



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

FEBRUARY 18, 2016

AGENDA

- 1. BSD SCN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B & C
15-099MSP** **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Master Sign Plan (Approved 7 – 0)**

- 2. BSD SRN – Capitol Cadillac – Sign
15-096MSP** **4300 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Master Sign Plan (Approved 7 – 0)**

- 3. BSD SCN – Bridge Park, Block A
16-001DP-SP** **Riverside Drive and Dublin-Granville Road
Development Plan – Site Plan Reviews (Approved 7 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Amy Salay, Robert Miller, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, Christopher Brown and Stephen Stidhem. City representatives present were: Philip Hartmann, Vince Papsidero, Alan Perkins, Claudia Husak, Marie Downie, Nicki Martin, Logan Stang, Aaron Stanford, Matt Earman, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the January 7, 2016, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She read the case procedures and determined that Cases 1 and 2 are eligible for consent but she has pulled Case 1 per the request of several Commission members. She said the case order in the minutes reflects the agenda.

- 1. BSD SCN- Bridge Park East, Blocks B & C
15-099MSP** **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Master Sign Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a Master Sign Plan for a new 8.2-acre mixed-used development on the east side of Riverside Drive, ±430 feet north of the intersection with West Bridge Street and south of the intersection with (future) Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections

153.065 and 153.066. She stated the Commission is the final authority on this application and anyone intending to address the Commission will need to be sworn-in.

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

Nicki Martin presented the aerial view of the site. She said the Master Sign Plan was reviewed with the Bridge Street District Code and the BSD Sign Guidelines. She said once this plan is approved, any signs not meeting the plan would need to return to the PZC for further review. She indicated the ART is able to review minor modifications under the BSD Code.

Ms. Martin said this plan text is generally consistent with the Bridge Street District Code and the BSD Sign Guidelines. She said the contents of the plan remain largely unchanged and updates were to address the Commission's concerns and questions from their previous meeting.

Ms. Martin said the applicant is required to designate a shopping corridor for this district as part of the Site Plan approval. She noted the shopping corridor areas in blocks B & C along Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. She stated the MSP is not just for the shopping corridor but all signs in blocks B & C to allow for a consistent and cohesive sign package. She said the initial application was concurrently reviewed with the MSP for Bridge Park West that was approved by the Architectural Review Board in December 2015 but this application was tabled at the January 7th PZC meeting at the request of the applicant.

Ms. Martin said the applicant has since addressed the PZC's concerns with respect to size, location, and detail. She said the applicant resubmitted their application and received a recommendation of approval from the Administrative Review Team.

Ms. Martin went through each of the updates. She said the applicant has eliminated the 'Anchor Tenant' provision. She explained retail tenants are eligible for signs based on frontage:

- 2 Signs – one frontage
- 3 Signs – two frontages
- 4 Signs – three frontages

Ms. Martin said the signs for office tenants remains unchanged, whereas one sign is permitted at the landlord's discretion. She explained the BSD Code allows for ground signs for any tenant but no ground signs are permitted in this case.

Ms. Martin said the following sign types are permitted in the BSD:

- Wall
- Projecting
- Awning
- Window
- Canopy Edge
- Sandwich Board
- Address Numerals
- ~~Building Directory~~
- Canopy Edge
- Placemaking Art
- Parking Marquee
- Leasing Window Cover
- ~~Umbrella~~

Ms. Martin said the Umbrella signs/graphics and Building Directory signs were eliminated and new Leasing Window Cover signs were added as requested by the Commission. She said the applicant has proposed gray vinyl to mask the tenant spaces as they turnover with a graphic with either the Crawford Hoying or Bridge Park logo at a size of up to 30% of the window area to be consistent with the window signs size permitted in this plan.

Chris Brown inquired about the size of the window graphic shown in the illustration because he thought it appeared less than 30%. Ms. Martin confirmed it was 30% for each of the five windows. Mr. Brown asked if there is a limitation on what can be Bridge Park logos versus Crawford Hoying logos. Ms. Martin answered the graphic would just need to be consistent with an approved logo. She said specifically, the City asks the applicant to provide a trademark so it would have to be a trademark logo. Mr. Brown said the illustration was a nice representation of three Bridge Park logos for five consecutive windows. He indicated he did not want to see Crawford Hoying painted over every vacant space but thought there might also be room for a phone number, which would be logical. He asked if that would be permitted.

Claudia Husak said a phone number is not permitted.

Ms. Martin said the applicant has finalized Address Numeral and Parking Marquee signs. She said the brushed metal letters will appear centered above individual tenant spaces for retail tenants. She stated the address numerals meet the fire Code, permitted to be 2 square feet in size, and does not count towards the total number of signs a tenant is permitted. She presented an example of the proposed Parking Marquee signs, meant to be consistent with the city-wide wayfinding plan, also produced by Kolar Designs, Inc. She said some will be Projecting signs and others will be Canopy Edge signs.

Ms. Martin said the way wall sign size, height, and location is regulated has remained unchanged but the applicant has provided additional details. She explained wall signs are regulated by use – Office versus Retail.

Wall sign size with a context sensitive approach by Level:

Level 1 – 50 SF Max.; Letter height ≤ 36"

Level 2 – 60 SF Max.; Letter height ≤ 36"

Level 3 – 80 SF Max.; Letter height ≤ 48" – only occurs on building C2 and 4 signs are permitted.

Ms. Martin said sizable signs are going to be quite expensive so it is unclear at this time if all four of the Level 3 signs will ever be utilized.

Ms. Martin presented a Canopy Edge Address sign that is only permitted over entrances to public lobbies. She said a retail tenant would be permitted to just have their business name.

Ms. Martin said the applicant has included graphics, which depict a variety of sign types. She explained Canopy Edge signs must be mounted flush with the top of Level 1 and the bottom of Level 2 to anchor it just above the retail tenant space it is associated with. She presented an example of a restaurant Placemaking Art sign that may not extend any taller than 20 feet into Level 2.

Ms. Martin reviewed the Master Sign Plan Criteria to:

- a) Allow a greater degree of flexibility and creativity in sign design and display.
- b) Ensure sign work is in a coordinated fashion to meet the general intent of signs in the District.
- c) Not intended to permit larger signs, more visible signs, or additional signs than permitted, without any consideration for unique sign design and display.

Ms. Martin said the BSD Sign Guidelines also provide some guidance ensuring that the signs in a MSP should provide direction and be pedestrian focused but remain visible to those traveling by other modes – bicycle on a cycle track, car on Riverside Drive.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for the Master Sign Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the MSP be updated to reflect that a Leasing Window Covering is a sign type not requiring a permit; and

- 2) That the applicant correct all page references and provide the revised approved MSP to Planning, prior to sign permitting.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward to present.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place N, #600, Dublin, Ohio, 43017, recalled the great feedback received at the last meeting with the PZC. He stated the letter height was incorporated into the plan confirming the first and second levels are permitted three feet and for the third level, four feet is permitted. He said they included a disclaimer that in some cases, that may be limited by the architecture. He noted the building rendered for the Commission's packets that provided examples of signs appropriate for different tenants. He said he brought images to show size and context, specifically the 80-square-foot sign permitted for building C2 on Level 3 that would happen 50 feet above grade. He presented the Columbia Gas sign visible from I-270, which is 90 square feet at 50 feet above grade. He also presented sign types from Grandview Yard.

To address the question about phone numbers being permitted on Leasing Window Covering signs, Mr. Starr said it would be nice to include phone numbers but he is fine with what he is permitted.

Mr. Brown said a small phone number could be incorporated gracefully at the pedestrian level. He made it clear he is not anti-Crawford Hoying but this is a Bridge Park development and an occasional Crawford Hoying phone number would be fine; he does not want to see Crawford Hoying repeated over and over in a row.

Deb Mitchell asked if there were guidelines about the usage of the Bridge Park logo versus Crawford Hoying's logo. Mr. Starr answered there are guidelines.

Ms. Husak encouraged the applicant to be careful about regulating what the signs actually state. Phil Hartmann noted the recent Supreme Court case.

Mr. Starr said they decided this area is to be considered a neighborhood, and as such, the buildings would just have addresses as a simple identifier rather than building names, and the directories were moved inside for a cleaner look. He indicated they envisioned the first time someone wants to visit, they would look up the address on a Google map and walk to the lobby. He asked Joell Chumbly to address the questions about parking signs.

Joell Angel-Chumbly, Kolar Design, Inc., 807 Broadway, 5th Fl, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45202, said they have been working with the City on developing a comprehensive wayfinding program for Dublin. She stated it has been approved and close to fabrication on the signs that is part of the broader system. She explained the parking sign is an extension of the vehicular experience so upon disembarking the highway, there is a series of sign types that will guide the visitors to the parking garages. She said "Parking" is a message on all the wayfinding signs with the circle "P" being an identifier for public parking. She said the circle "P" is used for the entire wayfinding system for the City as well as the Bridge Park development, which leads drivers to parking garages or the lots that already exist in the Historic District. She said the word "PARK" will stylistically look dimensional with a LED chain light on the inside of the open channel and on others, the LED chain lighting will be on the edge so it gives it a glowing light blue effect when illuminated at night. She said there is a smaller scale version on the secondary entrances to the garages but the personality of the sign is the same.

Ms. Salay questioned the office buildings being permitted four signs. She asked if this would be from the same tenant or different tenants.

Ms. Martin emphasized the additional level - Level 3, only occurs on building C2. She said between all four elevations, there are only four sign locations that occur on Level 3. She noted the large majority of this MSP does not permit wall signs up to 80 square feet.

Mr. Starr explained there are only two locations on the front; he said Crawford Hoying is likely to have their sign on one and another tenant close to signing would have the other. He said the other two places remain for signs on the north and south elevations. Ms. Salay confirmed there would be two signs on the western elevation of building C2.

Mr. Starr said Crawford Hoying would probably have a horizontal sign on the top band.

Mr. Brown said the only sign he objects to on building C2 is the Placemaking Art sign on the south of that glass tower. He said that glass band element was an architectural element being highlighted so he is surprised to see a Placemaking Art sign in front of it, which appears out of place with the character of the building. He said it also shows up on the western elevation as a potential sign location, which he also thought was odd; he assumed there would be one or the other, not both.

Mr. Starr recognized that as well. He said potential locations were identified but not all will be utilized. He said they are working with a specific tenant on that at the north end of the building, the west elevation. He indicated they may choose to use it, they may not. He said Mr. Brown's comment is fair on the Window sign.

Mr. Brown said the Commission spent some time on that particular element and would hate to see it covered up, particularly with something that large along with all the other things that might occur on that building as far as signs are concerned.

Victoria Newell said she agreed with Mr. Brown's point.

Ms. Salay inquired about the Placemaking Art sign location because it appeared to be tucked back. She said if it is a glowing vertical sign like the parking sign, she would not like it but if it is an art piece, it might be ok.

Ms. Martin said there is an option for two Placemaking Art signs but it would be up to the landlord's discretion and one tenant would not have two of them. Mr. Starr said you are really only going to have one of those locations.

Cathy De Rosa said it could be interesting, not knowing what it is. She indicated part of this is to give a little serendipity.

Ms. Mitchell said the location would not be appropriate for a literal sign with letters but perhaps it would be okay for a piece of art.

The Chair said she was concerned about eliminating that sign altogether because she wants flexibility for the applicant. Mr. Brown suggested taking it out of the landlord's hand by eliminating it; they could still bring it back.

Mr. Starr said if he was approached with a good sign, he would bring it back to the PZC for review.

Ms. De Rosa questioned permitting Parking Marquee signs up to 150 square feet. Ms. Martin confirmed 150 square feet is permitted but not all of these sign types are going to be 150 square feet. She said what was demonstrated in the illustrations would be permitted.

Mr. Starr said the largest sign proposed is 150 square feet.

Ms. De Rosa referred back to the criteria for which to evaluate sign designs. She indicated the parking sign is not as attractive as it could be and drivers might have trouble reading Longshore Way, etc. She stated she is not enthusiastic about the signs at all. She said she understands the goal is standard wayfinding so if every sign in the City is to look like that, the Commission is struggling with that design. She said it appears very large and full of light and not as aesthetically pleasing as the other examples presented.

Mr. Starr said from a size standpoint, this is one of the few signs that have to be visible from a vehicle. Ms. De Rosa said people understand the meaning of a circle "P". Ms. Mitchell again asked if the word "PARK" has to be spelled out because the circle "P" is the universal sign for parking.

Mr. Starr said it was an interesting design element with the lighted letters to bring vibrancy to the sign. He said there are two parking garages both on Longshore and Mooney Streets and they are named as such. Ms. De Rosa said it makes more sense to focus on the name of the garage instead of the word "PARK".

Mr. Brown asked what happens on the next blocks, across the street and would the lighted sign be outside someone's bedroom window. He said "PARK" is really large. He agreed circle "P" is the universal sign for parking.

Ms. Salay said the "PARK" sign comes under the City's purview, not Crawford Hoying's. Mr. Starr said Crawford Hoying had some input into the design of the "PARK" sign.

Ms. De Rosa said all you really see any more in other communities are the circle "P"s.

Mr. Starr said Crawford Hoying is spending a lot of money to make the garages look nice so just using circle "P" signs would do a disservice to the architectural design on the structure. He offered to look at alternatives to coordinate with the wayfinding efforts. He said he likes the "PARK" sign but is not going to fall on the sword for that particular sign.

Ms. Salay said the City's consultant, Ms. Chumbly, if she understood what the Commission was saying in terms of aesthetic and the naming of the garages.

Ms. Chumbly explained the large marquee sign is meant to be visual from a distance, calling out the entrance to the garage but the primary identifier are the tin-mounted, 18-inch letters at the entries to the garages that are dimensional and state the name of the garage, ex. Longshore or Mooney. She emphasized that becomes the primary identifier for knowing which garage the driver is coming in and out of. She said the sign "PARK" with the arrow is for a retail garage. She indicated the difference is incorporating a more functional system that supports both the private and public entity in terms of how the user understands the navigation. She said the whole premise of wayfinding is to get people out of their cars. She said they enforced and were mindful of how the wayfinding messaging guides the visitor to the front door of some destinations if parking exists there but also trying to get people into the surface lots or parking garages, out of their cars and on their feet. She said they created a system that had continuity, functionality, and an aesthetic where the user was clear that this was part of the overall system. She offered to explore other solutions but this was meant to be a classic design that is also functional, with personality through the fabrication method including dimension, beautiful lighting, and integration with the architecture. She said a "festive" design would be a completely different philosophy.

Mr. Brown said to put it into perspective, the Placemaking Art signs are limited to 20 feet above the second floor line whereas the parking signs can go beyond that, which he is not comfortable with. He indicated he understands it is appealing to the driver but chances are there will be residential across the street.

Ms. Chumbly responded these are only on Longshore Street; they were mindful of residential areas. She said on the C Block garage, there is no residential above on that side of the building. She said the same is true on the Mooney garage; the sign is placed where the residential units do not face out. She indicated if a person is in the hotel, the light pollution might be an issue. She said they tried to avoid light beams on residential balconies. She said for buildings C5 and B5, the large marquee signs are placed in areas that would not happen. She said the smaller marquee signs are on secondary entrances. She said the height is 21 feet but she asked if Mr. Brown's concerns were in part of how the sign hangs on the building.

Mr. Brown said overall size is an issue along with the dimension of the stubs that hold it out. He said part of it is the Longshore Street element. He agreed a sign on Longshore avoids some of the residential areas but for Mooney and Block F, it is unknown what will be placed there in the future and that is what the PZC has to anticipate.

Ms. Mitchell said this really troubles her because she does not understand why we have to tell people in big letters, where there is parking. She said she works in a place where parking is at a premium but none of the garages have this kind of signage. She indicated this is very artful and she appreciates what Kolar Design has done but does not understand why a big sign that states "PARK" is needed.

Ms. Chumbly said the signs were viewed as Placemaking Art signs on Longshore because that is going to be a primary retail, restaurant corridor and the sign adds life and vibrancy to the streetscape. She said the large letters are a graphic expression on the marquee type sign for more personality. She restated alternatives can be explored.

Ms. Martin said from a staff perspective, they were supportive of the larger signs to cast shadows to add interest to the large blank walls.

Ms. De Rosa suggested then that creative exploration be encouraged and 150 square feet is too large.

Mr. Brown said he did not think it was that big but certainly larger than anything else, which does bother him. He said he understands trying to make it a more enticing area but it is a parking garage that looks like a parking garage.

Bob Miller said he appreciates the Parking Marquee signs to help people navigate and likes the "idiot proof" route. He said if you are used to the area, this is overkill but if you are coming in from out-of-town, this has value but would like to see some other creative ways to make the signs smaller as 150 square feet seems too large.

Mr. Starr said these signs are not for the locals like himself; they are for all the out-of-towners we hope to attract, generated by the event center and hotel. He offered to bring the signs back with different designs and sizes for the PZC to review as well as additional examples.

Mr. Miller noted that was a good idea. He said he did not intend to slow down the developer but this is worth taking a little extra time for.

Mr. Starr said 50% of the garage is built so the applicant needs to get these signs fabricated to be installed later this summer or early fall. He asked for approval of the MSP with the exception of the parking signs that could be brought back later.

Ms. Martin said it could be an amendment to this MSP.

The Chair asked also for the limitation of that sign in the one location on building C2.

Ms. Salay asked if the parking signs for the City's wayfinding system would all be the same or would the different neighborhoods have a different "flavor".

Mr. Papsidero said he would assume the City would have a consistent wayfinding system. He said there is a separate issue regarding the management of on-street parking as well as the City-owned garages that Staff has been working on to review with City Council in the near future to discuss options. He stated in terms of wayfinding, it should be consistent across the board to provide clarity for the public.

Ms. Salay said her point is we are selecting signs for these garages but we are also then determining a flavor for the entire Bridge Street District, including all parking garages.

Ms. Chumbly said the system is designed so all the garages in the Bridge Park development would have the same sign and just the name of the garage would change (per the location). She said even the one by the library would have a similar design as part of the system.

Ms. Salay said Staff needs to think about that as we all come together at City Council.

Ms. Chumbly said Kolar Designs, Inc. could provide some nice benchmarks from other cities that have done parking systems as their wayfinding system. Ms. Salay said that would be helpful as City Council is considering parking authorities and such. Ms. Chumbly said the examples would be more in line with what they are doing versus every garage having a different flavor.

Ms. Salay indicated a tone is being set for the future.

Mr. Papsidero said there could be flexibility so a sign could be somewhat unique given the location like in Historic Dublin. He said the character could be a little different based on the architecture of the building but still in this system "family".

Ms. Salay said we have to think beyond just Bridge Park.

Ms. Martin said she had prepared two conditions but two more are added per tonight's discussion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown made a motion, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with four conditions:

- 1) That the MSP be updated to reflect that a leasing window covering is a sign type not requiring a permit;
- 2) That the applicant correct all page references and provide the revised approved MSP to Planning, prior to sign permitting;
- 3) That the proposed Placemaking Art sign adjacent to the tower element of the west façade of building C2 be eliminated; and
- 4) That the provisions for all garage parking signs be eliminated to be brought back at a later date.

*Matt Starr agreed with the conditions.

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

**2. BSD SRN – Capitol Cadillac – Sign
15-096MSP**

**4300 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Master Sign Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the installation of a new wall sign for a car dealership at the northeast corner of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065 and 153.066. She stated this remained on the Consent Agenda.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

**3. BSD SCN- Bridge Park, Block A
16-001DP-SP**

**Riverside Drive and Dublin-Granville Road
Development Plan – Site Plan Reviews**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the third phase of development for previously approved Block A of the Bridge Park development, including a hotel, conference center, parking garage and reserves for private drives. She said the site is located at the northeast corner of the Riverside Drive and Dublin-Granville Road intersection. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Development Plan and Site Plan with associated Waivers, a Parking Plan and as Conditional Use for a conference/event center and parking structure under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.236. The Commission is the final authority on this application and anyone intending to address the Commission will need to be sworn-in.

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

Marie Downie presented six motions:

1. Conditional Use – Parking Structure
2. Conditional Use – Event Center
3. Site Plan Waivers (34 proposed)
4. Parking Plan
5. Development Plan
6. Site Plan

Ms. Downie said City Council approved the Basic and Site Plans in December 2015 and the Preliminary/Final Plats were approved by PZC and City Council in January 2016. She reported the ART recommended approval of the Development and Site Plan on February 11, 2016. She said once approved, the applicant can move onto building permitting. She said the next steps will be:

1. Master Sign Plan – ART and PZC
2. Potential Minor Project Reviews – ART
3. Building Permitting

Ms. Downie presented the aerial view of the site. She noted there are two 20-foot-wide private service streets with an 11-foot, one-way access point from SR 161 - Mooney Way and Longshore Loop. She said Mooney Way is located on the property to the east that is owned by Acura. She said a condition has been added that a public access easement for the service street be executed and recorded prior to the approval of any building or site improvement permits. She said there is a 20-foot hotel drop-off/pick-up area and an eight-foot drop-off/pick-up area for the event center.

Ms. Downie said the Site Plan includes more details regarding the siting of the buildings and the surrounding uses. She said the three buildings proposed include two corridor buildings and a parking structure.

Ms. Downie presented the proposed event center situated directly northeast of the future roundabout for SR 161 and Riverside Drive. She noted an associated open space directly north of the proposed building that will be used mainly as public open space but will be closed during private events with a public access easement to the north along the hotel that will remain open for pedestrians to flow from the roundabout through to Longshore Loop.

Ms. Downie presented the proposed hotel, southeast of the intersection with Riverside Drive and Banker Drive. She said it includes 150 guest rooms with guest services on the first floor and a rooftop bar, which is accessed from Banker Drive. She said final landscape plans will be reviewed for the open space at the northeast corner of this lot.

Ms. Downie presented the proposed parking structure with a focal point on the accent wall visible from the roundabout through the event center open space. She noted a small retail tenant space is located at the corner of Banker Drive and Longshore Loop. She said the structure will contain 468 parking spaces with nine additional spaces along Banker Drive. She said the proposal includes thin brick and metal panels as primary materials for this lot and the vehicular access points are along Longshore Loop and Mooney Way. She stated a parking plan is required to permit an excess of 128 parking spaces and the loading spaces along the service streets. She indicated that if additional parking is required or needed for Lot 7 in the future, the applicant has indicated the possibility of adding a story onto this parking structure with approval by PZC.

The Chair asked if there were any questions for Staff.

Cathy De Rosa asked for clarification for on-street parking. Ms. Downie said the on-street parking is just on Banker Drive and the temporary pick-up/drop-off areas are only on Mooney Way and Longshore Loop.

Amy Salay asked about the line of trees depicted in front of the event center. Ms. Downie confirmed the trees run along the sidewalk.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, Dublin, OH, thanked Staff as they were able to move swiftly through this process, meeting with Crawford Hoying at least once a week. He explained they have been working with Reveal Visuals for animations for City Council. He presented an updated version of the first slide he has always used showing the whole proposed development for the first three phases – much of which will be open and operational by Spring 2017. He said with the first two blocks (B & C), the groundwork was laid for residential, office, retail, and restaurant use to create this neighborhood. He announced two new tenants that have arrived – RAM Restaurant and Brewery and Mesh Fitness.

Mr. Hunter said tonight we are talking about Block A – the hotel, event center, and parking garage but hopefully there will soon be a grocery store, to truly make this a special neighborhood. He presented some of the changes since City Council's review. He noted how the event space had changed architecturally as well as the wall being softened in front of the event space with plant material. He provided a sneak preview of the pavilion at the right side of the hotel, which will need to be brought back at a later date. He presented a new material – High Performance Concrete that is a far more durable product that can be custom-matched to get the same texture and color for a natural fiber look. He noted many of the canopies were simplified. He presented the metal panel that creates a nice mosaic effect for the focal wall of the parking garage. He said some of the panels have been replaced with glass so when inside the parking garage, people will be able to see out and it will also create a mosaic on the inside as well. Based on past feedback, he said they made a lot of changes to the parking garage, adding more

brick and created a simpler style. He said the first floor at the corner of Banker Drive and Longshore Street will house a tenant to make sure that area is activated with retail or restaurant use, etc.

Mr. Hunter explained why thin brick is being used – speed and simplicity of construction. He provided an example where thin brick was installed properly (Worthington Place) which can be installed right next to the concrete.

Mr. Hunter presented an illustration of the event center at dusk to show how it might light up at night. He said this is going to be extremely visible when coming across the SR 161 Bridge.

Ms. Downie restated there are 34 Waivers. She reported the ART has recommended approval of all 34 Waivers due to the unique lot configuration, street layout, uses, and architecture. She said the ART noted that the number of Waivers in no way reflects the quality of the architecture proposed. The Chair requested Ms. Downie go over each Waiver:

1. Accessory Structures shall be in the buildable area of the lot; A request to allow an accessory structure on Lot 6, to be within the 5-foot side yard setback and encroach Lot 5.
2. Parapet roofs shall be between 2 feet – 6 feet in height; A request to allow the height of parapet over the pre-function space and restroom area of building A2 to be approximately 10 inches in height, and a parapet varying in height from 7.45 feet to 8.75 feet surrounding the rooftop mechanical well. A request to allow the height of parapet over the area of the rooftop mechanical well of building A3 to be approximately 9 feet in height.
3. Permitted materials are stone, brick, and glass; a request to allow aluminum composite metal panels as a primary material for the entire block; a request to allow thin brick and ultra-high performance concrete as secondary materials for the entire block; and a request to allow concrete panel as a secondary material for the parking structure.
4. 75% FPL Coverage; event center- Only one story - should minimum story waiver be approved this waiver is no longer needed; hotel - 51.62% FPL along Banker Drive.
5. Permit a private patio to meet the corner occupation requirements.
6. Rear Yard setbacks for corridor buildings are 5 feet - event center - 0 feet; hotel – 2.89 feet and encroachment of the vehicular canopy.
7. 90% of the lot is permitted to be covered by impervious and semi-pervious coverage – event center- 96% of impervious and semi-pervious coverage combined.
8. Corridor buildings are required to be 3 stories – event center - 1 story and hotel - 1 story along Longshore Loop.
9. 60% transparency is required – she noted the percentages proposed due to the internal use and architecture of the building.
10. 30% transparency is required along upper street facing stories; hotel - 13% on 8th story due to mechanicals, utility rooms, restrooms, etc.
11. 15% transparency required on non-street facing facades; event center - 11% due to the internal use of the building; and hotel - 4% on 8th story.
12. Blank walls are prohibited – She noted the locations of proposed blank walls.

13. Principal entrances are required along Primary Street Façade - event center and hotel are proposed along Longshore Loop due to the pick-up/drop-off areas for the guests.
14. Entrances are required every 75 feet, however due to the use of these buildings, the highlighted entrances are proposed.
15. Vertical increments are required every 45 feet - The vertical increments proposed for the event center are shown in red. No vertical increments are proposed for the hotel.
16. Horizontal Façade Divisions are required on buildings 3 stories and taller; a request to permit the hotel to have partial horizontal façade divisions on the north, south, and west elevations.
17. Facades are required to be 80% primary materials; the numbers with the asterisks indicate the percentages including ACM as a primary material.
18. 20% of the façade is permitted to be secondary materials; hotel south elevation is proposed at 54% secondary material. (Ultra-High Performance Concrete- it's the reddish material)
19. A shed roof is proposed on the event center.
20. This is a request to permit a canopy encroaching the right-of-way on the retail portion of the parking structure along Banker Drive.
21. The rear yard setback is required to be 5 feet for the parking structure; the proposal varies from 0 4.33 feet.
22. The parking structure is proposed at 95% impervious coverage while a maximum of 80% is permitted.
23. The building entrances for the garage are indicated in yellow; the Code requirement is intended for storefronts, not parking structures; one entrance is provided along the south elevation, which the report indicates is zero.
24. This is a request for vertical increments as indicated in the red on the screen.
25. This is a request to permit thin brick and metal panels as primary materials on the parking structure.
26. She noted the proposed percentages for primary materials.
27. She noted the proposed percentages for secondary materials.
28. Towers are required to be in specific locations; this is a request to permit the two towers indicated on the screen.
29. One tower is permitted; two are proposed; the height and width of the towers are indicated on the screen as well.
30. Pocket Parks are required to be within .10 and .5 acres; there is a gap in the classifications in the Zoning Code requirements; this open space is within the gap, therefore, a Waiver is requested to consider this .06-acre open space a pocket park.
31. Two exit lanes are proposed while three are required.

32. Ceiling clearance height is proposed at 9 feet along Banker Drive while 12 feet is required.
33. Retaining walls; this is including a Waiver in the Site Plan that the landscape materials be provided where the wall exceeds 4 feet.
34. Rooftop mechanicals are required to be screened to the full height; this is a request to permit the screening to be less than the height of the mechanicals.

The Chair asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak on behalf of this case. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Downie presented the six motions requested:

1. Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for a Conditional Use for the Parking Structure with no conditions.
2. Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for a Conditional Use for the Conference/Event Center with no conditions.
3. Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for a Development Plan Review with three conditions:
 - 1) That a mid-block pedestrianway between the event center and office be provided with the development of Lot 7;
 - 2) That signs be posted indicating Mooney Way as a fire lane meeting the requirements of Dublin Fire Code Section D103.3; and
 - 3) That any inconsistencies on the plans be revised and a final version be submitted for final Staff review and approval.
4. Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for a Parking Plan with two conditions:
 - 1) That the required number of ADA spaces be provided (Per Chapter 11 of the Ohio Building Code, current edition); and
 - 2) That a detailed outline of delivery times shall be submitted for Staff review to confirm that no deliveries will be made during peak pick-up/drop-off times.
5. Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for each of the 34 Site Plan Waivers:
 1. §153.062(B)(3)(e) – Accessory Structures – 5-foot setback required; 0-foot setback with encroachment onto Lot 5 requested.
 2. §153.062(D)(1)(a)2 – Parapet Roof Height – Parapet roofs with a height between 2 ft. and 6 ft. required; 10-inch parapet over the pre-function area/restroom on building A2, 7.45 ft. – 8.75 ft. parapet over the rooftop mechanical equipment on building A2, and a 9 ft. parapet on building A3 requested.
 3. §153.062(E)(1) – Façade Materials – stone, brick and glass permitted primary materials and glass fiber reinforced gypsum, wood siding, fiber cement siding metal and exterior architectural metal panels and cladding permitted secondary materials; aluminum composite metal panels proposed as a primary material for the block, thin brick and ultra-high performance concrete proposed as

secondary materials for the block, and concrete panels proposed as secondary material for building A4.

4. §153.062(O)(5)(a)1 – Front Property Line Coverage – minimum of 75% front property line coverage; front property line coverage for one story for building A2 proposed, 51.62% front property line coverage for building A3 along Banker Drive proposed.
5. §153.062(O)(5)(a)1 – Building Types, Corridor Buildings, Building Siting, Street Frontage, Occupation of Corner - Occupation of corner is required; a private patio to meet the corner occupation requirement at the corner of Riverside Drive and Banker Drive for building A3 requested.
6. §153.062(O)(5)(a)2 – Building Types, Corridor Buildings, Buildable Area, Rear Yard Setback – Rear Yard Setback, 5 feet; A request to allow building A2 and A3 to have the following rear yard setbacks:
 - o Building A2: 0-foot. rear yard setback
 - o Building A3: 2.89-foot building rear yard setback and encroachment of vehicular canopy.
7. §153.062(O)(5)(a)2 – Building Types, Corridor Buildings, Building Siting, Buildable Area, Semi-Pervious Lot Coverage – Lots are permitted 80% impervious coverage. Once the 80% is reached, an additional 10% of semi-pervious lot coverage is permitted; request to allow building A2 to have an additional 27% of semi-pervious lot coverage.
8. §153.062(O)(5)(b) – Building Types, Corridor Buildings, Height, Minimum Building Height Minimum of 3 stories;
 - o Building A2: A request to permit one story.
 - o Building A3: A request to permit one story along Longshore Loop.
9. §153.062(O)(5)(d)1 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency, Ground Story Street Facing Transparency – A minimum of 60% transparency is required on ground story street facing façades;
 - o Building A2: A request to permit 15% transparency along the west elevation (Riverside Drive), and 26% transparency along the east elevation (Longshore Loop).
 - o Building A3: A request to permit 52% transparency along the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 48% transparency along the north elevation (Banker Drive) and 31% transparency along the east elevation (Longshore Loop).
10. §153.062(O)(5)(d)1 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency, Transparency – A minimum of 30% transparency is required on upper stories along street façades; A request to permit 13% transparency on the 8th story along the east elevation (Longshore Loop) on building A3.
11. §153.062(O)(5)(d)2 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Non-Street Façade Transparency, Transparency – A minimum of 15% transparency required on non-street facades;
 - o Building A2: A request to permit 11% transparency along the south elevation.
 - o Building A3: A request to permit 4% transparency on the 8th story along the south elevation.

12. §153.062(O)(5)(d)1-2 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations – Blank walls are prohibited on both street facing and non-street facing facades;
 - Building A2: A request to permit a blank wall on the southern portion of the west elevation and the middle portion of the south elevation.
 - Building A3: A request to permit blank walls on the west elevation of the 8th story, north elevation of the 2nd – 7th stories, south elevation on the 1st – 8th stories and the east elevation on the 3rd – 8th stories.

13. §153.062(O)(5)(d)3 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Building Entrance, Principal Entrance Location –The Principal Entrance is required along a Primary Street Façade;
 - Building A2: A request to permit the principal entrance to be located along Longshore Loop.
 - Building A3: A request to permit the principal entrance to be located along Longshore Loop.

14. §153.062(O)(5)(d)3 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Building Entrance, Street Facades: Number of Entrances – Street Façade Entrances are required once every 75 feet;
 - Building A2: A request to permit one entrance located along Longshore Loop while three are required.
 - Building A3: A request to permit 1 entrance along the west elevation while 3 are required, 1 entrance along the north elevation while 2 are required, and 2 entrances along the east elevation while 3 are required.

15. §153.062(O)(5)(d)4 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Façade Divisions, Vertical Increments – Vertical Increments are required every 45 feet;
 - Building A2: A request to allow the following vertical increments:
 - South Elevation: ±73 feet, ±90 feet
 - East Elevation: ±55 feet, ±78 feet
 - North Elevation: ±98 feet, ±113 feet
 - Building A3: A request to allow no vertical increments.

16. §153.062(O)(5)(d)4 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Façade Divisions, Horizontal Façade Divisions – Horizontal Façade Divisions are required on buildings 3 stories and taller, within 3 feet of the top of the ground story and required at any building step-back; A request to permit Building A3 a partial (non-continuous) horizontal façade division along the north, south and west elevations and no divisions at the step-back along the east elevation.

17. §153.062(E)(1)(a) – Building Types, Material, Façade Materials – A minimum of 80% of facades shall be primary materials;
 - Building A2: A request to allow the following percentages of primary materials:
 - West Elevation: 59%/*96%
 - North Elevation: 66%/*93%
 - East Elevation: 54%/*96%
 - South Elevation: 74%/*97%

 - Building A3: A request to allow the following percentages of primary materials:
 - West Elevation: 64%/*88%
 - North Elevation: 41%/*80%
 - East Elevation: 31%/*86%

- South Elevation: 22%/*46%
**Including ACM as Primary Material*

18. §153.062(E)(1)(a) – Building Types, Material, Façade Materials – A maximum of 20% of facades may be secondary materials; A request for the south elevation of building A3 to consist of 54% secondary materials.
19. §153.062(O)(5)(d)6 – Building Type, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Roof Types, Permitted Types – Permitted roof types include parapet, pitched and flat; A request to permit a shed roof on building A2.
20. §153.062(O)(12)(a)1 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Building Siting, Street Frontage, Right-of-Way Encroachment – right-of-way encroachments are not permitted; A request to allow the canopy along the retail portion of building A4 to encroach over the Banker Drive right-of-way.
21. §153.062(O)(12)(a)2 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Building Siting, Buildable Area, Rear Yard Setback–Rear yard setback, 5 feet; A request to allow the rear yard setback for building A4 to vary from 0 - 4.33 feet along Longshore Loop.
22. §153.062(O)(12)(a)2 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Building Siting, Buildable Area, Impervious Coverage – Lots are permitted 80% Impervious Coverage; A request to allow building A4 to have 95% impervious coverage.
23. §153.062(O)(12)(d)3 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Façade Requirements, Building Entrance, Street Facades: Number of Entrances – Street Façade Entrances are required once every 75 feet; A request to permit building A4 1 entrance along the north elevation while 4 are required, 1 entrance along the east elevation while 3 are required, 1 entrance along the south elevation while 3 are required and 2 along the west elevation while 3 are required.
24. §153.062(O)(12)(d)4 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Façade Requirements, Façade Divisions, Vertical Increments – Vertical Increments are required every 30 feet.; A request to allow vertical increments at 35.39 feet apart along the east elevation and 39.27 feet apart along the west elevation of building A4.
25. §153.062(O)(12)(d)5 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Façade Requirements, Façade Materials, Permitted Primary Materials – Permitted primary materials include brick, stone and glass; A request to permit thin brick and metal panels as primary materials for building A4.
26. §153.062(E)(1)(a) – Building Types, Materials, Façade Materials Minimum of 80% primary façade materials; – A request to allow the following percentages of primary materials on building A4:
 - North Elevation: 24%/*79%
 - South Elevation: 13%/*71%
 - West Elevation: 21%/*97%
 - East Elevation: 16%/*92%**Including Thin Brick and ACM as Primary Materials*
27. §153.062(E)(1)(a) – Building Types, Material, Façade Materials – A maximum of 20% of facades may be secondary materials; A request for following percentage of secondary materials on building A4:
 - North Elevation: 76%/*21%

- South Elevation: 87%/*29%
- West Elevation: 79%/*3%
- East Elevation: 84%/*8%

**Including Thin Brick and ACM as Primary Materials*

28. §153.062(O)(12)(b)6 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Façade Requirements, Roof Type, Tower – Towers are permitted on facades only at terminal vistas, corners at two PFS, and/or adjacent to an open space type; A request to permit towers on building A4 at the southeast corner of Longshore Loop and Mooney Way and at Longshore Loop at the terminal vista across from the proposed private open space for.
 29. §153.062(D)(4) – Building Type, Roof Type Requirements, Towers – One tower is permitted per building. A request to permit two towers on building A4. – Maximum height of towers may not exceed the height of one additional upper story and the width should not exceed the height. A request to permit the following tower dimensions on building A4:
 - Southeast tower: 15.75 feet high, 27.57 feet wide
 - West tower: ±17.70 feet high and 39.27 feet wide
 30. §153.064(F)(2) – Open Space Types, Refer to Table 153.064-A. – Pocket Parks are required to be between .10- and .50-acre; A request to permit the proposed pocket park located at the southwest corner of Banker Drive and Longshore Loop to be .06-acre.
 31. §153.065(B)(5)(a)1 – Site Development Standards, Parking and Loading, Parking Structure Design, Entrance/Exit Lanes. – Parking structures are required an exit lane for every 200 parking spaces; A request to permit 2 exit lanes, while 3 are required.
 32. §153.065(B)(5)(c)3 – Site Development Standards, Parking and Loading, Parking Structure Design, Interior Circulation. – A minimum ceiling clearance height of 12 feet is required where parking structures have frontage; A request to permit a ceiling clearance of 9 feet along Banker Drive.
 33. §153.065(E)(1)(b) – 4 Site Development Standards, Fencing, Walls and Screening, Fence and Wall Height and Opacity. – Retaining walls extending above grade are limited in height to 4 feet or be more than 50% opaque; A request to permit retaining walls along Riverside Drive/SR 161 varying in height up to 7 feet with one.
 34. §153.065(E)(3)(b)2 – Site Development Standards, Fencing, Walls and Screening, Rooftop Mounted Mechanical Equipment. – All roof mounted mechanical units are required to be screened to the full height of the proposed unit; A request to permit the parapet height on Building A3 (36 inches) to be less than the height of the proposed Utility and Exhaust Fans (46 inches and ±63 inches).
6. Ms. Downie said approval is recommended for 18 conditions **(the 19th one added tonight)**
- 1) That any inconsistencies on the plans be revised and a final version be submitted for final Staff review and approval;
 - 2) That Conditional Use applications be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the proposed parking structure and event center;

- 3) That patio and outdoor dining details be reviewed and approved by Staff. Any modifications to the site or building will require a Minor Project Review prior to installation;
- 4) That a Master Sign Plan be submitted for separate review and approval;
- 5) That additional details be reviewed and approved as part of the building permit and Master Sign Plan regarding the building entrances on building A4 including but not limited to illumination and mounting details of the canopy;
- 6) That any additional required open space be provided with the development of Lot 7;
- 7) That a comprehensive Parking Plan be submitted indicating opportunities for shared parking;
- 8) That details of the proposed bicycle racks be provided for Staff review and approval;
- 9) That a detailed outline of delivery times and passenger pick-up/drop-off be submitted for Staff review and approval;
- 10) That the retaining walls along Riverside Drive/SR 161 be softened with plant materials as outlined in this report;
- 11) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to improve the percentage of pervious hardscape in the open spaces;
- 12) That a revised Photometric Plan should be resubmitted with Building Permits;
- 13) That the applicant verify whether cameras will monitor pedestrian activity from a remote location, or if other security measures will be taken, at building permitting;
- 14) That the applicant provide a more detailed description of the exterior cladding materials in the areas identified as exceeding the blank wall limitations to verify that these materials provide adequate visual interest and are architecturally appropriate to the proposed building design;
- 15) That the applicant provide additional information regarding the use of irrigation systems for Staff approval;
- 16) That a final landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Forester and the Director of Parks and Open Space prior to permit approval;
- 17) That the applicant work with Staff to provide increased access to the open space along Banker Drive;
- 18) That additional information including examples of successful installation of thin brick at a similar scale be provided for the PZC review; and
- 19) That the public access easement for the portion of Mooney Way that is on the adjacent Acura dealership property be executed and recorded prior to approval of any building or site improvement permit, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Chris Brown asked Staff what the public opinion is on public versus private roads and what the implications are. He asked if parking is in compliance with everything Engineering would like to see.

Aaron Stanford said they determined Longshore Loop to be a private service street due to the character and function in that area – largely used for drop-off/pick-up for the hotel. He stated that is what a service street is intended to do per the BSD Code. He said they also considered long-term maintenance and cost. He said there is a lot of custom material proposed for that area, which is not typical for the City to maintain. He noted the street will be built to City standards for durability and strength, which is an advantage. He said the street was also analyzed for adequate fire truck maneuverability. He reported they also considered traffic generation. He said the street network map, part of the BSD Code, also guided them illustrating the public street network ends at Banker Drive. He indicated a large portion of vehicles turning to Longshore Loop are really intended in that area so there will not be a lot of pass-through traffic. He said a disadvantage is the City's slight reduction of controlling authority in this area, which they determined is not a great risk.

Mr. Stanford said Banker Drive, by the nature of the median that will be constructed on Riverside Drive, would be right-in/right-out from Riverside Drive. He said Mooney Way from SR 161 is a right-in only access and they worked to narrow that area. He said the intersection at Longshore/Mooney can get a little tricky from the geometry and the function of how that all works being a one-way street coming in intersecting a through-way with two other streets that are two-ways. He said there will be some additional signing and pavement markings for that area.

Mr. Brown asked if there are any issues with the pick-up/drop-off area. Mr. Stanford indicated if it was combined with on-street parking it would have been confusing. He said one of the goals of our street network is to be more pedestrian-friendly and this lends itself to that principle.

Ms. Husak recalled that when the PZC recommended approval of the Plat and City Council approved the Plat, the street sections and right-of-ways were all included.

Ms. Salay said she thought City Council had discussed enhancing the parking garage so it did not look so much like a parking garage. She said the concern was the openings were going to glow at night. She said this design is not very special but she cannot find the comments in the Council minutes. She asked the applicant if they considered doing something with the openings to soften the light flooding out.

Mr. Hunter said this particular garage is more challenging because it curves around the corner and there are some segmented materials that do not work as well with that. He said the conversations they have had with Staff resulted in not copying what had been designed for other garages, particularly those in the Arena District. He said not all of those have fins or metal panels; some are very simple structures, elegantly detailed and that does not come through on some of these renderings. He said the thin brick allows them to change the brick pattern. He indicated they paid attention to those sort of details and let it be a parking garage.

Mr. Brown inquired about the plaza between the event center and the hotel. He asked how a tent can be erected with those lights coming across. Mr. Hunter replied he thought the lights were high enough not to be a problem but they could be removed.

Ms. Newell indicated she liked the lights in that area but questioned the overall intensity. She asked if there is a way to dim the lights or if there is a particular lighting level they are considering to provide security but also a really nice ambiance so it is somewhat subdued and not glaring with the amount of lights shown.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, 300 Spruce Street, Suite 300, Columbus, Ohio 43215, said the lights are not dimmable yet but they are considering the photometrics and will be issuing the matrix with documentation to staff. She agreed they wanted an ambiance effect and not lighting you might find at a car dealership.

Mr. Brown suggested color temperature of a warmer glow. He asked Staff if they considered lumen levels as part of the application. Ms. Downie responded a lighting plan was submitted and it is reviewed per Code.

Ms. Newell inquired about the Ultra-Performance concrete panels.

Mr. Hunter presented material sample boards. Ms. Newell indicated she liked the darker quality and liked the design of the building overall. Ms. Salay said everything outside of the parking garage is wonderful. Ms. Newell said she really liked the tapered panels from dry design and believes it will be a very cool element on the parking garage. Mr. Brown agreed it was a cool product.

Mr. Brown encouraged the applicant to not value engineer the joints of the aluminum panels as they need to be done properly to drain properly and everything cannot be caulked that leeches and stains in a hurry.

Mr. Miller inquired about the green roof construction for the event center and how that system will work as far as water and irrigation.

Mr. Hunter said the shed roof was originally proposed but they were concerned if they used a metal roof, and there was rain during a wedding, the metal would provide unwanted noise.

Ms. Umbarger said they are considering a tray system for the green roof.

Mr. Brown inquired about the hotel bar area on the roof. He asked if it will be a garden area as green roofs are not always pretty looking, asking if it is more of an environmental response. Ms. Umbarger answered it is similar to what is proposed for the sloped roof. She stated a sedum tray system was repeated here as well as on the lowest portion of the hotel.

Ms. Newell asked what the tray depth will be. Ms. Umbarger answered 4 inches. Ms. Newell said it is not going to support tall plants. She explained the sedum is a plant material that should change seasonally. She said the plant trays require rain and when there is not enough for certain plants, they will die off and be replanted. She explained there are several different roofing manufacturers that offer system that have a plant matrix so everything will come together as a package. She indicated trays can also be made deep enough to support tree structures.

Mr. Miller asked if the plant material dies, if the trays would be replaced. Ms. Newell responded in most cases. She said the advantage of the trays is they are placed on top of the roof material allowing for easier maintenance. Mr. Miller clarified there is no irrigation system on this; its success will be from whatever the weather allows. Mr. Hunter added that is why sedum is used in this capacity because it is fairly hearty.

(FTR log note system dies but FTR keeps recording audio)

Steve Stidhem said he likes the piece of art in the plaza area with function to it as well. He indicated the open space will have a lot of uses the applicant might not have considered yet; he envisions a lot of different events in that space. He asked if there is anything in this area that would remind someone they are in Dublin.

Mr. Hunter said the architecture in the hotel, parking garage, and the event center are all extensions of the same type of architecture seen in blocks B & C of Bridge Park. He said when positioned in the plaza and looking west, there will be the clearest view of the SR 161 Bridge. He indicated that is the most iconic "Dublin" element to him, looking back to historic Dublin. He said they did not want to recreate

history but rather the next chapter in the BSD. He said the river was an inspiration for the actual form of the hotel.

Ms. Newell indicated the integration of the park structure screams Dublin to her.

Ms. Mitchell said early on, people were concerned the area would be Short North meets Dublin but instead the development is very authentic.

The Commission said collectively that they envision lots of activity that will come to this area, which will make it feel like Dublin.

Mr. Hunter reported that the weather has been kind so construction is moving ahead of schedule. He said Bridge Park Avenue is starting to take shape and he presented the area that the new tenants, RAM Restaurant and Brewery and Mesh Fitness will be located.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the retaining wall heights varying from 4 feet to 7 feet, right next to the street. Mr. Hunter explained the heights were based on the grades of the site and confirmed there is only one point where the wall reaches 7 feet.

Ms. Mitchell reiterated this development has the feeling of Dublin. Mr. Hunter thanked her for her comment as they have worked very hard along with Staff and are very proud of it.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve a Conditional Use for the Parking Structure with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve a Conditional Use for the Conference/Event Center with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve a Development Plan Review with three conditions:

- 1) That a mid-block pedestrianway between the event center and office be provided with the development of Lot 7;
- 2) That signs be posted indicating Mooney Way as a fire lane meeting the requirements of Dublin Fire Code Section D103.3; and
- 3) That any inconsistencies on the plans be revised and a final version be submitted for final Staff review and approval.

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

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve a Parking Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the required number of ADA spaces be provided (Per Chapter 11 of the Ohio Building Code, current edition); and

- 2) That a detailed outline of delivery times shall be submitted for Staff review to confirm that no deliveries will be made during peak pick-up/drop-off times.

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

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve 34 Site Plan Waivers. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Site Plan Review with 19 conditions:

- 1) That any inconsistencies on the plans be revised and a final version be submitted for final Staff review and approval;
- 2) That Conditional Use applications be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the proposed parking structure and event center;
- 3) That patio and outdoor dining details be reviewed and approved by Staff. Any modifications to the site or building will require a Minor Project Review prior to installation;
- 4) That a Master Sign Plan be submitted for separate review and approval;
- 5) That additional details be reviewed and approved as part of the building permit and Master Sign Plan regarding the building entrances on building A4 including but not limited to illumination and mounting details of the canopy;
- 6) That any additional required open space be provided with the development of Lot 7;
- 7) That a comprehensive Parking Plan be submitted indicating opportunities for shared parking;
- 8) That details of the proposed bicycle racks be provided for Staff review and approval;
- 9) That a detailed outline of delivery times and passenger pick-up/drop-off be submitted for Staff review and approval;
- 10) That the retaining walls along Riverside Drive/SR 161 be softened with plant materials as outlined in this report;
- 11) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to improve the percentage of pervious hardscape in the open spaces;
- 12) That a revised Photometric Plan should be resubmitted with Building Permits;
- 13) That the applicant verify whether cameras will monitor pedestrian activity from a remote location, or if other security measures will be taken, at building permitting;
- 14) That the applicant provide a more detailed description of the exterior cladding materials in the areas identified as exceeding the blank wall limitations to verify that these materials provide adequate visual interest and are architecturally appropriate to the proposed building design;

- 15) That the applicant provide additional information regarding the use of irrigation systems for Staff approval;
- 16) That a final landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Forester and the Director of Parks and Open Space prior to permit approval;
- 17) That the applicant work with Staff to provide increased access to the open space along Banker Drive;
- 18) That additional information including examples of successful installation of thin brick at a similar scale be provided for the PZC review; and
- 19) That the public access easement for the portion of Mooney Way that is on the adjacent Acura dealership property be executed and recorded prior to approval of any building or site improvement permit, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

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

The Commission congratulated the applicant and thanked Staff for their amazing work. Ms. Husak said she echoed the Commissions comments, appreciating the incredible work done specifically by Marie Downie as she has done an amazing job on this application.

Communications

Claudia Husak said there is a new staff member starting on Monday in the Planning Department. She said Lori Burchett, Planner II, comes by way of Seattle, WA, Idaho, Athens, and The Ohio State University.

Chris Brown said he is not able to attend the PZC meeting on March 10th.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about the process for the wayfinding system being created for the City. Mr. Papsidero said it has been to City Council approximately 10 - 12 months ago. He said the first phase will be implemented with the Bridge Park development. Ms. De Rosa said it would be interesting to obtain the overview of the city-wide plan. Mr. Papsidero said Staff could provide that. Ms. De Rosa inquired about parking meters. Mr. Papsidero said that is being explored under Council's direction, including kiosks. He indicated on-street parking is meant for customers and not employees and a way to enforce that is to charge for parking and at this point, the parking garages will be free.

Steve Stidhem asked if charging stations have been explored. Mr. Papsidero answered they have not been considered as far as he is aware. Amy Salay indicated they are not too difficult to install and thought it would be a cyclical topic as gas prices increase. Mr. Stidhem suggested that the need for parking garages will decrease 10 – 15 years into the future as car technology becomes operationally more automatic; he anticipates very big changes.

Ms. Salay said there will be a Council workshop that the PZC will be invited to attend on April 18th to discuss various topics such as policy and signs, etc.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on April 7, 2016.