



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

JUNE 23, 2016

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| 3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, G Block
16-038BPR | Mooney Street
Basic Plan Review |
| Proposal: | A mixed-use development, including two buildings containing 179 residential dwelling units, approximately 12,000-square-feet of office use, 11,000-square-feet of retail use, and a parking structure. The site is bounded by Tuller Ridge Drive to the north, Dale Drive to the east, Mooney Street to the west, and Bridge Park Avenue to the south. |
| Request: | Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066. |
| Applicant: | Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners. |
| Planning Contact: | Claudia D. Husak, Senior Planner; (614) 410-4675,
chusak@dublin.oh.us |

REQUEST 1: SITE PLAN WAIVERS

Request for an approval recommendation to City Council for 3 Site Plan Waivers:

1. Open Space Types - §153.064(C)(1)-(2) – Distance from Publicly Accessible Open Space – Within 660 feet (required); Within 715 feet (requested).
2. Site Development Standards - §153.065(B)(5)(a)(3) – Location of Parking Structure Entrance/Exit Lanes – Entrance/Exit Lanes not on Principal Frontage Street (required); Entrance/Exit Lane on Principal Frontage Street (requested).
3. Building Types - §153.065(O)(b) – Ground Story Height – Ground story height must be between 12 feet and 16 feet (required); 20 feet due to grade change (requested).

Determination: The Site Plan Waivers were recommended for approval to City Council as part of the Site Plan Review.

REQUEST 2: SITE PLAN REVIEW

Request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for a Site Plan Review with 2 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with staff to detail construction of portions of Dale Drive to a public street standard appropriate for occupancy of the residential units, including construction design and cost sharing; and
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to determine appropriate locations for bicycle parking outside of the individual units.

Determination: The Site Plan was recommended for approval to City Council with 2 conditions.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Vincent A. Papsidero, FAICP
Planning Director

Scott Engebretson, Vineyard Columbus, said currently Vineyard Church is just around the corner on the edge of Dublin Village Center and their main operations are centered in Westerville.

Rachel Ray asked if there would be enough parking to which the applicant replied affirmatively. He said most of the businesses in the area are open Monday through Friday and they would mainly need parking on the weekends.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns. [There were none.] He stated the ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission is scheduled for next week for the PZC meeting on July 7, 2016.

DETERMINATIONS

3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, G Block 16-038BPR

Mooney Street Basic Plan Review

Lori Burchett said this is a request for a mixed-use development, including two buildings containing 179 residential dwelling units, approximately 12,000-square-foot of office use, 11,000-square-foot of retail use, and a parking structure. She said the site is surrounded by Tuller Ridge Drive to the north, Dale Drive to the east, Mooney Street to the west, and Bridge Park Avenue to the south. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of an approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented the block locations for context. She said this was reviewed by the ART and then by the Planning and Zoning Commission as an Informal Review. She briefly reviewed what was presented last week at the ART meeting as a result of the PZC meeting.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for three Site Plan Waivers:

1. Open Space Types - §153.064(C)(1)-(2) – Distance from Publicly Accessible Open Space – Within 660 feet (required); Within 715 feet (requested).
2. Site Development Standards - §153.065(B)(5)(a)(3) – Location of Parking Structure Entrance/Exit Lanes – Entrance/Exit Lanes not on Principal Frontage Street (required); Entrance/Exit Lane on Principal Frontage Street (requested).
3. Building Types - §153.065(O)(b) – Ground Story Height – Ground story height must be between 12 feet and 16 feet (required); 20 feet due to grade change (requested).

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for a Site Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with staff to detail construction of portions of Dale Drive to a public street standard appropriate for occupancy of the residential units, including construction design and cost sharing; and
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to determine appropriate locations for bicycle parking outside of the individual units.

Tim Hosterman inquired about the ramp off Dale Drive given the grade changes. He said if the incline is too dramatic, the bike hitches on the police cruisers can gouge the concrete. James Peltier, EMH&T, answered the ramp is six inches but there is no actual ramp, it just goes into the second floor. He added that the ramps inside the garage are the gradual standard.

Rachel Ray asked if the engineers supported the Waiver regarding the parking garage entrance off Dale Drive that is being requested as they were not present. Ms. Burchett answered the engineers were supportive of the Waiver.

Ms. Ray noted that Blocks G & H were proposing to count a portion of the Scioto River Park toward meeting the open space requirement, as did Blocks B & C under previous applications. She suggested that a table accounting for the amount of park acreage being used to meet the open space requirements be maintained to ensure none of the parkland is double-counted with future applications.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Site Plan with three Waivers and two conditions.

**4. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, H Block
16-039BPR**

**Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street
Basic Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for a residential condominium development consisting of approximately 73 townhome units with parking below each unit. She said the site is surrounded by John Shields Parkway to the north, Dale Drive to the east, Mooney Street to the west, and Tuller Ridge Drive to the south. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan. She reviewed what was presented the previous week. She noted the 75 townhome units originally proposed were reduced to 73 as the applicant had to remove two units to accommodate the relocation of the pool. She said 38 parking spaces on the street were required in addition to the garage spaces under each unit. She asked the applicant to submit a Parking Plan. She explained this is just another check box to be completed for the review process.

She said this was reviewed along with Block G by the ART and then by the Planning and Zoning Commission as an informal to which they were supportive. She noted that a technical Waiver is needed for the tower.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to City Council for two Site Plan Waivers:

1. Building Type – §153.062(O)(4) – Front Property Line Coverage – The structure is required to cover a minimum of 75% of the front property line. A portion of building H1 is approximately 70% at the easterly boundary and 52% at the southerly boundary. The public space has been designed to give the appearance of a closer setback through plaza areas, walls, and landscaping.
2. Building Type – §153.062(O) (5) – Permitted Roof Types — Towers are permitted on facades only at terminal vistas, corners at two principal frontage streets, and/or adjacent to an open space type. Towers will be necessary in order to provide access to the roof top decks.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to City Council for a Site Plan with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant submit a parking plan that includes location of all on-street spaces that will count toward meeting the minimum parking requirement;
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to determine the width and location of the Greenway;
- 3) That the applicant continue to work with staff to detail construction of portions of Dale Drive to a public street standard appropriate for occupancy of the residential units, including construction design and cost sharing; and

- 4) That the applicant work with staff to determine appropriate locations for bicycle parking outside of the individual units.

Rachel Ray asked about the fourth condition regarding the location of bicycle parking and whether the applicant had started identifying locations for bicycle parking. John Woods, MKSK, said the applicant has provided bicycle parking as required.

Ms. Ray requested clarification regarding the second condition referencing the Greenway. Ms. Burchett explained the width and the location of the Greenway needs to be determined as the steps from the building could encroach the Greenway in some areas. She said the property to the east narrows and then widens but the intent is to maintain an average width of 60 feet. James Peltier, EMH&T, said an average width of 61 feet has been proposed for the Greenway.

Claudia Husak highlighted the condition that applies to blocks G & H where the applicant is to continue to work with staff to detail construction of portions of Dale Drive to a public street standard appropriate for occupancy of the residential units, including construction design and cost sharing. She said this comes out of the BSD initiative. She said a ditch is not acceptable to the City. She said this will need to be finished to BSD standards and will need to be reflected on the plat. She indicated she would prefer not to make that a condition of approval for the PZC.

Mr. Peltier said it is a challenge because only half of the road is being completed. He asked if the applicant could keep the ditch in the interim. Vince Papsidero answered that was not acceptable and it needed to be fixed if possible. Ms. Husak indicated it could potentially be a condition for the PZC review but it would need to be resolved for City Council. Ms. Husak offered to follow up with the senior civil engineer. She added that if this becomes the responsibility of the City, then it would need to be incorporated into the CIP. Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said a condition makes sense but there is an open end.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Site Plan with two Waivers and four conditions.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 2:27 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on June 30, 2016.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JUNE 9, 2016

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

**1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, G Block
16-038BPR**

**Mooney Street
Basic Plan Review**

- Proposal:** A mixed-use development, including two buildings containing 179 residential dwelling units, approximately 12,000 square feet of office uses, 11,000 square feet of retail uses, and a parking structure.
- Request:** Informal review and feedback of a Basic Plan Review prior to review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
- Applicant:** Crawford Hoying.
- Planning Contact:** Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner.
- Contact Information:** (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us.

RESULT: The Commission informally reviewed and commented on a proposal for a mixed-use development, including two buildings containing 179 residential dwelling units, approximately 12,000 square feet of office uses, 12,000 square feet of retail uses, and a fully-wrapped parking structure located northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street. The Commission was concerned that the proposed architecture did not provide necessary relief from architectural rhythms established in previously approved blocks of the Bridge Park development. The Commission challenged the applicant to consider future uses of the site and encourage versatile, long-lasting construction wherever possible. The Commission was supportive of the amount and location of the proposed open spaces noting the plaza’s design compliments the plaza to the west.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Nichole Martin
Planner



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

JUNE 9, 2016

AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, G Block** **Mooney Street**
16-038BPR **Basic Plan Review (Discussion only)**

- 2. BSDSRN – Bridge Park, H Block** **Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street**
16-039BPR **Basic Plan Review (Discussion only)**

- 3. BSD SCN - Charles Penzone Grand Salon** **6671 Village Parkway**
16-015BPR **Basic Plan Review (Approved 6 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Chris Brown, Bob Miller, Cathy De Rosa, Stephen Stidhem, and Amy Salay. Deborah Mitchell was absent. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Vince Papsidero, Philip Hartmann, Donna Goss, Nichole Martin, and Flora Rogers.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said certain cases on tonight’s agenda may be approved by consent. She stated that no cases were eligible for the consent agenda tonight. She determined to take the cases in the following order: 3, 1, and 2 and the minutes will reflect the cases recorded in the order as they were published in the agenda.

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, G Block** **Mooney Street**
16-038BPR **Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a mixed-use development, including two buildings containing residential units, office and retail uses, and a parking structure. She said the site is south of Tuller Ridge Drive, north of Bridge Park Avenue, west of Dale Drive, and east of Mooney Street. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback of a Basic Plan Review prior to review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Nichole Martin asked if cases for Block G and H could be heard together as the sites are adjacent to one another. The Chair introduced Block H as well so both cases could be heard simultaneously.

**2. BSDSRN – Bridge Park, H Block
16-039BPR**

**Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street
Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a residential condominium development consisting of approximately 75 townhome units. She said the site is located with John Shields Parkway to the north, Dale Drive to the east, Mooney Street to the west, and Tuller Ridge Drive to the south. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback of a Basic Plan Review prior to review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Nichole Martin noted G Block is located in the Bridge Park development, south of H Block, west of Dale Drive. She explained an informal review is not required but since the Basic Site Plan Review will be going to City Council per a development agreement, this informal review provides an opportunity for the PZC to provide feedback for Council's consideration.

Ms. Martin provided a brief history of the Bridge Park development. She said Blocks G and H are the fourth and fifth blocks of development in Bridge Park. She explained G is in a transitional area between some of the previously approved projects in C, B, and A blocks. She said H will have a very different feel from the other blocks of development.

Ms. Martin said two buildings are proposed for G Block labeled as G1, which is a 72,000-square-foot, six-story, mixed-use building and Building G2/G3 as a 300,000-square-foot, 5-story, fully residential wrapped parking structure. She stated that 0.33-acre of public open space is proposed along Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge Drive while 0.84-acre is required. She explained the main plaza is proposed between buildings G1 and G2/G3 and accounts for the majority of the public open space provided within the block. She said the plaza design aligns with the Block C plaza to the west to provide a cohesive connection between the two blocks. She said there are also two smaller open spaces provided, accessible from the residential units in G2/G3 building.

Ms. Martin said G1 contains retail on the first floor, office on the second floor, and a mix of 48 residential units (efficiencies, 1, 2, and 3 bedrooms) located along Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street. The G2/G3 building, she said, contains 406 parking spaces and a mix of 132 residential units (micro units, efficiencies, 1 and 2 bedrooms) on all four sides. She said the fourth floor will provide a private residential access between buildings G1 and G2/G3. She presented the floor plans for both buildings. She noted the façade materials: G1 depicts three different colors of brick and glass as primary materials for the retail and office located on stories one and two and stories three through six introduce two different metal panels with subtle façade articulations as well as private residential balconies. G2/G3 depicts two different colors of brick primarily present on the lower stories of the building. She said fiber cement siding, fiber cement panels, and metal panels are introduced on the upper stories; red fiber cement panels are depicted where the façade is inset for residential balconies and the parking garage entrance. She said the western elevation along Mooney Street is the only location where individual residential units (6) have access to a public street, not through a common entrance. The individual units she noted have entrances oriented to the side and are masked by brick-clad planters.

Ms. Martin said there are two vehicular access points for the garage: one on Mooney Street and the other on Dale Drive. She noted the pedestrian and public access points.

Ms. Martin concluded her presentation on Block G with the following discussion questions:

1. Does the proposal provide an appropriate transition given the surrounding development?
2. Does the Commission support the proposed architectural style and building materials?
3. Is there adequate open space provided in appropriate locations?
4. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Ms. Martin said Block H is located north of Block G, directly west of the Sycamore Ridge Apartments and directly south of the Grand facility. She said a new public street is proposed (Larimer Street) to connect Mooney Street to Dale Drive and provide vehicular access to the auto courts in the development. She said public and private open space is provided. She explained there are three pairs of buildings (H1, H2, and H3), each split in a north/south direction to provide access to the auto courts and garages. She explained that part of the site is the John Shields Greenway so the applicant has determined the appropriate amount of dedication required. She indicated the proposal shows some steps to the front entries extending into the Greenway and the applicant will have to work with staff to reconfigure these areas. She explained Code requires 0.34-acre of public open space for the proposed development of H Block and private open space is proposed between buildings H1 and H2 for exclusive use by residents. She said the proposal shows ground level parking under all 75 units and will include one- or two-car garages, depending on the size of the unit. She said currently 153 spaces are provided within enclosed garages and at adjacent streets for the 75 units and all garages are accessed through an auto court with a permeable paver system with an ingress/egress in one location for each building off of a secondary street.

Ms. Martin presented an illustration using building H3 as an example. From the site plan, she said it appears that some of the units may have difficulty maneuvering vehicles in and out of their unit's garage.

Ms. Martin presented the architecture for the proposed Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge elevations. She noted the renderings show a contemporary architectural style emphasizing geometric forms with various roof heights, balconies, railings, and front stoops. She explained the illustrated building materials include glass, brick, wood, and cement fiber panels. To create architectural interest, she said, the applicant addressed facade diversity with two colors of brick to break down the massing of the facades into a pedestrian scale; horizontal and vertical facade articulations to further break down the massing; and secondary materials will be used to create building variety and diversity. She indicated the applicant is proposing a neutral color palette; however, specific building materials have not been chosen at this time and more detail will be provided in the future. She added metal sunscreens and decorative balconies that provide visual interest along the street.

Ms. Martin concluded Block H with discussion questions for the Commission's consideration:

1. Does the Commission support the proposed site layout and design of the units?
2. Does the proposed design and architectural elements of the buildings fit with the intended character of this area of the district?
3. Does the Commission have concerns with circulation and access within the auto court?
4. Should the greenway be the only public open space for the proposal?
5. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Bob Miller inquired about the auto courts from an engineering perspective. Ms. Martin said further maneuverability detail has been requested.

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, said Ms. Martin did a really good job at going through all the details for these two blocks. He presented the Site Plan noting this is a continuation of the Bridge Park Avenue streetscape. He said the open space aligning with the C Block open space differ in design so they each have a unique identity. He said how the block differs from the other blocks is that it contains a completely wrapped parking garage. He pointed out the residential liners along C Block so it is important to maintain that character on the G Block.

Mr. Hunter explained that they have continued to push the architect so the buildings have a strong identity. He said the outdoor spaces were enhanced that included balcony space overlooking Bridge Park

Avenue, second floor office space provides covered space on the ground floor so the restaurants that move in will have a unique space. He noted how the materials weave, highlighting the horizontal and vertical aspects of the building.

Mr. Hunter summarized the Bridge Park experience. He said C2 is along Riverside Drive, C3 is under construction, and now they have worked their way up the development, creating unique identities for each of the buildings. He said they share common themes and materials but the uniqueness comes from the detail. He said the G1 building is a transitional building and on the edge of their property as it exists today. He noted there is a legacy product across the street (Dale Drive) of shorter heights so they paid more attention to that.

Mr. Hunter introduced a new product called millennium tile; it was installed on 5th Avenue, a branch of the Columbus Public Library. He explained it was originally designed to be a roofing tile but it is starting to be used on the sides of buildings and it has a reflective quality and it comes in different textures and colors. He said they would like to use it on the top of the building without using a strong cornice to bring down the scale.

Mr. Hunter said they are using a different architect for the condominium buildings in Block H and asked him to come forward.

David Keyser, dkb Architects, 52 E. Lyn Street, explained every unit will either face onto the public street or onto a public or private open space per the crescent configuration of the six buildings. He said the auto courts are accessed and primarily shielded from the public areas. He said the massing of the buildings is broken down to a pedestrian scale. He said some units have porches or balconies. He said one of their challenges was the 17-foot grade difference between Dale Drive and Mooney Street. He said it helps the units individualize with varying heights of stoops with steps moving up the Tuller Ridge elevation creating a pedestrian friendly relationship.

Chris Brown inquired about the taller towers. Mr. Hunter said there are larger units with roof terraces where that tower element pops up to the fourth floor.

Amy Salay asked if the stairs were divided. Mr. Hunter answered that yes the stairs are individualized.

Ms. Martin again presented the discussion questions for G Block.

Mr. Brown stated he liked the new and improved version of building G1. He said as the whole project develops, other than the hotel, we have much of the same building vocabulary going on everywhere from Tuller Flats to C Block to B Block. He said the variation is not tremendous so he considers this new millennium tile as a dynamic element. He said he looked at G1 and G2 to see if they would be able to be converted to another use in the future. He encouraged the applicant to consider a different framing structure above the second level. He said he likes that the envelope is still being pushed with the architect. He stated Bridge Park is a very important drive and there should be building diversity for the pedestrian experience. He said the monolithic building mass has been broken up as dictated by the Code. He said there needs to be enough variation from façade to façade to façade that he currently does not see. He suggested the style of G2/G3 be changed. He explained from the panoramic view of the development, metal is all that is visible from the tops of each building, which he does not like. He said it is all urban contemporary architecture but between the building materials and the rhythm, there is too much sameness. He referred to Seaside, FL as a good example for variation. He said G1 is an important building because it is not on the river and transitional to other development of Bridge Park.

Victoria Newell agreed with Mr. Brown's comments. She said if she was just looking at one building and not in context with everything else, she would probably like it. She said it repeats a lot of what the

Commission has already been presented with and was hoping for a new rhythm for these two blocks. She said G2 becomes very vertical per the elements so the massing is not right. She said it is busy and not helping. She said nothing is providing a backdrop or a relief from the rhythm and patterns created. She suggested extending brick to the top of the building. She stated she did not know anything about the millennium tile and cautioned the applicant about tile not aging well as glazing starts to wash away. She requested more information about the material.

Mr. Hunter said it is a metal tile formed to have a shape to it and not glazed. He said some have a more galvanized look and some have more of a reflective sheen.

Cathy De Rosa asked what unique voice this building is trying to make. She inquired about the amount of glass.

Mr. Hunter said there is metal used with the glass. He asked for the Commission's feedback on the color blocking and the use of color. He said a lot more can be done with fiber cement panels as they come in a variety of color.

Ms. De Rosa said color brings energy.

Ms. Newell suggested more brick to get away from the repeat of pattern and bring relief. She said she was not opposed to bringing bright colors to a building as long as she can be convinced they will stand the test of time and keep it fresh and maintained.

Mr. Brown said he liked the glass and the openness of the corner.

Ms. Salay said she likes the idea of all brick. She asked if millennium tile would be a way to introduce color instead of fiber cement panels. She inquired about the red color for G2.

Mr. Hunter said specific bricks have not been determined.

Steve Stidhem said G2/G3 looks like a Tetris screen so he wants to see something different. He said he liked the red the way it was used.

Ms. De Rosa said she liked the park plaza between the two buildings, including the water elements and the different elevations.

Ms. Newell said she liked the plaza, too.

Bob Miller said he visited the site. He said he liked G1 and for G2/G3 he thought at first it looked boring but when he stood down on Riverside Drive, and envisioned what was going to be in front and going into Sycamore Ridge, he thought the design would work really well. He asked if there was any chance to bring any green into the roof for G2/G3.

Mr. Hunter said it is a flat roof.

Mr. Miller said he loved the architecture for Block H. He said it felt like two completely different separate projects. He was concerned about units fronting the greenway and others fronting the pool, while some units front on no open space. He said he understands the auto courts but there are too many units going into too small of a space. He indicated he envisioned a lot of congestion at the am and pm rush hours. He clarified that H1 and H2 looked like one project and H3 is a separate project separated by Larimer Street. He asked if the pricing would be consistent across all three buildings to which Mr. Hunter said they would. Mr. Hunter said there would be a consistent cost per square foot.

Mr. Hunter said the engineers at EMH&T calculated the turning radii of the auto courts.

Ms. Newell thought it was still an issue and believes residents will have trouble maneuvering and it will be tough for the applicant to make the corner garage unit work. She said the intent of the BSD is to make it feel walkable and is concerned with the public private space with the swimming pool. She said she liked the architecture and looks forward to seeing more detail about the materials, etc.

Mr. Hunter said the area is private but it is not gated. He said the pool is worth a conversation and per the Ohio law, there would have to be a gate.

Ms. Salay said she likes the architecture a lot and likes the idea of the pool area. She cautioned about making the auto courts too large but likes the islands in the middle. She did not think there will be an issue with too many cars coming and going at the same time. She said the buildings are gorgeous and will add an element to the BSD that has been missing. She said these designs far exceeded her expectations.

Ms. De Rosa said she liked the architecture and the balconies are interesting, not monotonous like other buildings. She said the courtyards felt European. She asked if the on-street parking would be reserved. Mr. Hunter said parking spaces would not specifically be reserved.

Mr. Stidhem said he liked the architecture and overall the plan was cool. He said it reminded him of San Francisco.

Mr. Brown said he liked the architecture and is not opposed to a pool but the public should be able to go east to west. He said there would be on-street parking on Larimer and he would like having a space right in front of this unit. He said the pool would be used, minimally, and questioned the amount of sun it would receive. He said he liked the taller ridge elevations and how they tumble down the hill like San Francisco. He asked how mail will be managed.

Mr. Hunter indicated the US Postal Service will require that the mail be consolidated. He said there is a building by the pool that would be able to house something like that.

Mr. Brown inquired about the alignment of Larimer Street and the connectivity to the east of this block.

Mr. Hunter indicated the developers want to introduce a grocer but it requires a service bay so this area works the best.

Mr. Brown said he anticipates this being a large empty-nester community and asked where larger units might go that have a lot of money. Mr. Hunter said he did not think this would be the only condominium product on the east side and they are contemplating other areas.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions or comments. [Hearing none.]