdoor living space feels right, even with taller buildings. He said initially they were considering a streetscape that would accomplish a cycletrack by itself, then a gap, and a pedestrian path that is at least 12 feet, then a gap, and when you string all these dimensions together, instead of it being 85 feet between building faces, it could be stretched to 135 feet or 140 feet, making it feel very suburban. He

said the idea of combining the cycletrack and the sidewalk is great in terms of getting the dimension where we need it, but they should still consider whether bicyclists should be included in this area. He would like to allow for flexibility for outdoor dining, possibly expanding outside that space. He said as for the planters, he asked that tree grates be considered in certain areas to help keep that 12-foot wide walkway maintained. He said things that are introduced up above grade become an obstacle. He said he preferred the height at 6 inches high but would like to keep the conversation open to consider tree grates in some of these locations to keep it as pedestrian-friendly as possible.

Mr. Hardt thanked the applicant for the informal presentation in July, which he found to be extremely helpful by providing a big picture perspective on the whole project. He said that made reviewing this project a lot easier. He thanked both the Staff and applicant for presenting the application in manageable chunks.

Mr. Hardt said he was not in favor of the Broadstone name and would prefer that streets that continue through the district keep one name instead of changing mid-stream and encouraged the group to consider this holistically.

Mr. Yoder explained why we were now seeing Broadstone instead of Park Avenue is because the police dispatchers did not like Park Avenue as there are so many others with similar names in Franklin County. He said several different names were considered. Mr. Hardt suggested that whatever name is chosen, he would prefer consistency.

Mr. Hardt said he disagreed strongly with eliminating the cycletrack from Broadstone. He stated that he found it astounding that a community that claims to be bicycle friendly that has bicycles on the front of our Community Plan, a bicycle task force, the members of which had participated in this design solution, in addition to contemporary cities like Austin, Indianapolis, Portland, and Memphis, all of which are implementing something that Europe did decades ago, and for us after all this time to question whether it should be there or not it is remarkable. He said this district is supposed to accommodate a wide variety of transportation modes, including pedestrians, cyclists, and cars, and he believes it is a mistake to view that graphic as the bicycles are on the sidewalk. He said they are not, they are on the cycletrack. He said the three-dimensional images they have viewed and the more thorough design documents clearly indicate that is a delineated space with the different paving materials. He said the purpose of a cycletrack is to generate safety. He is concerned that bicycles will end up on the sidewalk if it is not there. He hoped that removal of the cycletrack is not the consensus of Council.

Ms. Salay suggested possibly moving the cycletrack to a different street.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested relocating the planter in this case to include the cycletrack adjacent to the on-street parking.

Mr. Hardt said he and the other Commissioners thought engineering staff should be tasked with figuring this out, so he is not inclined to redesign the streetscape, but the elimination of the cycletrack is not something he could support.

Victoria Newell said she agreed with Mr. Hardt. She said this is something the Commission asked for from the beginning. She thought the solution they have come up with is potentially a very good one in lieu of having it in the street as originally submitted. She thought that as long as the cycletrack is clearly defined, then the public should have the opportunity to learn how to use that space instead of assuming right from the beginning that there is an issue with its design. Mr. Hardt has experienced very successful cycletracks in other cities both on foot and on wheels.

Mr. Hardt said he had intended to say in the content of the Staff Report and the presentation tonight, he is seeing an interpretation of the Code that he does not necessarily agree with. He said the updated Code

that the Commission voted on several weeks ago, included a requirement that says "a minimum of 12-foot of clear sidewalk width shall be provided along designated shopping corridors through a combination of public right-of-way in building zone areas." He referenced the Staff Report where it states the space being allocated to the cycletrack counts toward that sidewalk, to which Ms. Ray confirmed. Again, he said he could not disagree more. He thought the intent of that Code was that we would have 12 feet of clear sidewalk space, clear of other obstructions, and that is what he was in support of to accommodate seating, and sandwich boards, and people sitting on benches enjoying ice cream cones, etc. He said five feet of space for the cycletrack does not and should not contribute to that. He said there is a comment in the Staff Report that says that dimension labeled in the drawings has "varies" to be at least one foot and he believes it needs to be at least six feet, because that is how you get 12 feet in width.

Amy Kramb said she agrees the cycletrack should NOT be considered sidewalk. She said she understands designing the roadway sections is not up for discussion tonight but when these typical sections are figured out, the cycletrack needs to be there and separated out, and in no way, considered part of the sidewalk. She said how that is designed and on which side of the planter it should be placed, that is not her decision to make.

Mr. Hardt agreed that it is not part of tonight's discussion but wanted to provide feedback to the interested parties in the room so as they go forward and refine the designs and buildings, that consideration is put into this.

Todd Zimmerman said he thought a cycletrack will be used more as a family-friendly bikeway, while hard-core riders will stay in the street, so he would like to see them left in. He does not want to see the family-friendly cycletrack in the street. He stated that everything he has seen and heard so far, he agrees with the Commission. He said the comments from Staff and the applicant have helped him come a long way. His final comment was that this proposal looks good.

Ms. Kramb thought she voiced most of her comments and believes more work has to be done on a couple of the street sections.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not have a lot to add but anticipates more conversations to come. She asked if there were any other Basic Development Plan issues to be discussed. She reiterated there are 10 conditions per the Staff Report.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if they agreed to the 10 conditions as written. Mr. Yoder said the applicant agrees. She called for a motion with respect to the Basic Development Plan.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt made the motion, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve the Basic Development Plan with the following ten conditions:

1) City Council approval of the area rezoning to the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District;
2) That the applicant selects building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
3) That the applicant works with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;
4) That the applicant dedicates the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
5) That the applicant addresses any remaining Engineering details as part of the Development Plan Review;
6) That the applicant coordinate with the City and Washington Township Fire Department to ensure fire accessibility throughout the site as part of the Development Plan Review;
7) That the applicant work with the City to plan for future transit stop locations for appropriate areas of this development;

8) That the applicant provide the remaining one-foot (for a total of 12 feet) clear sidewalk area as part of the public streetscape along appropriate portions of the Shopping Corridor;
9) That the applicant describe the intent for the required BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review; and
10) That the applicant provide an outline of the details for each open space type, including the intended users, exact acreages required and provided, and general program, at the Development Plan Review, with determinations as part of the Site Plan Review.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any public comments on the Preliminary Plat. [Hearing none.] She asked the applicant if they agreed to the six conditions as written. Mr. Yoder answered they agreed. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for a motion with respect to the Preliminary Plat. She said originally there were five conditions and now there are six with the additional condition with respect to COTA.

Motion and Vote
Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend **approval** of the Preliminary Plat to City Council, with the following six conditions:

1) The modifications to the street sections described in this report are incorporated in the plan as part of the Development Plan Review;
2) That the proposed utility easements be provided on the preliminary plat prior to review by City Council;
3) That the applicant dedicates the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
4) City Council approval of the Plat modification of the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent;
5) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to City Council submittal; and
6) That the City and COTA resolve the issues associated with the acquisition and relocation of the Dale Drive Park and Ride facility before the Final Plat is recorded.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated the final motion this evening deals with deciding the Required Reviewing Body for the Development Plan Review.

Motion and Vote
Mr. Hardt made the motion, Mr. Taylor seconded, to require the Planning and Zoning Commission to be the required reviewing body for the Development Plan Review. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

3. Perimeter Center, Subarea C – The Spa at River Ridge 5555 Wall Street
14-072AFDP/CU Amended Final Development Plan/Conditional Use

The Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for an existing 18,000-square-foot office building to be used as a salon and spa on a 3.45-acre site on the south side of Wall Street, north of the intersection with Perimeter Drive. This application also includes an expansion of the parking lot.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said a presentation is not needed, confirmed the applicant was present and invited her up to the podium to state her name and address for the record.

Laura Comek, attorney for the applicant for the Spa at River Ridge, said the landscape designers were in attendance if there were any questions. Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if anyone else from the public would like to speak with respect to this application. [There were none.] The Chair called for a motion. She said there was one condition for the Amended Final Development Plan:

1) That the existing dumpster doors are repainted using a complementary color to the building as part of the building permit submission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if they agreed to this condition. Ms. Comek said she agreed.

Motion and Vote
Mr. Taylor moved, Ms. Newell seconded, to recommend approval of this application for Amended Final Development Plan with the above condition. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes, Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote
Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend approval of this application for Conditional Use. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Ms. Salay said she met with the neighborhoods surrounding the Spa at River Ridge that was very well attended for the time of day and short notice but in general the neighborhood was pretty supportive and believes if they were not, they would be in attendance this evening. Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed they are an engaged group.

Communications
Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any communications to be relayed and discussed. Ms. Salay said regular City Council meetings have been on hold since July 1st, 2014. Claudia Husak asked if the meeting tomorrow could be moved back to 10:00 am, due to a schedule conflict. It was agreed.

Commission Roundtable Discussion
Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any roundtable issues to be discussed.

Mr. Hardt inquired about a business that has been asked by the City to relocate their business from one side of the river to the other to facilitate Bridge Park. He asked if the community was assisting the other businesses in the area or if they have even contacted the City.

Steve Langworthy said most of the relocation issues have been dealt with by the applicant. He said the businesses being relocated as part of the roadway, the City has to deal with as well as the applicant.

Amy Salay said in one instance, the City had to take their land and as a result, the building, due to moving Riverside Drive.

Amy Kramb inquired about the streets that are private but built to public standards. She said when the Commission allows signs on public right-of-way, she asked if it will it be an issue with Bridge Street as well.

Ms. Husak said staff's expectation would be the applicant would submit a Master Sign Plan at some point where all the details get ironed out. She does not believe the Code works well with a development of that size.

Ms. Salay suggested it is discussed as they talk about the Bridge Street Code.

Mr. Hardt said in the past, there has been discussion about private street that is built to public standards and we kept saying the applicant could not have it but in the Bridge Street Code, there is one aspect they talked about tonight that a private street built in that way should be treated the same and maybe the Commission should follow that thought through.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired about the Vrable project timeline. She thought it was going kind of slow given it was open in February.

Mr. Langworthy said the outside was really complicated with the changes in the grade and ins/outs of material changes they had to go through.

Ms. Husak thought the Building Department meets with them onsite once per week at a minimum.

Mr. Hardt said he did not have any specific knowledge of that construction project but he said the stage of construction that they were in last winter, was just about the worst possible scenario which likely may have caused delays.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 4, 2014.

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

JULY 31, 2014

The Administrative Review Team made the following determinations at this meeting:

4. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project
Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road
14-070BPR/PP **Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat**

Proposal:	A request for preliminary review for seven new blocks for future development on approximately 30.9 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D) for a Basic Development Plan. This is also a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat Review under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.
Applicant:	Nelson Yoder, Principal, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4656; rray@dublin.oh.us

DETERMINATION #1: Recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission of the following Development Plan Waivers:

1) Maximum Block Size (Block 'D') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a): To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block 'D' (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±594 feet on the west and 607 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,886 feet).

2) Maximum Block Size (Block 'H') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a): To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block 'H' (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±630 feet on the west and 686 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±1,945 feet).

DETERMINATION #2: Recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this request for Basic Development Plan Review with 10 conditions:

1) City Council approval of the area rezoning to the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District;
2) That the applicant select building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
3) That the applicant work with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;
4) That the applicant dedicate the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;

5) That the applicant address any remaining Engineering details as part of the Development Plan Review;

6) That the applicant coordinate with the City and Washington Township Fire Department to ensure fire accessibility throughout the site as part of the Development Plan Review;

7) That the applicant work with the City to plan for future transit stop locations for appropriate areas of this development;

8) That the applicant provide the remaining one-foot (for a total of 12 feet) clear sidewalk area as part of the public streetscape along appropriate portions of the Shopping Corridor;

9) That the applicant describe the intent for the required BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review; and

10) That the applicant provide an outline of the details for each open space type, including the intended users, exact acreages required and provided, and general program, at the Development Plan Review, with determinations as part of the Site Plan Review.

DETERMINATION #3: Recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Preliminary Plat with five conditions:

1) The modifications to the street sections described in this report are incorporated in the plan as part of the Development Plan Review;

2) That the proposed utility easements be provided on the preliminary plat prior to review by City Council;

3) That the applicant dedicate the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;

4) City Council approval of the Plat modification of the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent; and

5) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to City Council submittal.

RESULT: This application was forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the recommendations noted.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Steve Langworthy

Steve Langworthy, Director of Planning

DETERMINATION

4. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project
Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road
14-070BPR/PP Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat

Rachel Ray said this is a request for preliminary review for seven new blocks for future development on approximately 30.9 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive (relocated), south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Development Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). She said this is also a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat Review under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the site and then provided an overview of where this application for Basic Development Review is in the context of the current applications on file, and the upcoming applications that will be filed. She explained that the purpose of the Basic Development Plan Review is to make sure the framework that will enable the future mixed-use development at this site is cohesive and will ensure that a strong public realm is established. She explained that this application is not intended to serve as a determination for all project details associated with the public or private realm. She stated that further details will be determined at the Development Plan Review, Basic Site Plan/Site Plan and Final Plat stages. She said there are some questions still to be worked through, and pointed out that the applicant is meeting with the City on a weekly and almost daily basis to coordinate these items.

Ms. Ray said the applicant has also filed an application for Development Plan Review for Phase One of this project, although the applicant has requested a time extension to allow time to address the issues and obtain feedback from the Commission on the Basic Development Plan. She said that by the time the Development Plan Review for Phase One is ready to move forward, all of the detailed items that have not been determined at this stage will need to be for that review. She said following the Development Plan Review, the next step is the Basic Site Plan Review, which is a review of the conceptual buildings, uses, and site details, and finally, the last step is the Site Plan Review, which is likely to proceed in phases by block and will serve as the most detailed review out of all of the applications since all of the architectural details, open space details, parking, landscaping, signs, and other site details will be reviewed at that time.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the proposed Basic Development Plan. She said that the proposed plan includes a grid street network forming seven blocks for development. She stated that the Basic Development Plan involves the public realm elements, including seven development blocks (Blocks A, B, C, D, F, G, H) subdivided by private access drives and mid-block pedestrianways (Block 'E' is the designation currently applied to land north of John Shields Parkway, east of Riverside Drive, and is not included with this application), three new public streets (Broadstone Avenue, Tuller Ridge Drive, Mooney Street), and a future mixed-use shopping corridor designated along portions of Broadstone Avenue and Riverside Drive. She said this application also includes a Preliminary Plat for the project site that includes the reconfiguration of rights-of-way for John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive and the necessary vacation and reconfiguration of the right-of-way for the east/west portion of Dale Drive.

Ms. Ray said the Code analysis for the project includes the Lots and Blocks requirements. She explained that Waivers are required for Blocks 'D' and 'H' because the east and west faces of both blocks each exceed the 500-foot maximum block length, and when combined with the other block lengths, the total block perimeter also exceeds the maximum of 1,750 feet. She said approval is recommended for the Waivers. She explained that the intent of the maximum block length provisions is to prohibit "superblocks" from being established, which limit pedestrian connectivity and do not appropriately

distribute traffic. She stated that the plan meets the intent of this requirement by providing mid-block pedestrianways through private drives, which serves to break up the blocks and allow for connectivity through the site. She added that the greenway along the south side of John Shields Parkway adds an additional 80 feet to the block length measurement, which is a condition unique to these two blocks.

Ms. Ray said the Street Types section of the Code addresses the designation of street families and street elements such as bicycle facilities. She explained that five-foot one-way cycletracks are proposed along both sides of "Broadstone Avenue," which is the main shopping corridor that is part of the regional cycletrack system through the Bridge Street District. She said that the cycletrack transitions into an eight-foot, two-way cycletrack along Riverside Drive. She said that a condition was recommended to begin to identify accommodations for transit stops, as well as on-street parking details. She said at Mr. Hahn's' suggestion at a previous meeting, the applicant should consider providing on-street parking spaces for motorcycles and scooters where full-length vehicular parking spaces will not fit. She said they will also need to continue to work through fire access throughout the site as the details come together. She said one of the recommendations is a condition that, in addition to Mooney Street being public south of "Broadstone Avenue," Banker Drive (shown as Reserve I) will also need to be a public street between Dale Drive and Mooney Street to allow for fire access. She said no on-street parking would be required on this portion of Banker Drive.

Steve Langworthy asked if that was because of the steepness of the road grade.

Ms. Ray said yes, the slope is about 10 percent in that area, which makes on-street parking challenging.

Ms. Ray said the Neighborhood Standards are also part of the Basic Development Plan Review. She explained that the consideration include placemaking elements such as the designation of the shopping corridor, providing a pedestrian-oriented streetscape, identifying street terminations, locations for gateways and open spaces, and later in the process, sign plans. She explained that along the shopping corridor, which is shown along portions of "Broadstone Avenue" and Riverside Drive, the Neighborhood Standards require a minimum 12 feet of clear sidewalk area. She said within the right-of-way, between the six-foot sidewalk and five-foot cycletrack area, a minimum of 11 feet is provided; the applicant will be required to provide a minimum of one additional foot to be provided within the Required Building Zone along the shopping corridor.

Ms. Ray stated that in terms of open spaces, staff met with the applicant yesterday to work through the placement of open spaces to meet the intent of the Code requirements for the provision of a high quality open space network. She said the applicant was also thinking through the private spaces, including restaurant patios, and how they will interact with the streetscape. She said those details would be finalized through the next phases of Development Plan and Site Plan Review.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the proposed Preliminary Plat. She said the Preliminary Plat can be viewed as the "technical" side of the Basic Development Plan Review. She referenced the plat content including the site conditions, lots, right-of-way dedication/vacation, lot line adjustments, street sections, reserves for private drives, grading and utilities, open space, and a tree survey.

Ms. Ray explained that the applicant had provided street sections for all of the roadways throughout the project area. She presented graphics depicting the sections for "Broadstone Avenue" and Riverside Drive. She stated that although the applicant is not constructing Riverside Drive, it is included on the plans given its integral relationship to the project. She provided overviews of the sections for Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge Drive, as well as section views on how the private drives will be installed over parking structures in some areas of the site.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing a summary of the comments received from the ART on this application to date. She reiterated that this is the first of a multi-step process in the review of this project, with

details increasing with each review. She commented that the applicant is in the process of working to establish a development agreement with the City Administration, although the agreement has not been finalized at this time. She noted the comments and conditions related to the shopping corridor and provision of a highly pedestrian-oriented streetscape, in addition to the attention that will be paid to ensuring that the applicant appropriately integrates open space into the development, including distribution, suitability, and design. She noted that stormwater information should be advancing, and the applicant should be prepared to make any corrections on the Preliminary Plat before it advances to City Council.

Ms. Ray referenced the comments from Fire, which at this time relate mainly to fire hydrant locations, the need for public streets in certain areas of the site to provide fire access, and private drive construction above garages. She noted that Mr. Perkins' comments indicated that surfaces must be capable of supporting a 75,000-lb. fire apparatus. She said Building Standards commented that the applicant should start thinking about a loading/trash/building services plan and utility services.

Ms. Ray said there are three ART actions required: 1) Development Plan Waiver Review for two waivers; 2) Basic Development Plan Review, based on the review criteria of Section 153.066(E)(3) for Development Plan Review; and 3) Preliminary Plat Review. She said the Planning and Zoning Commission will also make a determination on the required reviewing body for the Development Plan reviews.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the two waivers, which are for:

1. Maximum Block Size (Block D) – to increase the maximum permitted block dimensions from 500 feet to +594 feet on the west and 607 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 to +1,868 feet; and
2. Maximum Block Size (Block H) – to increase the maximum permitted block dimensions from 500 feet to 630 feet on the west and 686 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 to +1,945 feet.

She said the Waiver review criteria have been met for both blocks.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the Basic Development Plan, with 10 conditions:

1) City Council approval of the area rezoning to the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District;
2) That the applicant select building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
3) That the applicant work with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;
4) That the applicant dedicate the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
5) That the applicant address any remaining Engineering details as part of the Development Plan Review;
6) That the applicant coordinate with the City and Washington Township Fire Department to ensure fire accessibility throughout the site as part of the Development Plan Review;
7) That the applicant work with the City to plan for future transit stop locations for appropriate areas of this development;
8) That the applicant provide the remaining one-foot (for a total of 12 feet) clear sidewalk area as part of the public streetscape along appropriate portions of the Shopping Corridor;
9) That the applicant describe the intent for the required BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review; and
10) That the applicant provide an outline of the details for each open space type, including the intended users, exact acreages required and provided, and general program, at the Development Plan Review, with determinations as part of the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Langworthy said nearly all of the conditions are administrative in nature.

Ms. Ray said a lot of the conditions refer to the types of elements that are expected to be addressed with the Development Plan Reviews, and are noted here to make sure the applicant is aware.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the Preliminary Plat with 5 conditions:

1) The modifications to the street sections described in this report are incorporated in the plan as part of the Development Plan Review;
2) That the proposed utility easements be provided on the preliminary plat prior to review by City Council;
3) That the applicant dedicate the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
4) City Council approval of the Plat modification of the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent;
5) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to City Council submittal.

Mr. Langworthy asked for clarification if the reconfiguration of the John Shields Parkway right-of-way was covered under condition five.

Ms. Ray said the reconfiguration is shown on the plat, and will be addressed in that manner.

Aaron Stanford said the applicant has already shown the necessary changes on the plat.

Mr. Langworthy asked for any additional comments.

Police Sergeant Rodney Barnes said Police is supportive of the proposal. He said they appreciate the amount of access provided through the area. He said Police has talked about increasing the officers in this area, and making greater use of the substation within the Hard Road Fire Station, with a possible use for bike patrol.

Mr. Stanford noted that the applicant indicated that the street names may be changed further, and asked at what point will they be finalized.

Claudia Husak said the street names should be determined with the Preliminary Plat.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said they are more concerned with the timing of the Final Plat than the Preliminary Plat and have focused on the end of the process. He said the Preliminary Plat could be delayed from advancing to City Council if needed to have time to work out the final street names.

Joanne Shelly said Barb Cox has been working with the applicant to coordinate the naming of the streets, and they could be finished as soon as next week.

Mr. Yoder said addresses will be assigned to the blocks and buildings after the street names have been determined.

Alan Perkins, Washington Township Fire Marshal, said based on the changes to Mooney Street to make it a public street, and the condition requiring Banker Drive to be public between Mooney Street and Dale Drive, Fire is comfortable with the streets. He said for the private drives, the Fire Department will need to make sure they have comfortable truck access, and if there are areas that will not accommodate a fire apparatus, they will need to make sure there are posted weight limits. He said he is waiting on locations for fire hydrant and set-up zones, and said he would have more comments as those elements are known

in the next steps. He said the building types for the most part will be okay at six story buildings since they are likely to have sprinklers.

Ray Harpham commented that Building Standards' only comments at this time relate to waste management, and making sure that attention is paid to how this will function throughout the site.

Mr. Yoder said there is a meeting to discuss this very topic occurring right now, with other team members.

Fred Hahn said he had no further comments at this time beyond what had been included in the report.

Mr. Langworthy stated that this is a determination this week, with the recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission provided in the ART Report and presented at this meeting. He asked the applicant if he agreed to the conditions of each recommendation.

Mr. Yoder agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Langworthy said recognizing the applicant agrees to all the conditions as discussed the recommendation of approval stands and will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for two Waivers, Basic Development Plan, and Preliminary Plat Review. He said the application was scheduled for the Commission's meeting agenda for August 7, 2014.

CASE REVIEWS

2. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project
Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road
14-070BPR/PP **Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for preliminary review for six new blocks for future development on approximately 27.3 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Development Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). She said this is also a review and recommendation of approval to the Commission and City Council for a Preliminary Plat Review under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray said she and other staff members had met with the applicant yesterday afternoon to review the streetscapes and referenced an Exhibit the applicant had supplied showing the proposed right-of-way configuration for "Park Avenue."

James Peltier, EMH&T, explained how they have realigned the right-of-way for Park Avenue to follow the roadway curvature and noted the difference at the intersection with Mooney Street.

Ms. Ray confirmed that relocating the cycletrack to the sidewalk side of the planter would allow for additional walkway area.

Barb Cox said she understood and thought the right-of-way was shown appropriately.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked if the cycletrack should be the same material as the sidewalk, or a different material.

Fred Hahn suggested that the cycletrack on Park Avenue should have the same materials as the sidewalk but maybe a six-inch band could differentiate the space between the cycletrack and sidewalk. Ms. Cox agreed.

Steve Langworthy asked how many parallel parking spaces were shown.

Ms. Cox said they may have to reduce the number of parallel parking spaces to accommodate an appropriate number of ADA-accessible spaces. She assumed the two blocks along Park Avenue would need at least one.

Mr. Langworthy asked what the requirement was for the number of accessible spaces. Ms. Cox indicated that it was based on the total number of parking spaces provided. Mr. Langworthy asked if the spaces needed to be differentiated between public parking and garages. Ms. Cox said handicap spaces need to ramp onto a sidewalk, be slightly longer than regular eight-foot parallel spaces and an appropriate number of spaces will be needed for public streets. She said once the buildings are designed, the number of ADA spaces within the garage can be determined. Mr. Langworthy asked at which point that was dealt with. Ms. Cox answered sooner rather than later.

Joanne Shelly asked if the curb could be pushed down rather than providing a ramp. Ms. Cox answered that was not possible as they would have to do a whole section of curbing in that manner, and that would not work in this instance. Mr. Hunter asked if additional parking spaces could be provided on Park Avenue closer to the intersections. Ms. Cox said maybe one more could be added, but they would need to look at it based on intersection spacing. Mr. Langworthy suggested that maybe that is where the handicap spaces are provided.

Ms. Cox said the intent is to make this area highly active in terms of pedestrian activity so she suggested placing one or two accessible spaces on Riverside Drive and one or two accessible spaces on Mooney Street.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the ratio of parking for office space and residential development. Mr. Hunter replied it all factored into the parking numbers. He said they could put in extra office square footage in Building C1 and B1 while still meeting and exceeding the parking requirements.

Ms. Ray questioned why the cycletracks were shown on the plans only next to the planters. Ms. Cox said it was a carry-over from concept previous project that the material would be different, and the line delineates material changes. She explained there was likely going to be a band between the sidewalk area and the cycletrack area, but staff had not yet determined the details for where it starts and stops.

Mr. Hahn confirmed that at this conceptual level, it is appropriate to just show the dimensions. Ms. Cox and Ms. Ray agreed.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant if they were comfortable with the dimensions for the right-of-way, what was on the plat, the conceptual development plan, and Park Avenue. The response was yes.

Ms. Ray asked about the provision of a minimum 12 feet of clear area in front of Building G1, as required for the shopping corridor. Mr. Peltier indicated that the shopping corridor was not expected to extend east to that block.

Mr. Hahn suggested that the applicant consider providing parking spaces designated for motorcycles, particularly if there were areas that were too small for vehicular parking spaces.

Ms. Ray reported she received an email from Brian Quackenbush earlier that day regarding Riverside Drive and switching the location of the cycletrack adjacent to the sidewalk. She said she had discussed the street section with staff, and staff had agreed that the same approach for Park Avenue could be applied to Riverside Drive for consistency.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant what they planned to present to the Commission. Mr. Peltier answered they would show the building footprints on the Basic Development Plan. Ms. Ray said the applicant needs sections as part of the Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Ray said she had not had a chance to meet with staff to discuss Mooney Street and whether it would be public or private at this time, but she planned to meet with staff after today's ART meeting to have a recommendation for the applicant before the end of day Friday.

Ms. Ray asked if there were any other higher level topics requiring discussion. She said she had forwarded Ms. Cox's memo on the Basic Development Plan/Preliminary Plat to the applicant and asked the applicant if they had any questions about Ms. Cox's comments at this time.

Ms. Ray offered Time Extension forms to the applicant as the ART is obligated to make a recommendation next week on all of the open applications. She asked that the forms be returned tomorrow or Monday. Ms. Ray requested electronic filings as soon as possible so she would have enough time to properly review and draft her Planning Reports. She asked if there were any further questions.
Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant when we might start to see actual building plans. Mr. Hunter replied "soon." He said they were trying to get through the Basic Development Plan first.

Claudia Husak inquired about the signatures on the application form from the medical office property. Mr. Hunter said it was in progress.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or comments regarding this application at this time. [There were none.] He stated that the ART's recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Basic Plan Review and to City Council for Preliminary Plat Review were scheduled for July, 31, 2014, unless the applicant decides to file a Time Extension.

3. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project, Phase 1

14-071DP-BSC **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive Development Plan Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for review and approval for four new blocks for development on approximately 17.28 acres, including new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Bridge Street District Development Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Ray stated that pending the issues surrounding the Basic Development Plan/Preliminary Plat, a Time Extension for the Development Plan (Phase 1) was recommended.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 pm.

- Sidewalk extension to allow for access from short-term parking;
- Standard directional signs; and
- Crosswalk markings

She said approval with one condition is recommended:

1) That the revised stormwater calculations be submitted with the building permit.

Mr. Gunderman asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this request for Minor Project Review with one condition.

CASE REVIEWS

3. Verizon Wireless Co-Location – Avery Park Water Tower **7697 Avery Road**
14-067ARTW **Administrative Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for Verizon to replace six panel antennas and install three remote radio heads and one OVP distribution box on the Avery Park water tower. She said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless communications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Ray reported there have been no updates on this application since the previous ART meeting. She reported that she was waiting to hear back from the Law Director's office on the lease terms for this site since it is on a City-owned facility, although the lease should not have any impact on the application requirements. She said ART's determination is anticipated within the next two weeks, which still meets the required time frame for decision making.

Mr. Gunderman confirmed there were no additional comments or questions on this application and concluded a determination is scheduled for next Thursday, July 24, 2014 unless otherwise specified.

4. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project
Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road
14-070BPR/PP **Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for preliminary review for six new blocks for future development on approximately 27.3 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Development Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). She said this is also a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat Review under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray reported that a general staff meeting to review this application was held July 16th, and she had prepared a list of comments, questions, and a preliminary zoning analysis both for the Development Plan/Preliminary Plat as well as the Development Plan to serve as a starting point for the discussion with the ART at today's meeting. She provided three sets of comments on each of the applications to the applicants and the ART members, and noted that revisions would be necessary on the plans before a recommendation can be made to the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said she planned to meet with the applicant again immediately following this ART meeting to walk through more of the detailed items to be addressed on the plans, but she would like to discuss some of the higher level issues at today's meeting.

Ms. Ray began by laying out the concerns and issues with the following as part of the Preliminary Plat:

Right-of-Way

- Private streets should be provided in reserves on the plat, and reserve lines should mirror the sections for public streets.
- Banker Drive (currently noted on the plans as Bond Avenue) should be public between Mooney Street and Dale Drive, and interim and future conditions should be provided given the existing car dealership on the south side of that future roadway. Ms. Ray stated that additional information about how the project would address development on the south side of this roadway, until future development was proposed, would be needed.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, clarified that the public portion would end when Banker Drive extends over the proposed parking structure for the segment between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Mooney Street south of Park Avenue should be public, since it is no longer proposed over a parking structure, and the street section should be consistent as the segments north of Park Avenue, with on-street parking on both sides of the street.
- The applicant should provide an exhibit showing all of the lot lines to be reconfigured or adjusted, including Dale Drive/Park Avenue (and the Dale Drive vacation); John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive; and the greenway parcels south of John Shields Parkway.
- The applicant should provide detailed sections for all streets and street segments, including all of the variations (such as where turn lanes are added).

Barb Cox inquired about Block F where Lot 1 and Lot 2 were noted but the lot lines were note shown. Mr. Langworthy stated that better defined blocks were needed and setbacks should be noted.

Mr. Quackenbush asked if, for the private streets, the lot lines should be drawn at the curb or walkway and not at the edge of the building as there is no tree lawn. Ms. Ray responded staff prefers a sidewalk in the area and suggested mirroring the sections for the public streets.

Ms. Cox pointed out several areas where the proposed lot lines did not join that would need to be corrected.

Ms. Ray continued:

Parcels/Lots

- Lot sizes are dependent on the proposed building types, and the applicant should indicate the conceptually proposed building types and uses anticipated for each block and lot. She suggested a table reference.
- She asked the applicant if they ever planned to subdivide the blocks into smaller parcels for future financing purposes, and suggested that they consider a game plan for how the parcels could be configured, and if there would be an impact on the plat.
- She stated that known open spaces should be shown in public access easements.

Other Improvements

- She stated the applicant still needed to provide a master utility plan with the Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Cox said utility provisions were needed or there could be issues with the utility easements and future building placement.

Mr. Quackenbush said the private streets were over the parking garages, and he did not anticipate the need for utility easements to run through the private streets.

Ms. Cox pointed out a few areas where the reserve areas meet the rights-of-way and where the transformers sit. Mr. Quackenbush agreed with Ms. Cox's assessment. She said there may just be three or four instances.

Ms. Cox asked the applicant to make sure the plans included "environmental" aspects of the site, including existing wetlands, buried structures, etc.

Jeff Tyler said there may be more issues and comments to come on the electrical plans, and he is continuing to meet with the applicant to discuss and coordinate Building Code related issues.

Ms. Ray stated that to conclude the discussion on the Preliminary Plat, a few additional design details were noted on the comment sheet she had provided the applicant, including the need for updated proposed street names, fixing the plan scale, providing a table showing all block dimensions, and providing a tree survey for the portion of the site north of Tuller Ridge Drive.

Ms. Ray referred everyone to the comments she had prepared on the Basic Development Plan which included the following key issues:

Required Waivers

- Blocks "D" and "H" exceed block length and perimeter, and other block waivers may be identified once the applicant provides the correct block measurements. Ms. Ray said the Waiver could be reviewed either as part of the Basic Plan or Development Plan applications.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said he preferred to submit the Waiver request with the Basic Development Plan. Ms. Ray agreed that since the Preliminary Plat would be affected the Waivers should be discussed as early as possible.

Street Sections

- Ms. Ray stated that the ART and the Planning and Zoning Commission will require a much clearer understanding of the vision for each street, including detailed sections at a minimum 20-scale. She agreed that final details will be determined with the Development Plan Review (refer to comments on case 14-071DP-BSC, below).

Neighborhood District Standards

- Ms. Ray reiterated the applicant's need to think through the vision for the shopping corridor(s) along Park Avenue and Riverside Drive (since the required shopping corridors had not yet been identified), the gateways, and other urban design elements of the streetscape.

Ms. Ray noted technical issues:

1. Block Measurements - Blocks need to be measured along rights-of-way where they exist, and along the section edges of the private streets, and/or property lines. Provide a table showing calculations (total length of each side and total perimeter).
2. Vehicular Access Configuration – Engineering is still reviewing.
3. Mid-block Pedestrianway - Required for Block G on shopping corridor
4. Plans/Additional Information Needed
    a. Scale should be no larger than one inch = 100 feet
    b. Gray out the building footprints (the property/right-of-way lines should be more prominent)
    c. Identify existing/future Principal Frontage Streets
    d. Identify front/corner side/side property lines (based on building orientation)
    e. Show lot configuration (refer to Preliminary Plat comments)
    f. Show all typical sections (refer to Preliminary Plat comments)
    g. Show location and dimensions of planned shopping corridor

Ms. Ray summarized the main issues with the Basic Development Plan and that a clearer vision was needed for the character of the streets throughout this project before the application moves forward. She said this, to some extent, also applies to the open space plans because while all the final details do not need to be solidified at this stage, the applicant needs to demonstrate how they are starting to think through the details of their placement, dimensions, character, purpose, function, etc. for open space.

Mr. Langworthy suggested that the applicant show the required build zones (RBZ) on the plans and not the building footprints, since the purpose of the Development Plan application is to focus on the street network and block framework. He said the applicant should understand that the buildings will then have to be sited within the RBZ range.

Ms. Ray suggested that the applicant show the building footprints on the plans for the Development Plan. Mr. Quackenbush said that taking buildings off of the Development Plan would be quite a challenge because then there would not be much left.

Joanne Shelly suggested just providing the building envelope. Ms. Ray agreed, because the building footprint outlines would help illustrate the locations of parking structures and vehicular access.

Ms. Cox referred back to the Preliminary Plat and noted that there were a few requirements such as rights-of-way with chamfered corners that would require variances by City Council since they are technically required by the Subdivision Regulations, but are not necessarily appropriate for urban streets. Mr. Langworthy said those items would be noted in the report.

Mr. Langworthy asked about the process for vacating right-of-way for existing Dale Drive. Ms. Cox said it can be done with the Final Plat. Ms. Ray asked for an exhibit to clarify each of the lot line adjustments, right-of-way vacations, etc.

Ms. Ray reiterated that the plans for the street sections needed to be at a larger scale with a much greater level of detail. She indicated that when this goes to the Commission, they will want an understanding of the vision for Park Avenue that will include the look/feel, where the private patio spaces will be accommodated, how the open spaces will be integrated into the streetscape, and how the other less prominent streets will feel as well. She stated that Park Avenue will terminate at the pedestrian

bridge landing point, and the ART, Commission, and City Council will all want wide sidewalks and an exceptional public realm along Park Avenue leading up to the park and the bridge. She indicated that at this stage, the Commission will be looking for "vision" and not necessarily all of the details – just an understanding that the project's public improvements and public realm are headed down the right path.

Mr. Yoder asked what would be considered enough walkway area. Mr. Langworthy asked if each street will have a section drawing.

Ms. Ray stated each street needed to have its own section, including where street segments had different sections. She recommended that the applicant carefully review the preliminary analysis she had provided, and provide the information highlighted in yellow that is still missing since that information would be needed before the project moves forward.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked about the mid-block pedestrianway requirements along the shopping corridor. Ms. Ray noted the blocks exceeding 400 feet on a shopping corridor would require a mid-block pedestrianway. She also referred to item #4 of the Development Plan.

Mr. Yoder inquired if they could stop the shopping corridor to avoid the need for a mid-block pedestrianway. He suggested that portions of the Riverside Drive frontage and the first two blocks of Park Avenue could serve as the shopping corridor.

Ms. Ray said the Code had a minimum required length for the shopping corridor, and the applicant would need to show how the minimum length was provided on the plans since that information had not been provided.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or comments regarding this application at this time. [There were none.] He stated that the ART's recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Basic Plan Review and to City Council for Preliminary Plat Review were scheduled for July, 31, 2014.

5. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project, Phase 1

14-071DP-BSC **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive Development Plan Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for review and approval for four new blocks for development on approximately 17.28 acres, including new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Bridge Street District Development Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Ray said after conducting a preliminary review of the plans since they had been submitted last week, she had identified a significant amount of detail on the public improvements that have not yet been provided. She said she had met with the Director of Strategic Initiatives/Special Projects to discuss the level of information that the City is comfortable making a recommendation on at this stage of the project, and he agreed that a comfort level on the details for project elements including the disposition of each of the public/private streets, the cycle track configuration on Park Avenue, and the streetscape character of Park Avenue and Riverside Drive needed to be reached before the Development Plan moves forward.

Ms. Ray stated that with a bit more information, the Basic Development Plan application could move forward, since it is more conceptual in nature, but she strongly recommended that the applicant consider

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 10, 2014

AGENDA

1. Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District
14-039ADMC — **Scioto River Neighborhood District**
(Approved 5 – 0) — **Zoning Code Amendment**

2. Zoning Map Amendment/Area Rezoning-Bridge Street District
14-040Z — **Scioto River Neighborhood District**
(Approved 5 – 0) — **Zoning Map Amendment**

3. Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District
13-095ADMC — **Zoning Code Amendment**
(WORKSESSION)

Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Amy Kramb, Richard Taylor, Victoria Newell, John Hardt, and Todd Zimmerman. Amy Salay was absent. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Readler, Dana McDaniel, Logan Stang, Nicki Martin, Rachel Ray, Andrew Crozier, Jeff Tyler, Devayani Puranik, Terry Foegler, Joanne Shelly, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. John Hardt seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6– 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there is a presentation that will be first and following the cases will be heard in order of the published agenda and briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Presentation Bridge Park East Project

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, provided a project overview on the planned Bridge Park East mixed-use development. He said his intent was to inform the Commission of changes that have been incorporated into the plan since the Commission's informal review in November 2013.

Mr. Yoder said the changes are related to the comments related to blocks sizes being too big and the recommendation that the blocks needed to be broken up. He said they improved the building design with enhancing the character, they provided more open space, extended the shopping corridor to the east, and provided more office square footage and meeting places to address the need for more space for Dublin's corporate citizens. He said they have increased the square footage to 60,000 square feet of office space spread throughout five different buildings and are taking advantage of the best views available within the project. He stated that they had reduced the number of residential units from 741 to 596.

Mr. Yoder said the target audience includes current and future Dublin corporate citizens, capturing the companies that are here now and attracting new Class A offices, while having the residential units capable of attracting a nice spectrum of empty nesters and young professionals. He said this is an approximately 24-acre project in a great area of the city while still being a walkable district that is highly engaged with the river and adjacent parks. He said the project will include a 500 seat theater, gathering spaces with pocket

parks, restaurants, convention center space, and a hotel that would likely be a Marriott product. He said economically, they are expecting to create 500 full time jobs for two full years for the project construction, as well as 1,000 full time equivalent jobs.

John Hardt asked Mr. Yoder to clarify the limits of Phase One of the project.

Mr. Yoder said phase "1A" is basically the existing Bridge Point Shopping Center, for which they plan to ask for demolition permits as soon as tenant relocations are complete, and areas slightly north of existing Dale Drive.

Mr. Hardt asked for the height of each of the new buildings.

Mr. Yoder said the corner building will be 85,000 square feet and will be a four or five story building. He said the hotel is four stories of guest rooms with a ground floor amenity space for a total of five stories, the next building has two stories of office/fitness with fitness/retail on the ground floor with four stories of apartments above for a total of six stories. He said the potential condominiums will be six stories with 12-foot ceiling height.

Richard Taylor said the changes are great and the project is headed in the right direction. He said he appreciates the applicant's response to the Commission's comments that they provided last November.

Todd Zimmerman said he likes the concepts and indicated that the progress on the implementation of the Bridge Street District is eye opening.

Victoria Newell said she appreciates the applicant's efforts made to address the Commission's comments and asked for some details on proposed materials that will be used for this project.

Mr. Yoder said they are working with Moody Nolan to complete the next level of documentation to bring sections and detailed elevation views to the Commission to highlight the materials. He said they are looking at the combination of brick and stone with a variety of colors and types of brick that would be most appropriate while having the ability to bring in Hardiplank or masonry products to have a variety of materials focused on the upper levels of the buildings.

Chris Amorose Groomes said she appreciated the presentation and the opportunity to ask questions. She said it appears that great strides have been made, although she said she still had concerns with the breakdown of uses and the amount of residential uses and apartments along Riverside Drive. She said she is concerned that only 18,000 square feet of retail in the entire first phase would be too small an amount compared with 1.1 million square feet of residential square footage. She thought that a more appropriate balance would be critical to balancing the traffic generated by this development.

Mr. Yoder agreed, but said that they would need to closely monitor the balance of parking. He said that residential development generates less parking at the equivalent of about 1.5 spaces per thousand square feet, while office uses generate about three to five spaces per thousand, but both hit the tax rolls at the same rate. He said changing the mix of uses could put the parking out of balance where they would not be able to afford to build the parking needed to support the office uses.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if they have started to identify interior spaces that will be used for structured parking.

Mr. Yoder said a location might be available further up the hill as the project expands, but would not be something that would be considered within the first phase.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Yoder for the presentation.

City of Dublin

Land Use and Long Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 10, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Jeremiah Gracia, Economic Development Administrator; Alan Perkins, Washington Township Fire Marshal; and Sgt. Rodney Barnes, Police.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; Jonathan Staker, Planning Assistant; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; Logan Stang, Planning Assistant; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Flora Rogers, Administrative Assistant.

Applicants: Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; Jay Boone, Moody Nolan; James Peltier, EMH&T; and Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 2 & 3).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the July 3, 2014, meeting minutes. He confirmed that ART members had sent their modifications to Ms. Rogers prior to the meeting. The minutes were accepted into the record as amended.

INTRODUCTIONS

1. Verizon Wireless Co-Location – Avery Park Water Tower **7697 Avery Road**
14-067ARTW **Administrative Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for Verizon to replace six panel antennas and install three remote radio heads and one OVP distribution box on the Avery Park water tower. She said the applicant had originally requested to punch in a new port entry hole for the cables; however, after discussions with Engineering, who had expressed concerns with adding a new hole in the water tower, the applicant is now proposing to reconfigure the existing wires and use one of the existing entry ports instead. She said since this is City-owned land, the City's legal counsel for wireless issues is looking at how this request relates to the existing lease in effect for this site. She said this will require more time for review, and therefore a determination on this request is anticipated for the July 24th ART meeting (barring any issues raised).

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any initial questions or concerns with respect to this application.

Aaron Stanford confirmed that Engineering had preliminarily reviewed the request and found the port entry detail to be acceptable.

2. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project – Basic Development Plan
Riverside Drive & West Dublin-Granville Road
14-070BPR/PP **Basic Development Plan Review/Preliminary Plat**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for a Basic Development Plan and Preliminary Plat for preliminary review for six new blocks for future development on approximately 27.3 acres, in addition to new public rights-

of-way, for a future mixed-use development located on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road.

[ART discussion summarized below.]

3. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project – Phase 1

14-071DP-BSC **Riverside Drive & Dale Drive Development Plan Review**

Rachel Ray stated this is a request for Development Plan Review for four new blocks for development on approximately 17.28 acres, including new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive at approximately the intersection of Dale Drive, north of West Dublin-Granville Road.

Ms. Ray said there was a Pre-Application Review at last week's ART meeting for both applications. She explained that staff had also met with the applicant yesterday to review the updated plans and to discuss the approach to obtaining the property owners' signatures for the COTA Park and Ride site and the medical office building on Dale Drive. She stated that staff had agreed to process the application and begin the reviews, provided the property owner signatures are obtained prior to a determination on each application. She reiterated that the ART recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission are targeted for Thursday, July 31st for both applications.

Ms. Ray said the first application is for the Basic Development Plan and Preliminary Plat, which covers the larger area south of John Shields Parkway but does not include the land west of the Vrable site, north of John Shields Parkway. She described the Mooney Street extension south through the site, which would become private south of the new "Park Avenue" roadway in the southern portion of the site. She said the Basic Development Plan application is intended to review the street network and block framework for the site on a larger scale. She said the applicant has also filed a Preliminary Plat for the lots and future rights-of-way.

Steve Langworthy confirmed blocks A and B will be divided by a private street.

Ms. Ray explained that the proposed Zoning Code language for the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, which the Planning and Zoning Commission will review later this evening, includes special provisions for the measurement of block size given the unique block access circumstances near the future roundabout.

Ms. Ray said there are separate case numbers for the Basic Development Plan/Preliminary Plat and the Development Plan for Phase 1 of Bridge Park East. She stated that Phase 1includes four blocks with the future "Park Avenue." She explained that the purpose of the Development Plan is to take a step further than the Basic Development Plan, looking at general building footprints and locations of streets, blocks, and lots, in addition to evaluating the proposal against the Neighborhood District standards that are currently being drafted.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they would like to comment further on the two applications.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the streets that will be installed above parking structures will be private. He provided an overview of the proposed public and private streets shown throughout the site.

Ms. Ray said the plans also include block dimensions, utility plans and open spaces. She reiterated that although the open space plan shows amenity decks as part of the "open space" provided on site, these spaces will not count toward the open space requirement.

Mr. Yoder described the intent of the open space distribution across the site, including larger pocket parks and pocket plazas intended to serve as larger gathering spaces, such as BriHi Square in Historic Dublin, in addition to smaller spaces along the sidewalk.

Ms. Ray said in terms of timing, she is looking at scheduling a General Staff meeting within the next week, and we will continue to meet with the applicant at the ART meetings until the recommendation scheduled for July 31st.

Mr. Langworthy instructed staff to prepare for the General Staff meeting and to review the applications from a broader perspective.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 pm.

City of Dublin

Land Use and Long Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 3, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; Jonathan Staker, Planning Assistant; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; Brad Conway, Residential Plans Examiner; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; Jay Boone, Moody Nolan; Mike Bermeister, OHM Advisors (Case 1); Linda Menerey, EMH&T (Cases 4 & 6); Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross LLC (Case 4); David Blair, Ford and Associates Architects; Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests (Case 5); and Jim Muckle, Vrable Healthcare (Case 6).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the June 26, 2014, meeting minutes. He confirmed that ART members had sent their modifications to Ms. Wright prior to the meeting. The minutes were accepted into the record as amended.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

1. Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development **Riverside Drive and State Route 161**
Pre-Application Review

Bridge Park East
Rachel Ray said this is a request for non-binding review of a potential application for a mixed-use development with residential, commercial, office, restaurant, hotel and conference center uses on approximately 25 acres located on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of State Route 161. She said this is a request for pre-application review prior to submission of an application for Basic Plan Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(C).

Ms. Ray provided an overview of the applications that the applicant plans to file within the next week. She explained that the applicant would submit Basic Development Plan, Development Plan, and Preliminary Plat applications for the entire area shown as part of the Bridge Park East development. This area includes the land between Tuller Road to the north, east of the relocated Riverside Drive, north of West Dublin-Granville Road, and west of the new Dale/Tuller connector roadway but not including the Acura car dealership. She explained the proposed Development Plan application for Phase One that includes the new street currently identified as Park Avenue leading up to the future pedestrian bridge landing point, and adjacent development blocks. She explained that the applicant had met with City staff yesterday at their weekly project coordination meeting to review the application materials in preparation for the Pre-Application Review and the upcoming application submittals.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, provided the ART with an overview of each of the plans submitted as part of the three separate applications that would be filed.

Colleen Gilger asked if Block 'F' was slated for a medical office building.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, agreed that was presently the intent for that building.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, explained that building was not shown on the perspective rendering included in the Basic Development Plan.

Ms. Ray explained the Preliminary Plat includes the public streets of Park Avenue, Mooney Street, and John Shields Parkway. She said the Final Plat, when submitted by the applicant, will be sectioned off into smaller areas likely corresponding with the Site Plan applications.

Ms. Ray reiterated the timeline for reviewing these applications, assuming the applicant is prepared to file next week. She explained that these cases would be introduced to the ART next week, July 10, and staff would continue meeting with the applicant on a weekly basis to coordinate. She stated that an ART determination is expected for July 31st to be ready to move forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 7, 2014.

Steve Langworthy prefaced this agenda item by stating it is a pre-application review, and general comments are preferred as the applicant prepares their formal submission. He said the purpose at this stage is to raise the larger issues or concerns and note anything that may be missing for the submittal.

Fred Hahn asked if the building terraces have anything to do with open space.

Ms. Ray confirmed that the applicant is showing their roof decks and courtyards on the open space plans, but they will not count toward meeting the Code required open space. Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant to be sure to identify the open spaces that will meet the requirements, versus the other open areas shown on the plans.

Mr. Quackenbush said they are currently in the process of identifying any Waivers that may be necessary, in addition to the potential for fees-in-lieu of open space dedication.

Jeff Tyler pointed out that they are showing Block 'A' as part of the Preliminary Plat, but it is not depicted on the Development Plan. Mr. Quackenbush said Block 'A' was represented on some of the plans for the Basic Development Plan but they will rethink what they are showing.

Jennifer Rauch referred to the perspective rendering of the site and suggested the applicant label or color code the buildings/blocks included in this phase to make it less confusing. Mr. Quackenbush agreed that would help make the development area clearer and easier to understand.

Aaron Stanford confirmed that the applicant had begun coordinating with Engineering on the proposed street names for this project. He said more information will be necessary to determine how the applicant plans to address stormwater management, and the applicant will not be able to count improvements in the public rights-of-way, including the pervious pavers in the parking lanes, for managing stormwater from private sites. He said the applicant will also need to begin thinking about the provision of water service throughout the site and the water taps needed. He said the City is dealing with the same water line issue with the developer for the Tuller Flats project. He asked the applicant if they have engaged in conversations with the City of Columbus yet in terms of the provision of water service.

Mr. Quackenbush said their proposal was more straightforward than Tuller Flats with different development entities and buildings. He said Tuller Flats is an apartment complex whereas the Bridge Park project will have different building owners and developers. He said the blocks were not all separated but they were starting to think through those issues. He said one of the issues is private utilities, and they are speaking with AEP about electric as there limited areas to put transformers. He explained they are shown on the utility plan but it is hard to understand at this scale. He stated they have planned for below-grade transformers like downtown Columbus, with grates providing access to vaults. He said they could also go through the garage for access.

Mr. Stanford asked if the garages will be built on the right-of-way. Mr. Quackenbush answered the garages would be adjacent to the public streets.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any special fire issues with underground transformers. Mr. Quackenbush said these will be normal pad transformers but garages are above the floodplain and gravity drains the water. He said the submersible is explosion proof and designed for this type of location.

Mr. Stanford asked if they were incorporating street lighting on the plans. Mr. Quackenbush said he did not think so, but he would check.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant to detail each block on the Development Plan so staff can verify block dimensions and the relationships between the buildings and the rights-of-way and property lines. Mr. Quackenbush said some of those dimensions were called out on the plans.

Mr. Langworthy concluded that a more thorough review would be conducted at a general staff meeting following submission of complete applications, and that the applicant could expect comments in writing that they could respond to prior to moving forward.

Bridge Park West (94 & 100 North High Street)

Jennifer Rauch explained that the applicant had requested late the previous day to include the Bridge Park West project in the Historic District as part of the Pre-Application Review, as they are nearing completion of the application materials for the west side of the river.

Mike Bermeister, OHM Advisors, presented the Basic Development Plan application materials. He explained that as part of the submittal, they had provided a narrative that outlines how the proposal meets each element of the Bridge Street District zoning regulations, and where Waivers would be necessary. He said the project exceeds the block size requirement, street frontage, and building height.

Mr. Bermeister said with respect to the lots and blocks requirements, he pointed out the proposed parcel reconfiguration and that they end up with a block size of approximately 498 feet, where a maximum of 300 feet is required. He said the Waiver ties into the block configuration for a pedestrian pathway and the building is separated to the back of the condominiums so while it is an open view they do not have an actual pedestrianway. He said vehicular access to the parking garage below on High Street requires a Waiver as well.

Mr. Bermeister commented that in terms of the Street Type requirements of the Code, they meet all the requirements with the exception of High Street access. He noted the parking count, which currently exceeds all requirements.

Mr. Bermeister stated that the applicant had also begun to review the Building Type requirements. He said there were elements of the Historic Mixed-Use building type, with a Podium Apartment Building on the back and a parking structure as part of that, which exceeds the requirements. He presented various perspective renderings and at the request of ART members, agreed to clarify some of the views to ensure that the actual scale, massing, and appearance of the building viewed from different angles and viewpoints would be easier to understand.

Mr. Bermeister said the future location of Rock Cress Parkway is shown at the south end of the project site, north of North Street. He said the buildings in this area, adjacent to the Oscar's restaurant, were not part of the project but the renderings serve as a placeholder for a future building. He presented section views of the project to demonstrate the back of the building's limited visibility from High Street due to the change in grade.

Colleen Gilger said there are elevations for the front sides and the back views for the buildings but asked about the back side view. Mr. Bermeister said it was not included in the package and is being developed. He said they are also developing the landscape plan along High Street to incorporate benches and other streetscape details, as well as internal vistas and gateways.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked if the concept plan should be included in the Development Plan submittal. Ms. Rauch said to include that in the Basic Site Plan application submittal.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the scale of the drawings. Mr. Bermeister said it should be 1 inch equals 100 feet, but he would make sure to provide a scale on the plans.

Rachel Ray commented on the property lines and other details that should be shown on the plans, and that the aerial photo should be eliminated, since it makes the proposal difficult to read.

Mr. Bermeister said he would provide black and white graphics instead of aerial views.

Ms. Rauch commented that the Architectural Review Board would be very interested in seeing the details of how the "historic" and traditional portion of the building transitions to the more contemporary portion, as this was a significant topic of their discussion when reviewed informally in May.

Steve Langworthy said he was concerned with the proposal, overall. He said the plans show the historical aspect on High Street but when you turn the corner, the architectural character changes abruptly. He emphasized the need to see a transition. Mr. Bermeister said they were continuing to work on the revised renderings.

Jeff Tyler said he agreed with Ms. Gilger for needing to see the perspective of views from other buildings. He emphasized the need to sell this project and suggested more drawings are needed to convince the ART and the ARB that this is the right architecture for this area.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the garage doors with access off the High Street entrance. Mr. Bermeister said the idea was to downplay the visibility of that access point.

Mr. Hunter said he had trouble with how the parking would work. He said they have more parking than they need and want to use it, making it easier to get the public in.

Mr. Tyler pointed out that there appears to be multiple perspectives and two to three different rendering styles using several different programs, which did not result in a flattering appearance of the building. He indicated the main perspective did not show detail like the others, and articulation along this side of the street is important.

Ms. Rauch said there is no curb cut shown where Mr. Bermeister had referenced the intersection with the future Rock Cress Parkway.

Mr. Langworthy stated he was concerned about the pocket park shown on the slope toward the back of the building.

Fred Hahn said it could be nice and a very interesting space, or worthless given the slopes. He said as the project comes forward, staff will need to see a great deal of detail about this space.

Aaron Stanford asked if there was any potential to include a valet area along North High Street. Mr. Bermeister answered that valet service through the carriage doors was being considered. Mr. Stanford asked who would use the garage doors on High Street. Mr. Bermeister said from retail, public areas, restaurants, and apartments. He said the applicant wants to make excess parking available to the visitors to the Historic District.

Mr. Hahn asked about parking counts, loading zones, and restricted or designated parking. Mr. Bermeister said they need three primary loading zone spaces and restricted parking for deliveries and fire trucks on High Street.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there was any strong desire to provide metered spaces on High Street. Mr. Hunter said he did not know. Mr. Langworthy said metered parking would not just be for this section but could be needed District-wide for both the east and west sides of the river. Mr. Hunter said the garages will likely have some fee associated with them and on-street parking available for up to 20 spaces.

Mr. Stanford asked how they propose to handle trash for two restaurants at opposite ends of the building, as he was looking for a corridor with a trash compactor. He said he was accustomed to seeing trash rooms on each floor for condominium complexes.

Ms. Rauch said the change requests discussed today were not expected by Monday following the holiday weekend but the changes will be required for the full submission. Mr. Bermeister promised to get the changes and comments in the revised plans to be submitted.

Joanne Shelly said she appreciated the effort the applicant made by reading the Code. She said the graphic read pretty well but she was not seeing section lines anywhere and said the sections appear very overwhelming and massive.

Ms. Rauch said she would appreciate a scale comparison of the new compared to the existing as viewed from High Street.

Mr. Langworthy expressed he was not sure this was the whole issue; he has concerns about the river side as well.

Mr. Bermeister promised to create additional views that include pedestrian views from the street to better tell the story.

Ms. Shelly illustrated that the view from the east side of the river to the west side at the pedestrian level will show primarily trees and not the building.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments or questions. [There were none.] He thanked the applicant for their presentation.

DETERMINATIONS

2. Verizon Wireless – AEP Transmission Tower Co-Location **8421 Glencree Place**
14-060ARTW **Administrative Review**

Devayani Puranik said this is a request for Verizon to replace six panel antennas and install three remote radio heads on an existing pole within an AEP transmission tower on the east side of Glencree Place, north of the intersection with Summit View Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless communications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Puranik said this application was introduced last week and there have been no changes. She said an Administrative Departure to Code Section 99.05(C)(3)(f) is requested for maximum height, allowing antenna panels on an existing tower to be installed approximately 110 feet from grade, which falls within the existing tower height.

Ms. Puranik explained that replacing the panel antennas and installing the remote radio heads requires no other changes or ground modifications. She said **approval** with three conditions is recommended:

1) That any future installation and/or replacement of the antennas should not exceed 110 feet measured from the grade;
2) That the new equipment should be unobtrusive and maintain similar color; and
3) That any associated cables are trimmed to fit closely to the panels.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this application with three conditions.

3. BSC Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – FC Bank – Sign
4545 W. Dublin-Granville Road
14-061MPR **Minor Project Review**

Devayani Puranik said this is a request to construct a new 20-square-foot wall sign for a new tenant in the Shoppes at River Ridge shopping center on the south side of West Dublin-Granville Road at the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066(G).

Ms. Puranik said the proposed wall sign, which includes internally illuminated channel letters, meets the height and square footage requirements. She said the letters would be individually flush-mounted to the brick façade. She said the applicant is also proposing vinyl window graphics that show the store hours. She explained that the proposed window sign would be adhered to the right glass panel of the door and that she is working with the applicant to modify the store hour details so that it meets the Code requirements for size and not requiring a sign permit.

Ms. Puranik said **approval** with one condition is recommended:

1) That the existing exterior light fixtures above the proposed wall sign should be covered and resurfaced to camouflage with the background wall prior to sign permitting.

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 14, 2013

AGENDA

Informal Case
1. Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development **Riverside Drive and State Route 161**
13-111INF **Informal Review**

New Case
2. Village at Coffman Park PUD – Ganzhorn Suites
13-058Z/PDP/PP **Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan/ Preliminary Plat**

Administrative Case
3. Bridge Street District – Code Modification
13-095ADMC **Administrative Request -Zoning Code Amendment**

[Please note: due to technically difficulties there is no recording available for this meeting. These minutes were created using staff notes.]

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, John Hardt, Warren Fishman, and Victoria Newell (arrived 8 pm). City representatives were Dan Phillabaum, Terry Foegler, Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Gary Gunderman, Justin Goodwin, Rachel Ray, Marie Downie, Jennifer Readler, Jeff Tyler, Alan Perkins, Barb Cox, Dana McDaniel, Laurie Wright, and Libby Farley.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved, John Hardt seconded to accept the documents into the record as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

1. Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development **Riverside Drive and State Route 161**
13-111INF **Informal Review**

Dan Phillabaum presented this case and began by providing some background information that preceded this Informal application. He said that one of City Council's Goals for 2013 is to embrace the vision of true mixed-use, walkable neighborhoods in the Bridge Street District by

working with public and private partners to create a sustainable, safe, vibrant and dynamic mix of land uses, creative open spaces, residential options and signature architecture to attract a diverse population of residents and visitor.

Mr. Phillabaum said that to begin implementing this vision, Council made a strategic decision to focus development efforts on the Scioto River Corridor area based on the transformative opportunities this area presents to build off of the walkable environment of Historic Dublin by creating a complementary, pedestrian-friendly development pattern on the east side of the river, to engage the Scioto River by expanding parkland on both sides of this natural amenity and facilitating pedestrian movement across the River, and to create a gateway experience at this prominent location. He said that staff has been directed to advance the preliminary planning and design of several Capital Improvement Projects in this area of the city, including the realignment of Riverside Drive, creation and expansion of parkland on both sides of the Scioto River, a roundabout at Riverside Drive and State Route 161, and a pedestrian bridge linking Historic Dublin, the parks and future development on the east side of the Scioto. He said the purpose of this Informal is to provide an opportunity for Crawford Hoying Development Partners to introduce the Commission to their master plan concept for the east side of the Scioto River and for the Commission to review and provide initial feedback to City Council, Staff and the Developer on this mixed-use development concept within the context of this public infrastructure framework.

Mr. Phillabaum described the project site as being approximately 25 acres at northeast corner of State Route 161 and relocated Riverside Drive. He said it includes majority of the former Bash Driving Range, Bridge Point Shopping Center, the Spa at River Ridge, Touch of Class Car Wash and COTA Park and Ride Facility. He added that coordination between the City and several of these entities is ongoing in order to facilitate the public infrastructure currently under preliminary design. He informed the Commission that Crawford Hoying has also been in close coordination with City staff and our consultant team to as they develop their mixed-use concept to ensure that the private development and public infrastructure are aligned so that the vision for the Scioto River Corridor can be realized.

Chris Amorose Groomes said that first they would view the presentation from the applicant, then they would take public comment on the proposal, then open it up to Commission for discussion and questions for the applicant and staff.

Nelson Yoder with Crawford Hoying Development Partners thanked the Commission for taking the time this evening to review their ideas for the Bridge Park mixed-use development. He thanked the Commissioners that were able to attend the Community Input Forum where these plans and images were first presented to the public and welcomed the opportunity to have a broader discussion and obtain more in-depth feedback from the Commission. He said Crawford Hoying firmly believes this project is walkable, sustainable and aligned with the City's vision for the Bridge Street District.

John Martin, with Elkus Manfredi Architects provided a description of the overall plan beginning with the blocks south of Park Avenue. He said that at the southernmost block of the development are a five story, 140,000 s.f. office building and a 195 key hotel room and a 30,000 s.f. conference center with a plaza space between. He said these buildings are located above two levels of parking below ground. He said the next block to the north would contain a

32,000 s.f. fitness center at the ground floor with 82 dwelling units on the floors above, a three story parking structure lined by townhomes on two sides, and about 23,400 s.f. of retail/food & beverage uses at street level on the south side of Park Avenue with 90 dwelling units on the floors above. He said all of the development in this block is located above two levels of parking below ground, and to the east across Mooney Street is a 5,000 s.f. retail/food & beverage use anchoring the intersection with townhomes to east at the ground floor and 88 dwelling units above. He added that a two level parking deck would be located behind this building.

Mr. Martin then outlined the proposed development north of Park Avenue. He said there would be about 33,000 s.f. of retail/food & beverage uses lining the north side of Park Avenue west of Mooney Street and turning the corner along Riverside Drive. He said there would also be a 19,000 s.f. neighborhood grocery along Riverside Drive. He said the four upper floors of these buildings would be comprised of a total of about 220 dwelling units over the three building footprints below. He added that on the interior of this block is a three level parking structure capped with a roof-top amenity deck for residents. He said on the block to the east across Mooney Street is a 10,000 s.f. retail/food & beverage use anchoring the intersection with townhomes to east at the ground floor. He said the remainder of this block was comprised with approximately 78 residential units both at the street level and on the floors above and parking would be located on the interior of this block.

He said the six blocks to the north between Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge/Dale Drive would be comprised of about 100 3-story townhomes and that these would likely be built by other developers in a range of architectural styles. He said the remaining block to the west along Riverside Drive would also be entirely residential, with about 285 dwelling units distributed among four five-story buildings that surround a parking structure capped with a roof-top amenity deck for residents.

Mr. Martin described a few perspective images to illustrate what this district could be in the future. He noted that these were conceptual sketches of an architectural character that will certainly undergo changes as the development is refined.

The first view is from the vantage point of the center of the roundabout looking to the north. He said a portion of the exposed parking beneath the buildings would be concealed by a bermed embankment. He said the office building would be clad in stone or cast stone with the same coloration and texture of Dublin limestone. He said a plaza in the center opens views to the hotel and conference use. He said there would be a ballroom in the center of the space with pre-function areas featuring extensive use of glass in order to provide views to the river. He said small meeting rooms would be oriented closer to the courtyard. He said the hotel would have an amenity deck with a swimming pool at the top floor.

He said the next view was of Park Avenue from the pedestrian bridge landing across Riverside Drive. He said this would be a ‘double loaded’ street with active ground floor uses such as retail and food & beverage on both sides. He was supportive of the design for this street that proposes a different pavement material through the intersection at Riverside Drive, and makes a strong connection to the cycletrack along Park Avenue to bring pedestrian and bicycle traffic from their development to Historic Dublin and back. He said the buildings depicted would be four stories of residential in wood construction on top of either a concrete or wood podium and clad with brick or masonry.

He described the next image as a view to the south down Riverside Drive with the neighborhood grocery in the foreground. He said this grocery would serve the needs of the over 1,000 future residents in the area. He noted that parallel parking has been depicted along the east side of riverside Drive and they were hopeful that this could be achieved. He said from the grocer to the south would be more of the retail and restaurant uses as one approaches the pedestrian bridge.

He said the next view was of Park Avenue at the east end of the development area to the west toward the river. He described the street as having two travel lanes flanked by parallel parking, cycletracks on each side of the street, a planting and site furniture zone, followed by sidewalks adjacent to the proposed development. He anticipated that sidewalks would be a minimum of 12 feet wide in addition to space dedicated to create outdoor café seating. He believed this streetscape would be very inviting to residents and visitors alike.

He presented the final image of the proposed townhomes as the most conceptual of all that they had presented. He said the townhomes would be developed by a variety of developers and architects, but that they would generally be three-stories with parking in the rear of the unit. He said these units may be very different than depicted here and could be constructed of masonry, brick, stone, siding and could feature sloped or flat roofs and that the objective would be to encourage a diversity of contemporary architectural styles as each block is built out.

Mr. Yoder concluded their presentation and said the plan and the images presented are the end result of a lot of minds working together to develop a plan that they feel will meet the test of time. He believed that this development would appeal to both empty nesters looking for a step down housing option, as well as young professionals that might work nearby at Cardinal Health of Wendy's Headquarters. He stated that a housing market analysis was currently being conducted by Ken Danter, with the Danter Company, specialists in real estate market feasibility.

He provided additional information related to the parking distributed throughout the project, and the benefit to residents with covered parking that may be above or below ground level. He said the retailers and restaurants on the other hand want readily accessible parking at ground level. He added that the amount of parking provided meets, or exceeds in some areas, the amount of parking required by Code. He said his architects made a conscious decision to draw upon the strength and character of the historic limestone of Old Dublin without being too literal but creating a neighborhood on these banks that would appeal to a great number of people. He stated that as a lifelong resident of Dublin he wanted to see the City continue to be successful into the future. He said that Crawford Hoying recognizes that users in and out of Dublin want a walkable, Historic Dublin type of environment. He welcomed the Commission's feedback and questions and wanted to gauge if they were supportive of the images presented as being the right look for the project.

Chris Amorose Groomes invited public comment.

Mike Bradley, Interim VP COTA for Planning and Service Development said that they like and are supportive of the project, but are anxious to know how COTA fits in. He said that they are receiving questions from passengers that use the Park & Ride at Dale Drive on the future of this facility. He reiterated that COTA is very supportive of the density of this project and that

discussions and coordination between COTA and Dublin about this and other Park & Ride facilities in Dublin.

Bill Jacob, 8326 Autumnwood Way said that this was an exciting opportunity for the City of Dublin and was looking forward to seeing something happen. He said he represents some of the residents and business people in Historic Dublin and Dublin in general, and wanted to make sure that the development wouldn't have a negative impact on existing businesses.

Phil Weisenbach, 5505 Villas Drive said that as a runner, he likes the idea of being able to cross the river over the pedestrian bridge, but had concerns about traffic at the intersection of Riverside Drive. He was supportive of the project but wanted to ensure that the pedestrian crossings are safe.

Ms. Groomes said that there was obviously a lot to talk about with this project and asked for the patience of everyone present.

Amy Kramb said her biggest concerns were with traffic back-ups in the roundabout at State Route 161 and Riverside Drive created by the signal at the intersection of Park Avenue (Dale Drive) and Riverside Drive to the north. She wanted to see the capacity numbers that were projected for Bridge Street and the traffic studies. Her second concern was with the convention center and hotel uses and was skeptical if these were appropriate uses in this location. She said the memo referenced some uses or building types would not be permitted with the underlying zoning and that a rezoning would be necessary. She asked if the hotel and convention uses were currently permitted.

Mr. Phillabaum replied that those specific uses are being proposed on property currently zoned Bridge Street Commercial District, and they are not permitted in that district.

Ms. Kramb asked what the zoning to the north of Dale Drive was currently.

Mr. Phillabaum replied that the rest of the site is zoned Bridge Street Office Residential District.

Ms. Kramb said she was hesitant to carve out another piece to a different zoning to accommodate the applicant, and thought that they should work within the existing zoning. She said she would want to be provided with some analysis of the conflicts with the current zoning districts, such as uses and building types. She said it seemed like there was a considerable greater amount of density and taller buildings than the current zoning. She was generally in favor of the contemporary architecture and the concept of structured parking. She was not convinced that there will be views to the river from the ground floor of the conference center and that the residential building shown on the Wendy's restaurant site would be feasible due to access limitations.

Mr. Phillabaum reminded the Commission that during the area rezoning process the previous owner of Bridge Point Shopping Center requested to be rezoned to Bridge Street Commercial District, as they envisioned maintaining the property in its existing state as a suburban strip retail center with outparcels. He said that particular zoning district was generally applied only to existing retail centers and other low-rise single use buildings.

John Hardt was excited to see this and other things happening in this area since staff and the commission spent nearly three years thinking and dreaming about what they wanted to see happen in Bridge Street. He said this part of the city really needed a different flavor of development than shopping centers surrounded by parking. He thanked everyone for the work that has been done to date. He respectfully disagreed with Ms. Kramb on the use discussion at the Bridge Point location. He appreciated the staff comments that what is being proposed does not fit the zoning, and this was an opportunity to get uses functionally in the right places rather than fitting in a zoning district planned several years ago. He said he would be open to considering a rezoning process to achieve a rich mix of uses with residential spread out across the entire area. He agreed with Ms. Kramb that the residential building depicted on the Wendy's restaurant site to the south of State Route 161 did not seem feasible and was the least pedestrian-friendly site in the area.

Mr. Hardt expressed conceptual support for the contemporary architecture, but noted that there was a lack of variety overall. He was not in favor of the monolithic scale and appearance of the buildings north of Park Avenue, and said that the space on the interior of the building immediately north of Park Avenue along Riverside appears to be impenetrable by the public. He recommended more accessible internal public open spaces on the interior of these buildings, and suggested making the internal courtyard accessible from the east side of the block. He acknowledged the staircase depicted connecting down to the sidewalk along Riverside, but didn't think it was substantial enough to serve as effective public access.

Mr. Hardt said that more variety is needed in the townhome area. He did not have a problem with the building that was shown, but not with three blocks of the same building. He said the Riverside facing buildings have the same problem of being too uniform in character. He referenced Woodlands, Texas and the Arena District as examples of places that successfully achieve architectural variety but with coordinated character.

Mr. Hardt said that the Park Avenue area was on the right track, but was concerned that it did not go far enough. He would like to see the integration of non-residential uses at the ground floor continue able to be continued as Park Avenue extends to the east and had concerns that without this the overall walkable intentions for the District would not be fulfilled. He suggested that these spaces be constructed as loft spaces with higher ceilings to accommodate future commercial uses in this space as markets change. He had concerns with the right turn from Park Avenue to Oxford Street as being very automobile-oriented and wanted to see a more pedestrian friendly approach to this access point.

Mr. Hardt referenced the view of the office building, hotel and conference center and had concerns with the conference appearing as being built on raised plinth and the disconnection this created for pedestrians from the sidewalk along Riverside Drive. He said the office building had the same issue although not as severe. He said there were several other instances in the plans and images presented along Riverside Drive where sidewalks do not interface with the proposed buildings very well. He said this detail has to be correct to encourage interaction and activation of the Riverside frontage.

Richard Taylor said that he was also excited that we are beginning to implement the Vision Plan, and he thanked everyone for their time and effort and primarily the current members of the Commission who went to Greenville, South Carolina. He said his first concerns

were more directed toward the City than Crawford Hoying, because he disagrees with the roundabout and proposed location for Riverside Drive.

Mr. Taylor said he is frustrated that we created a problem by placing buildings on the opposite side of the street from the park. He said pedestrians should be able to cross Riverside at all the intersections to the east to have frequent and easy access to the park, and if residents have to cross a street to get to the park we are making a big mistake. He noted that a tunnel under Riverside had been suggested at the Community Forum and acknowledges that many people feel this is necessary as they are concerned about interrupting traffic flow with pedestrian crossings, but he disagrees. He said that we are trying to create a different type of place along this section of Riverside Drive and that in this area pedestrians should be prioritized above traffic flow.

Mr. Taylor referenced the Vision Principles that stressed the need for transit accommodations in the plan beyond buses—he said we need to allow for more modes in the future. Is concerned that we don't create enough right-of-way for future transit and have the same problem we have at Bridge and High, where the street can't be widened for on street parking because of where buildings were located. He said the Principles also discussed embracing nature, but he has always been confused with the need for a greenway running along John Shields Parkway and how it was supposed to function.

Mr. Taylor said he was concerned that several access points were in the development were too auto-centric and stated that one-way street were anti-urban. He said a major landmark tree was lost with the Vrable skilled nursing facility and wanted to be certain that a detailed survey of the existing trees be conducted and that the pedestrian bridge be moved if necessary to preserve trees along the river.

He said the development needed to expand the range of residential choices offered. He stated that the buildings have too much of the active common space located on the interior of the building where residents will never be forced to walk out to the public street, and was concerned that the apartment buildings will function as high-end dormitories. He said that if the city is going to spend millions of dollars to create great views to the river, the corporate residents should have priority over college kids or recent graduates looking for small apartments. He understood Office Residential District as being primarily office uses with some residential use, and believed in general there needed to be more jobs within the development.

Mr. Taylor was concerned with single-use apartment buildings. Buildings should be adaptable and constructed of masonry versus wood frame. He said wood frame construction was not easily adaptable to other uses. He indicated that a modern architecture was desirable, but that this can be taken too far. He didn't think replicating Historic Dublin was appropriate, either. He referred to the image presented of the office and hotel buildings, and stated that the hotel architecture direction is good, but he feels that the office is too suburban. He characterized it as a 70 mile per hour freeway building. He said that the buildings in this portion of the plan should engage the street at the roundabout with retail uses. He noted that a conference center is limited to upper floors in the Code and that the proposed ground floor location is not permeable for the public. He said it would be fine if pushed back to interior of block in favor of more active use in this location. He suggested more be office use be incorporated in the plan overall. He

said the proposed heights of buildings in the plan may be appropriate, but said 4 to 5 stories would be the maximum he was comfortable with.

Mr.Taylor questioned what happened to future bridge connection depicted in Transportation Network graphic from the Code from Dale to Historic Dublin. He said the only vehicular bridge depicted now was at John Shields Parkway and felt this was a major mistake to lose this bridge. He said that residents here should be able to meet all of their daily needs within the quarter-mile pedestrian shed, and doubted that pedestrian use of bridge would happen without a strong connection to both sides of the river both in terms of use and design. Noted that there is a strong pedestrian node in the proposed plan, but the pedestrian shed does not overlap with the Historic Dublin pedestrian shed based at the Bridge and High intersection. He wondered what effect this proposal would have to the Historic Dublin businesses, and was concerned that the customer base could leave for this side of the river. He said the only way to avoid this was to make a stronger connection between the Historic District and the new development. He noted that the west landing of the pedestrian bridge will be below High Street and said that the bridge won't be visible at all from Historic Dublin.

Mr. Taylor was not supportive of the monolithic apartments. He said he would like to see office and residential vertically mixed versus horizontally, and a wider range of housing types. He wanted to see buildings where it could all happen together at once, and agreed that retail should extend to the east along Park Avenue. He said that we need to think about development beyond this development, and extend planning further to the east and west to understand how everything will fit together.

He wanted more detail on the street types, and was concerned that 12 feet of sidewalk is not enough to accommodate through foot traffic and outdoor dining spaces. He also wanted detail on street tree height and spacing, including if they are proposed as wells or lawns.

Mr. Taylor said that in all of the blocks of the plan buildings have been pushed from edge to edge within the block, with no room for small open spaces within the block. He said the development should include smaller scale parks and public green spaces that are walkable to all residential units. He asked if the block dimensions met the length and perimeter requirements for this zoning district.

Mr. Phillabaum replied that some of the block sizes depicted may exceed the maximum length permitted but more analysis is needed.

Mr. Taylor clarified that if the block lengths are exceeded, a mid-block access would be required and wanted to see how this was worked out.

He said that parking was a difficult issue to tackle in terms of predicting what the necessary number of parking spaces is and taking into consideration the overlap between businesses during the day and residents at night. He said at some point a parking authority may be needed to manage parking meters and garages, shared parking arrangements, etc. He was concerned with having so much of the parking underground and that this will kill street activity if direct access is provided from the below grade parking to the uses above with an elevator or other

internal access way. He said he would rather see separate parking garages that require people to walk out along the street to their destination in a nearby building, especially for office employees. He was unclear how the parking for the proposed townhouses was proposed to function, and requested additional information to clarify the relationship between this parking and how the residents access their units as these are refined.

Warren Fishman said he was also excited about things happening in Bridge Street after five years of working on the Code and attending meetings. He asked how much square footage of housing and how many housing units were proposed.

Ms. Groomes answered that it was 1.26 million square feet of development with 1,162 housing units.

Mr. Fishman thought that this density of dwelling units was out of kilter from Code. He appreciated the comments from the architects on the Commission and said that hearing their input was very valuable to him. He said he wants to see beautiful architecture with durable materials that will last for the next 100 years, because that is what makes a lasting community. He said the buildings had to be adaptable and this can only be accomplished with masonry construction.

Mr. Fishman agreed that priority should be given to executive level professionals, as they bring income to the city through income tax, not young professionals. He said that most people he has talked to at Bridge Street events say that they want to own their residence, and it is only because of the current economy that they are renting. He believed that young executives want to own a condominium with at least 1,500 square feet, 2 bedrooms and an office. He said that there shouldn't be any one car garage units, that two should be the minimum.

Mr. Fishman suggested that bicycle parking facilities should be included on the interior of buildings. He said that at APA and other training venues he has attended he constantly hears that the cities that have implemented form based codes were disappointed because developers built too many apartments. He said these communities were left with empty storefronts that zoning made them put in, but that they have no incentive to lease because the rents for residential are paying for building.

Mr. Fishman wanted to stick to the uses and other requirements that are in the Code as they spent countless hours working on that language with staff and City Council. He said he had a lot of respect for the work of Ken Danter and would be interested to see the results of his analysis mentioned by the applicant.

Victoria Newell apologized for missing the presentation by the applicant, and said she could sum up her concerns as being in three areas. She thought the plan was too heavily weighted toward only residential uses at the north end and was concerned with this separation of uses. She said a stronger connection needs to be made to Historic Dublin, as both sides of the river should be able to benefit from this development. She said she was very familiar with this type of commercial residential construction and sees a trend occurring with this type of development. She asked what is it that will make this area unique, as these types of townhomes and the other architectural character is being seen everywhere. She had concerns with what the rear of the townhomes would look like.

Chris Amorose Groomes said she was in agreement with almost everything the other Commissioners said. She said she had reviewed some of the previous impact and capacity studies for Bridge Street produced by a number of talented consultants. She was concerned with the numbers proposed in this development plan and how they compare with what was projected for this area in the Vision Plan and the Planning Foundations document.

Ms. Groomes noted that the Vision Plan included a target housing unit mix for the next 5 to 7 to 10 years, with 807 rentals, 425 multi-family condos, 175 single-family attached and 93 single family attached, and that was for the entire Bridge Street Corridor. She said she was concerned this proposal exceed what was projected in the impact studies for the Riverside District. She said we need to achieve the right balance of commercial and residential uses. She believed that the real financial assets to the community are our corporate office employers, as opposed to residential uses which generally cost the city. She said the great frontage being created along Riverside should be devoted to the these corporate employers, not residents.

Ms. Groomes said the Riverside frontage should be more engaging and had concerns with the size of the buildings at Riverside, as this scale gets out of hand very quickly. She remembered the Lane Avenue project they had toured as being just under 100 dwelling units, and that the building felt really big, and was concerned that these buildings will be even bigger. She said she was not comfortable with the size of the apartment buildings along Riverside.

Ms. Groomes agreed with Mr. Taylor that Park Avenue is not wide enough to accommodate the amount of pedestrian activity desired. She said she hoped that this area would be an authentic, complete neighborhood. She said some areas of the plan seem disjointed and recommended that it be more diverse in the distribution of uses. She challenged the applicant to make this an authentic place and a complete neighborhood with more of the daily service needs of residents and businesses more buildings of a smaller scale.

She was concerned about auto courts behind the townhomes, and thought this arrangement really defeats the urban environment. She expressed a preference that the units use an underground garage as opposed to the auto courts. She said she shared the concern of Ms. Newell that this architecture looks very similar to what is being done everywhere and fears that the buildings will become dated. She said people should not be able to look at a building and immediately tell when it was built.

Ms. Kramb spoke again and said she wanted to see the development numbers and how they match what has been modeled. She also wants more information about how the buildings match what is permitted by Code. She wants to see smaller, more unique buildings

Ms. Groomes invited the applicants to ask questions of the Commission and hoped that a clear image was provided and that they can come together on solutions.

Mr. Martin agreed with the notion of extending the non-residential uses along Park Avenue to the east. He said that they too hold the conviction that as this area becomes successful development will want to move in that direction.

Mr. Yoder was not certain that a true vertical mix of uses with residential above office above retail at the ground level was plausible economically and from a Code perspective, but they were confident that a very active street can still be created.

Mr. Martin clarified the width of the sidewalk along Park Avenue as being typically a minimum of 12 feet which would be clear walking dimension. He said this is wide enough for three people to walk abreast. He said this 12 feet would be in excess of any space dedicated in front of the buildings for seating/dining. He added that
he had participated in many public meetings and the Commissions comments were some of the most astute he has heard, and that the Commissioners were very consistent in their comments. He said it was a very valuable discussion.

Mr. Yoder thanked the members of the Commission for visiting The Lane in Upper Arlington. He said that it was a 108 unit building and many of the buildings proposed here would be smaller than that.

Ms. Groomes said that the other Commissioners may be a lot more comfortable with this building size than she was.

Mr. Hardt said the one building in particular that he was concerned about from a scale perspective was the building just north of Park Avenue.

Brent Crawford of Crawford Hoying Development Partners said that they are experiencing a trend in demographics at their projects that is skewed toward empty nesters, but also to slightly older young professionals in the late 20s to mid to late 30s, and not as much those young people just out of college. He said the average age of their residents was over 40 with an income over $100,000. He said the desire for large homes among this demographic has changed.

Ms. Groomes said that she thinks that our office residents are also important to accommodate. She said she wants to give the apartment renters good space within the plan, but maybe not the best spaces. She added that there should be ‘almost enough’ apartments available in Bridge Street to meet the market demand.

Mr. Crawford said that there was a conscious decision to locate the core of the non-residential use along Park Avenue, and that businesses want to be located in these walkable environments just as residents do. He said he could see potential to push the office more to the north because the interest has been very strong.

Ms. Groomes thanked the applicants.

Terry Foegler informed the Commission that the financial analysis from the applicant of the structured parking, the streets and other infrastructure would be advancing soon and may inform how much parking will need to be provided for additional office use in the development plan. He added that another significant regional study on demographics over the next 30 to 40 years was coming soon and was reflecting a significant trend toward single person households.

Justin Goodwin clarified for the Commission that a more robust capacity analysis was conducted more recently than the Vision Report that was reference by Ms. Groomes, and that this could be provided to the Commission along with the fiscal analysis that was also completed in the time since the Vision Report analysis.

Ms. Groomes called a short recess until 9:05 pm.

2. Village at Coffman Park PUD – Ganzhorn Suites
13-058Z/PDP/PP **Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan/**
(POSTPONED) **Preliminary Plat**

This case was postponed prior to the meeting as requested by the applicant.

3. Bridge Street District – Code Modification
13-095ADMC **Administrative Request -Zoning Code Amendment**

Ms. Groomes said she is unsure how to tackle the rest of the Code and asked what remains to be reviewed.

Mr. Goodwin noted that at the last meeting, the Commission had discussed working through each remaining section of Code with Planning providing initial observations of what items need to be addressed prior to the Commission's discussion on each topic. He said Planning is open to another approach if the Commission has a preference.

Ms. Groomes said that it is nice to have materials from Planning during the discussion. She said there are some topics like parking in an urban district that it is difficult to discuss because we have not had experience with this type of development.

Mr. Hardt recalled that an earlier Commission discussion at which the Commission came up with a list of Code items and set priorities for discussion. He said he thought it was okay if an individual Commissioner had specific concerns, such as parking, that everyone would have the opportunity to have that discussion and that some would be more interested in other topics. He asked if Planning had completed its full technical review of the Code.

Mr. Goodwin said that Planning has prepared a list of issues and potential revisions for all Code sections over the past year and has been reviewing each section again prior to sending the annotated copies to the Commission for Review.

Mr. Hardt said he believed Council would grow weary of receiving Code revisions in pieces.

Mr. Goodwin noted that the Commission had decided to review the rest of the Code prior to sending it to Council.

Mr. Hardt said it was easier for him to focus when the Code was the only item on the agenda.

Mr. Taylor agreed and asked how many more pieces of the Code there are to review.

Basic Development Plan Area Map

Case 15-002BPR/PP - Bridge Park