

# Planning Report

Thursday, September 8, 2016


## Bridge Park – Building B5 – Minor Project Review

### Case Summary

Agenda Item	1
Case Number	16-060MPR
Proposal	A Minor Project Review for exterior modifications to a previously approved parking structure to revise architectural elements and building materials for Building B4/B5 in the Bridge Park development.
Request	Review and a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a coordinated sign plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
Site Location	Located northwest of the intersection of (future) Banker Drive and (future) Mooney Street.
Applicant	Crawford Hoying Development Partners
Case Manager	Lori Burchett, AICP Planner II   (614) 410-4656   <a href="mailto:lburchett@dublin.oh.us">lburchett@dublin.oh.us</a>
Planning Recommendation	<b>Approval</b> The proposed Minor Project Review is consistent with previously approved development plans and meets all the applicable review criteria. Approval is recommended, with no conditions.



16-060MPR  
Minor Project Review  
Building B5 Exterior Modifications  
6561 Mooney Street



Facts	
Site Area	±2.2 acres
Zoning	BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District – Scioto River Neighborhood
Surrounding Zoning And Uses	<p>The surrounding properties are predominately zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District – Scioto River Neighborhood District:</p> <p>North: BSD-SRN – Bridge Park, C Block            South: BSD-SRN – Bridge Park, A Block            West: BSD-P – (Future) Riverside Park            East: BSD-SRN – Existing Office</p>
Site Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within B-Block of the Bridge Park development</li> <li>• Single lot with two mixed-use structures, Building B3 and B4/B5, and associated open space</li> <li>• Pedestrian access along Bridge Park Avenue, Mooney Street, Longshore Street and Banker Drive; Vehicular access to the parking structure for the entire block is via Mooney and Longshore Streets</li> <li>• Private, residential access via pedestrian bridges is provided between Buildings B3 and B4/B5 (parking structure).</li> </ul>
Background	<p><b>2016</b>  <i>PZC Master Sign Plan</i>            On <b>February 18, 2016</b>, the Commission approved a Master Sign Plan required as part of the (final) Development Plan and Site Plan approval and Bridge Street District Code for designated shopping corridors to permit a variety of context sensitive sign types in designated locations. An amendment to the sign plan to include signs for the City owned garages was approved by the Commission on <b>May 5, 2016</b>.</p> <p><b>2015</b>  <i>PZC Development Plan and Site Plan</i>            The Commission reviewed and approved the (final) Development and Site Plans for the four buildings associated with B Block, the second portion of the first phase of the Bridge Park development on <b>August 20, 2015</b>. The project proposal includes approximately 213 apartment units, 61,800 square feet of office, 47,000 square feet of commercial (retail, restaurant), and an 869-space parking garage.</p> <p><i>City Council Basic Plan Review</i>            City Council reviewed the Basic Development Plan on <b>January 20, 2015</b> for all blocks of the Bridge Park development and Basic Site Plan for <u>only</u> Blocks B and C. City Council made determinations on the Basic Development and Site Plans, 5 Waivers to Code requirements, and</p>

Facts	
	determined the Commission as the required reviewing body for future applications.
Development Status	Currently the site is under construction. The applicant has indicated approval of this request is time sensitive and necessary to remain on schedule and on budget. Previously the applicant indicated, C Block to the north is scheduled for completion in the later quarter of this year, and B Block is anticipated to be complete in first half of 2017.

Details	Minor Project Review
Minor Project Review (MPR)	The purpose of a MPR is to provide an efficient review process for smaller projects that do not have significant community effects.
Proposal	<p>This is a request for exterior modifications to a previously approved structure, Building B5 in the Bridge Park development. This project proposes revisions to architectural elements and building materials on the exterior of the east and south façades of the public parking structure, Building B5. The approved plan shows the building clad in brick with an overlay of stainless steel mesh screen. The southeast corner included a full height vegetated screen wall. At the entry points the spandrel panels were covered with metal mesh rails. The west and north façades of the building include residential “liners” and are not proposed to change from the previously adopted plan.</p> <p>This project proposes minor changes to the basic design of the garage facades. The south and east facades remain clad in brick, but additional masonry detail has been added to the brick façades. Other changes include the screen panels and the vegetative wall.</p> <p>A soldier course has been added to the top of the large brick openings and at the cap of the building. The spandrel panels above the entrances are detailed with a soldier course at the top and bottom of the panels and the inside brick runs vertically. The brick piers now include a light color vertical brick accent and are capped off with a fiber cement and alum coping.</p> <p>The spandrels between these piers are exposed architectural concrete with frameless perforated aluminum panels in a staggered vertical pattern covering the majority of the spandrel.</p> <p>The southeast corner has a one story vegetated screen wall rather than the multi-story vegetative screen that had been previously approved.</p>

**Details**

**Minor Project Review**



**Administrative Review Team (ART) Comments**

The ART reviewed the proposal and determined Planning and Zoning Commission review is necessary given the overall aesthetic changes to two façades of the structure. There was significant discussion about the materials of used to conceal the parking structure during its initial approval process. Additionally, the parking garage is a public facility and warrants an additional review by the Commission.

The ART reviewed the application as submitted, and requested the applicant provide additional detail on the submitted materials and recommended some changes to the placement of the materials. There were concerns expressed that the quality of the materials and interest that the varying depths of the panels provided has been lost with this new submittal. The board were supportive of the vertical breaks as it breaks up the façade so it does not appear as one long wall and well as the additional brick detailing.

Analysis	Minor Project Review
Minor Project Review	Section 153.066(G)(3) of the Zoning Code identifies Minor Project Review procedures. The Administrative Review Team has the discretion to forward applications that raise complex issues to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their review. Applications forwarded to the Commission shall be reviewed under the provisions of 153.066(F)(3).The following is an analysis by ART based on the standards outlined in the Bridge Street District Code.
a) <i>The Site Plan Review be substantially similar to the approved Basic Site Plan</i>	<b>Criterion met.</b> The proposal meets the approved Site Plan as no structures have moved, and the proposed changes are to materials and quantities.
b) <i>Consistent with the approved Development Plan</i>	<b>Criterion met.</b> The proposal meets the approved Development Plan as no streets or pedestrian access have been affected with this proposal.
c) <i>Meets all Zoning requirements except as authorized by Administrative Departures and Waivers</i>	<b>Criterion met.</b> All code requirements remain unchanged with approval of this request.
d) <i>Internal circulation system and driveways provide safe and efficient access</i>	<b>Criterion not applicable.</b> No modifications to circulation systems or driveways are proposed as part of this application.
e) <i>The relationship of buildings and structures to each other and other facilities is appropriately integrated with Community</i>	<b>Criterion met.</b> The building layout remains the same. No changes are proposed to the residential facades on the west and north of the building. Material changes and architectural brick features are proposed as part of this revision. No changes are proposed to circulation.
f) <i>Consistent with requirement for types, distribution and suitability of open space</i>	<b>Criterion met.</b> The publicly accessible open space located in B Block remains unchanged with approval of this request.
g) <i>The scale and design of the development allows for the adequate provision of services</i>	<b>Criterion not applicable.</b> No modifications impacting the provision of services is proposed as part of this application.

<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Minor Project Review</b>
<i>h) Stormwater management systems and facilities are adequate and do not adversely affect neighboring properties</i>	<b>Criterion not applicable.</b> No modification to the total impervious area is proposed as part of this application.
<i>i) If phased, the proposed phase can stand alone</i>	<b>Criterion not applicable.</b> No modification to the phasing or construction schedule of the project is proposed as part of this application.
<i>j) Demonstrates consistency with principles of walkable urbanism, BSD Vision Principles, Community Plan , and other applicable documents</i>	<b>Criterion met.</b> The proposal does not include changes to the pedestrian realm. The architectural perspective from the street will be different than the previously approved site plan, however the intent of the screening objective remains consistent. The applicant states that these material changes will continue to provide an interesting, walkable setting for urban lifestyles that places value on human scale and a diversity of experiences.

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Minor Project Review</b>
Approval	The proposed Minor Project Review is consistent with previously approved development plans and meets all the applicable review criteria. Approval is recommended, with no conditions.