



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West – Building Z2** **88 N. High Street**
17-050ARB-DPR **Development Plan Review (Approved 3 – 0)**
- 2. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West – Building Z2** **88 N. High Street**
17-015ARB-SPR **Site Plan Review (Approved 3 – 0)**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox and Everett Musser. Shannon Stenberg was absent. City representatives were: Vince Papsidero, Lori Burchett, Logan Stang, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to accept the April 26, 2017, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve the special meeting date of June 14, 2017. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] He swore in anyone planning to address the Board during this meeting.

- 1. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West – Building Z2** **88 N. High Street**
17-050ARB-DPR **Development Plan Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the construction of a mixed-use building with associated site improvements along the east side of N. High Street, approximately 180 feet north of the intersection with North Street. He said this is a request for review and approval of a



Development Plan under the provisions of the Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site and said the Development Plan consists of the creation of a block as presented. He explained, as part of this block, there is the creation of two lots; the first lot to the north is the future West Plaza and Pedestrian Bridge Landing and the second lot is the site for the proposed Z2 building. He said there is a gateway located at the West Plaza and the intersection of N. High Street and (future) Rock Cross Parkway. As part of the Development Plan Review, he said the location of gateways is to be determined and approved and the details provided with the Site Plan. He said these gateway details will be provided with the West Plaza Site Plan Review at a later date.

Mr. Stang stated there would be two motions before the Board this evening:

1. Development Plan Waiver for Flag Lots
2. Development Plan Review

Mr. Stang reported the Administrative Review Team approved an Administrative Departure for the Maximum Block Dimensions – Perimeter Length at their meeting on May 18, 2017.

Mr. Stang said the Waiver is requested for Flag Lots. He pointed out that there is a small appendage that extends well into the southeast. He said Flag Lots are strictly prohibited in the Bridge Street District; however, this was created partially due to existing conditions and ownership. He said all of this will be cleaned up with a future Plat and development and this is just a temporary fix. Based off of the criteria, he stated staff is recommending approval of this Waiver in addition to the Development Plan Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the final design of the Pedestrian Bridge Landing and West Plaza will be approved as part of a separate Site Plan Review application;
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with the City on the submission of Preliminary & Final Plats to address existing property concerns;
- 3) That the details and location of the proposed easements be finalized with the future Plat applications; and,
- 4) That the applicant either receive approval for the inclusion of PID 273-004079 & PID 273-000027 from the property owner or revise all plans to remove work proposed on the properties, prior to filing for building permits.

The Chair invited the applicant to add a presentation. [Hearing none.]

David Rinaldi asked how the Flag Lot disappears with re-platting and how it will look. Mr. Stang answered it depends on when the Plat is filed and how City land and the applicant's property will be transferred amongst one another.

Jane Fox asked if the intent is to create a block that is more symmetrical and what the City plans to do with that land. She asked if access to the back is the driver for the flag lot. Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, answered he is not certain. He explained the line has moved several times as they have been working on the West Plaza submittal. He added that what is currently Crawford Hoying Development Partners' land will become City owned land. Ms. Fox clarified that part of that will continue to stay a Flag Lot.

Vince Papsidero said other ownership patterns may change to the south and if not then it will remain that parcel in perpetuity. Just like the parcel to the north, he said, which will be the City parcel for the Pedestrian Bridge Landing and the West Plaza. He said that will remain an oddly conformed parcel.

To gain a better understanding, Ms. Fox asked why Flag Lots are prohibited in the Bridge Street District. Mr. Papsidero explained Flag Lots are an issue regarding subdivisions statewide and basically means a flag shaped lot is one that has very small frontage on a public road. He said despite its odd geometry this lot also meets the definition of being a Flag Lot because of the point into the southeast corner. He said this Waiver is more of a technicality of ownership as these pieces are all being built out.

Mr. Hunter added the driver for the location is topography for the boundary between what will be City property and property that will remain under the ownership of Crawford Hoying Development Partners. He explained the grade falls pretty quickly once on the City property, which is undevelopable but what remains on Crawford Hoying's property could be developed. Lori Burchett said details are being worked out and conversations continue as to where all the property lines will be located.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to approve a request for a Waiver for Flag Lots as they are prohibited per the Zoning Code §153.060(C)(8)(b).

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Development Plan Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the final design of the Pedestrian Bridge Landing and West Plaza will be approved as part of a separate Site Plan Review application;
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with the City on the submission of Preliminary & Final Plats to address existing property concerns;
- 3) That the details and location of the proposed easements be finalized with the future Plat applications; and
- 4) That the applicant either receive approval for the inclusion of PID 273-004079 & PID 273-000027 from the property owner or revise all plans to remove work proposed on the properties, prior to filing for building permits.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

2. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West – Building Z2 17-015ARB-SPR

88 N. High Street Site Plan Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the construction of a mixed-use building with associated site improvements along the east side of N. High Street, approximately 180 feet north of the intersection with North Street. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Site Plan under the provisions of the Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Logan Stang presented a graphic showing the BSD Review Process and explained this is the final zoning review in the Bridge Street District process. He reported the ARB reviewed the Basic Plan Review informally last October and November and City Council reviewed and approved the Basic Plan in January of this year. He said there will be three motions before the Board this evening with regard to this application, which are a number of Waivers, a Parking Plan, and the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and pointed out that the site is directly across the street from the public library.

Mr. Stang presented a graphic showing the background for the west elevation/N. High Street. He reported the ARB reviewed this project in November of last year (as shown on the left). At the meeting, he said the applicant was proposing a three story structure on High Street with four stories on the rear utilizing various architectural features to blend in with the Historic District to the south. He said after ARB review the applicant revised the proposal to a two-story building on High Street (shown on the right) blending more contemporary architectural features into all facades.

Mr. Stang presented a graphic showing the background for the north elevation/West Plaza. He explained the original proposal transitioned from west to east to a modern building utilizing flat roofs and curtain walls to blend with the Z building to the north and modern architecture across the river to the east. The revised plan he said replaced the flat roof mass with gables and reduced the number of curtain walls.

Mr. Stang presented a graphic showing the background for the east elevation/Scioto River, which is similar to how the west looked to blend with the surrounding architecture. What is shown on the right he explained utilizes the mix of contemporary and historic features such as the gables but with the addition of high windows to provide views of the river.

Mr. Stang presented the background graphic for the south elevation/Oscar's Restaurant to show the significant changes between the ARB Informal Review in November and the Council Review in January. He reported that City Council approved the Basic Plan Review with two Waivers: the first was to permit three stories for the east elevation due to the grade change; and the second for front property line coverage as the site has three frontages - North High Street, North Riverview Street, and North Street. He said a number of conditions were also added to refine details with the Site Plan Review as it pertained to the architecture.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed Site Plan. He said the site as approved with the Development Plan is irregular in shape and consists of a single, three-story building located on N. High Street. He noted the building takes up the majority of the site being located along the north property line directly adjacent to the West Plaza. He indicated the applicant will be dedicating open space for the West Plaza, which will be designed and approved through a separate Site Plan application. He said it is also worth noting that since the building sits on the north property line, various details regarding the streetscape and landscaping will be approved with the West Plaza and Pedestrian Bridge Landing and are not required with this application.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed floor plans consisting of a lower level, ground story, and the second story. He pointed out that the building contains a restaurant tenant space on the lower level with a covered patio area facing the river. The ground story also includes a restaurant space with patios facing the West Plaza and a lobby located in the southwest corner for the second story as it consists of four multiple-dwelling units: two one-bedroom apartments; one two-bedroom apartment; and one three-bedroom apartment.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed west elevation/N. High Street. He stated the architecture is substantially similar to what was approved at Council at the Basic Plan Review. He compared the Council approval (on the left) with the current proposal (on the right). He said the majority of the massing remains the same with just slight changes with the materials.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed north elevation/West Plaza as he said the most notable changes are to the roof massing changing the rear section to a larger gable and replacing the gable on the north elevation with a shed dormer similar to the west elevation.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed east elevation/Scioto River. He said the graphic shows the revised larger gable and also removes canopies that were shown above the windows on the ground level. He noted the balcony is now entirely cantilevered from the structure as well.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed south elevation/Oscar's Restaurant, which is similar to the Basic Plan with slight changes in massing and the reconfiguring of window placements.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed Landscape Plan – Ground Level that the applicant provided; however, due to the property configuration, the majority of the north, east, and west portions of the site will be designed with the streetscape of N. High Street and the West Plaza. He indicated that additional details will be required for some of the landscaping on the south portion of the lot with the building permits.

Mr. Stang presented a rendering showing the proposed materials including brick and wood siding as primary materials. He pointed out that there are two shades of brick - one light used for the water table and a darker brick used for massing. Wood siding is used as accents he explained with the upper level mass being clad in fiber cement siding. Lastly, he noted the proposed roof material is a dimensional asphalt shingle.

Mr. Stang concluded there are three motions that will be required this evening. He stated the first is for Site Plan Waivers of which there are a total of 16. The second motion he said is for the Parking Plan and the third is for the Site Plan Review with a number of conditions. He reported the Administrative Review Team had also approved two Administrative Departures:

- 1) Roof Height
- 2) Upper Story Height

Mr. Stang briefly explained each of the following 16 Waivers that were accompanied by graphics:

1. §153.062(D)(2)(e) Gable Ends: An architecturally appropriate element such as vent, window, or decorative (required); No architectural element on North Riverview Street and plaza gable ends (requested).
2. §153.062(I)(1)(a) Balcony Size: Minimum open area of six feet deep and five feet wide (required); Balcony size of five feet deep by 10.8 feet wide on North Riverview Street (requested).
3. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Occupation of Corner: Occupation (required); No occupation at North Riverview Street & North Street (requested).
4. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Front Required Build Zone = 0 - 20 feet (required); >20 feet at North Riverview Street (requested).
5. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Corner Side Required Build Zone = 0 - 10 feet (required); >10 feet at North Riverview Street & North Street (requested).
6. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Required Build Zone Treatment = Patio or streetscape (required); No treatment at North Riverview Street (requested).
7. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(2) Minimum Lot Width = 30 feet (required); 10 feet (requested).
8. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(2) Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage = 85% maximum (required); 94% (requested).

9. §153.062(O)(9)(b) Ground Story Height = 10 - 12 feet (required); 14.67 feet on the west elevation (requested).
10. §153.062(O)(9)(b) Upper Story Height = 9 - 12 feet (required); 14.67 feet for second story on the east elevation (requested).
11. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(1) Ground Story Street Facing Transparency = 40% minimum (required); 10% on east elevation (requested).
12. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(2) Non-Street Façade Transparency = 15% minimum (required); 1% on first story of south elevation, and 13% on second story of south elevation (requested).
13. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(2) Non-Street Façade Blank Wall Limitations = Limitations (required); Blank wall on first story of the south elevation (requested).
14. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(3) Parking Lot Façade Entrances: 1 (required); None (requested).
15. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(5) Primary Materials: 80% minimum (required); 69% on west elevation, 69% on east elevation, 53% on north elevation, and 60% on south elevation (requested).
16. §153.065(E)(1)(b) Fence and Wall Height: 6 feet maximum (required); 10 feet, 10 inches along the southern property line (requested).

Based on the Site Plan Waiver Criteria, Mr. Stang stated that approval is recommended of all 16 Waivers.

Mr. Stang presented the Parking Plan to designate off-site parking spaces. He stated 102 spaces would be required for this development. He said the applicant is requesting that three on-street spaces on N. High Street be used for their development and the remaining 99 spaces would be within the parking structure in the Z building to the north. He indicated the applicant has provided details of both the Z building parking calculations and this proposal to ensure that there is still a surplus of public parking within that garage. He said there are roughly 50 spaces left open that are not required by Code. He concluded approval is recommended for the Parking Plan.

Mr. Stang said based off of the Waivers, the Parking Plan, and the criteria for a Site Plan Review, staff is recommending approval with 14 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the manufacturer specifications for the wood and fiber cement siding at the building permitting stage to ensure minimum butt thickness is being met;
- 2) That the applicant provide the operating hardware details for the doors to the commercial uses at the building permitting stage;
- 3) That all signs receive approval by the ARB through the zoning review process, prior to the installation of any signs;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with the City on the implementation of the design and construction of the Pedestrian Bridge West Plaza to ensure compliance with all requirements listed under Zoning Code §153.064 – Open Space Types;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to provide additional bicycle parking spaces on-site to the extent possible, prior to filing for building permits;
- 6) That the applicant work with Engineering to ensure compliance with Stormwater Management requirements at the time of building permitting;
- 7) That the applicant provide landscape material specifications by a registered landscape architect with the building permit to ensure all landscaping requirements are being met;

- 8) That the applicant provide foundation planting for any area not occupied by streetscape, patio, sidewalk or similar feature with the building permit to ensure compliance with this requirement;
- 9) That the applicant provide the material details for the rubble stone with the building permit, subject to staff approval;
- 10) That the applicant either receive approval for the inclusion of PID 273-004079 & PID 273-000027 from the property owner or revise all plans to remove work proposed on the properties, prior to filing for building permits;
- 11) That the applicant provide the details for mechanical screening at the time of building permitting to ensure compliance with screening requirements;
- 12) That the applicant provide the details of the mechanical units with the building permit and that any access doors face away from the public right-of-way to the maximum extent practicable;
- 13) That the applicant continue to work with the City to ensure exterior lighting requirements are being met; and,
- 14) That the applicant provide documentation of an ADA accessible path from the structured parking garage to the building, at the time of building permitting.

Mr. Stang pointed out that a number of the conditions deal with providing additional information at the building permitting stage.

Mr. Stang summarized the three motions required this evening: the Parking Plan, 16 Site Plan Waivers, and a Site Plan Review with 14 conditions.

Mr. Hunter presented some artistic renderings that the applicant has completed since the submittal to start the conversation with the Board.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the Board will be shown material samples to which Mr. Hunter answered affirmatively.

Mr. Rinaldi said there has been great improvements from where they started. He asked for clarification on height. He requested detail for the tenth Waiver that applied to the ten-foot wall on the south elevation. He asked if it was rendered in brick to which Mr. Hunter answered affirmatively.

Jane Fox said the proposal has come a long way from the beginning and that she likes the architecture consistent throughout the whole structure. She indicated she really liked the architectural detailing of the one image they saw in November with the front with a metal roof as it was a softer transition into the Historic District. She said she recalled that the ARB's biggest concern was height and the two different pieces. She said they liked the detail that it went to a more contemporary feel and asked why the applicant moved away from the way it looked previously.

Mr. Hunter said he also loved that elevation originally but they found it became a traditional building next to a contemporary building and it did not feel like a transitional building so they tried to find a happy medium.

Ms. Fox recalled one of City Council's conditions of approval for the Basic Plan that was "the applicant continue to work with staff to determine whether the story height can be adjusted to meet Code through revisions of the Site Plan." She said the height has not come down at all to meet Code; it stayed exactly the same and maybe even a little taller than building Z1. She indicated she still had concerns with the story height because Council had instructed the ARB to review this element.

Everett Musser said he wanted to commend the architect for creating a totally different design. He said the structure once looked like two separate buildings and now it is consolidated into one building. He stated he thought it was architecturally appropriate as one comes over the bridge and is introduced to the Historic District. He addressed the height issue and thought it was the same height as building Z1.

Mr. Hunter said building Z1 and Z2 are incredibly close in height. He said they conducted studies relative to the slope on those roofs; they tried to pull them down after hearing the concerns and it just did not have the same effect.

Mr. Musser concluded that visually the height would not be noticed and overall he liked the current proposal.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated it will be a preference whether or not people like where the proposal was in November versus where the proposal is today. He stated the current elevation brings the scale down some and reads more as a 2.5 story building versus a 3 story structure. Expression wise, he said it is similar to what is visible across the plaza; this design really makes placemaking a better thing. He said the West Plaza is an arrival location and with further development and once the Pedestrian Bridge Landing is all detailed out will be interesting to see. He said seeing a unified expression at the plaza is going to make it a special place. He concluded he liked the way the direction has gone.

Mr. Rinaldi reviewed the Waivers and indicated the Transparency Waivers made sense where they occurred.

Ms. Fox inquired about the Required Build Zone (RBZ). She said in the Architectural Review Board standards and also in the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, the Board is asked to make sure setbacks were similar down the street. She noted the setback is not similar on this one. She indicated her concern was with losing the traditional setbacks that we see in the Historic District as we develop closer to North Street. She said when it comes to height and this buildable zone, she is looking at how we ensure as we move into the District with more development that we do not lose our setbacks (which is part of the character) and we do not have a building too high next to a building that is low. She referred to Joyce Richard's house, which is next to the L-shaped building on the other side.

Mr. Hunter asked for clarification about the RBZ Waiver. Mr. Stang said the RBZ Waivers were for North Street and N. Riverview Street. He said the improvements being made on High Street and right-of-way that has been acquired as part of that, affected the setback and he believes this building will actually be in line with the southern development. He added there will be additional streetscape elements that will be provided in the right-of-way as part of the High Street design and they will tie into the West Plaza creating a seamless connection with this intersection.

Ms. Fox said that is her concern. She said she wanted to ensure that development does not impact the entire character of the streetscape so setbacks are important in the future so there is nice movement happening on the street. She emphasized she would prefer the height be decreased because City Council had asked the ARB to consider that. She said cantilever balconies are not found in the historic core. She prefers wood over the contemporary materials as she does not see it as transitioning. She requested more detail on the landscape plan. She said she liked the two patio seating areas on the east side and how the grotto buys into the stone and the river is a wonderful concept. She requested softening the upper level with planter boxes. She indicated the back of building Z1 is very strong and for better transitioning she is requesting a lush, soft, riverscape with planter boxes and trees.

Mr. Hunter thought some of that would come with tenant improvement, once we understand who is taking that space. From the development on the east side, he said they have learned that when a tenant is given a blank slate they can really get creative but there is an opportunity to build some of that in upfront.

Ms. Fox requested to see a sample of the rubble stone.

John Woods, MKSK, 462 S. Ludlow Street, said the rubble stone is going to tie in with the retaining walls for the west landing and is being coordinated with Parks and Recreation. He said the intent is to continue the rubble stone and wrap it around this building. He said they are looking at historic precedence in the Historic District and replicating what is existing.

Ms. Fox inquired about the old stone wall that was on the front of this property. Mr. Hunter said it is still there today. Ms. Fox said there are a lot of people in the Historic District that need that stone to repair their walls. Mr. Hunter suggested discussing this with Mandy Bishop so the stone can get to the people that would like it for repair.

Mr. Hunter addressed the height issue relative to the first story. He explained that 10 – 12 feet for a first story for commercial tenants is too low because they expect a minimum of a 12-foot clearance so the building structure would need to be above that. He explained that these heights are needed to be competitive or they will not be able to attract anyone to fill these spaces.

Ms. Fox said then it affects the overall height. She understands the heights for commercial but what about the height for apartments. Mr. Hunter answered 9 feet, which is standard.

Ms. Fox indicated there will be development farther south and it is an issue because there are only about 60 historic buildings left, and there is probably only so much land that would be considered in the Historic District. She said as development moves to North Street, the character will change for an entire block, almost all the way to SR 161 and then all that is really left in old character in a cohesive stay is everything south to Waterford Drive. She explained with each block of development, the issue becomes how much of the old character is able to be preserved. She emphasized sensitivity to height and mass is needed because the deeper one gets into the heart of SR 161 and N. High Street the more impacts are made to the entire district. She said this building makes sense because it is located at a gateway but closer to the heart it becomes a much more sensitive issue.

Mr. Rinaldi pointed out that this is the southern end of the Historic Transition District and what is appropriate here may not be appropriate next door. He said this building is different and is meant to present that transition.

Mr. Musser said he understands Ms. Fox was concerned about the setback but it appears to be right in line with two streetscape ends of building Z. Ms. Fox said she was more concerned with the area by Oscar's Restaurant.

The Chair asked if there were any concerns regarding the Parking Plan [Hearing none.]

The Chair asked if there were any further concerns with the 14 Site Plan Review conditions.

Ms. Fox recalled City Council had asked the applicant to continue to refine the architectural details and building type requirements and in terms of refining architectural details, she asked what was changed since Council saw this proposal. Mr. Stang answered it was the selection of primary and secondary materials and how they would be applied to the structure. He said there were conceptual materials shown with the Basic Plan to Council but nothing finalized. He said the applicant has provided that information with this Site Plan Review calling out manufacturers and specifications to ensure it meets Code requirements and the look and feel that is intended.

Mr. Rinaldi said he sees a high quality palette and likes the wood/timber detail that ties back to a historic nature that makes a good transition. He stated he has no concerns with the materials selected that he has been shown.

Mr. Musser said he likes the overall look including the detailing and is very pleased with the direction that this proposal has taken.

Ms. Fox indicated she would not be able to support story height; she said the building should have come down in height.

The Chair said he acknowledged Ms. Fox's concern. He said he looked at that and compared the height to building Z1 for consistency and said it was similar. He suggested that everything has been done to bring down the massing and the height within reason. He recalled the building was three stories brought down to 2.5 stories and the roofline was brought down and broken up. He said in an ideal world, he would like the story height to be 12 feet but he also understands the reality of what businesses now need.

Mr. Musser indicated the building will look lower than it actually is in height and that is the important thing versus whether it meets the exact measurement required by Code.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Parking Plan to allow 102 required parking spaces be provided off-site by utilizing three on-street spaces on N. High Street and the remaining 99 spaces from the parking structure in the Bridge Park West Development.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve a request for 16 Site Plan Waivers:

1. §153.062(D)(2)(e) Gable Ends: An architecturally appropriate element such as vent, window, or decorative (required); No architectural element on North Riverview Street and plaza gable ends (requested).
2. §153.062(I)(1)(a) Balcony Size: Minimum open area of six feet deep and five feet wide (required); Balcony size of five feet deep by 10.8 feet wide on North Riverview Street (requested).
3. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Occupation of Corner: Occupation (required); No occupation at North Riverview Street & North Street (requested).
4. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Front Required Build Zone = 0 - 20 feet (required); >20 feet at North Riverview Street (requested).
5. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Corner Side Required Build Zone = 0 - 10 feet (required); >10 feet at North Riverview Street & North Street (requested).
6. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Required Build Zone Treatment = Patio or streetscape (required); No treatment at North Riverview Street (requested).
7. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(2) Minimum Lot Width = 30 feet (required); 10 feet (requested).
8. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(2) Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage = 85% maximum (required); 94% (requested).
9. §153.062(O)(9)(b) Ground Story Height = 10 - 12 feet (required); 14.67 feet on the west elevation (requested).

10. §153.062(O)(9)(b) Upper Story Height = 9 - 12 feet (required); 14.67 feet for second story on the east elevation (requested).
11. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(1) Ground Story Street Facing Transparency = 40% minimum (required); 10% on east elevation (requested).
12. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(2) Non-Street Façade Transparency = 15% minimum (required); 1% on first story of south elevation, and 13% on second story of south elevation (requested).
13. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(2) Non-Street Façade Blank Wall Limitations = Limitations (required); Blank wall on first story of the south elevation (requested).
14. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(3) Parking Lot Façade Entrances: 1 (required); None (requested).
15. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(5) Primary Materials: 80% minimum (required); 69% on west elevation, 69% on east elevation, 53% on north elevation, and 60% on south elevation (requested).
16. §153.065(E)(1)(b) Fence and Wall Height: 6 feet maximum (required); 10 feet, 10 inches along the southern property line (requested).

The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Ms. Fox, no. (Approved 2 – 1)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Site Plan Review with 14 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the manufacturer specifications for the wood and fiber cement siding at the building permitting stage to ensure minimum butt thickness is being met;
- 2) That the applicant provide the operating hardware details for the doors to the commercial uses at the building permitting stage;
- 3) That all signs receive approval by the ARB through the zoning review process, prior to the installation of any signs;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with the City on the implementation of the design and construction of the Pedestrian Bridge West Plaza to ensure compliance with all requirements listed under Zoning Code §153.064 – Open Space Types;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to provide additional bicycle parking spaces on-site to the extent possible, prior to filing for building permits;
- 6) That the applicant work with Engineering to ensure compliance with Stormwater Management requirements at the time of building permitting;
- 7) That the applicant provide landscape material specifications by a registered landscape architect with the building permit to ensure all landscaping requirements are being met;
- 8) That the applicant provide foundation planting for any area not occupied by streetscape, patio, sidewalk or similar feature with the building permit to ensure compliance with this requirement;
- 9) That the applicant provide the material details for the rubble stone with the building permit, subject to staff approval;

- 10) That the applicant either receive approval for the inclusion of PID 273-004079 & PID 273-000027 from the property owner or revise all plans to remove work proposed on the properties, prior to filing for building permits;
- 11) That the applicant provide the details for mechanical screening at the time of building permitting to ensure compliance with screening requirements;
- 12) That the applicant provide the details of the mechanical units with the building permit and that any access doors face away from the public right-of-way to the maximum extent practicable;
- 13) That the applicant continue to work with the City to ensure exterior lighting requirements are being met; and
- 14) That the applicant provide documentation of an ADA accessible path from the structured parking garage to the building, at the time of building permitting.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

Communications

Vince Papsidero said the Board approved a Special Meeting, which is going to be a workshop on June 14, 2017, at 6:30 pm regarding the draft Code amendments. He said a Public Open House will be conducted prior to that work session in the lobby from 5:30 – 6:30 pm. He stated that information will be posted on the website and notices sent to all the property owners in the affected area on June 2. He explained that once public input is gathered and met with the Board and staff has gathered questions asked by the public that information will be brought back to the Board for a final recommendation, tentatively planned for the July or August meeting depending on the level of detail of the comments to be forwarded on to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. He indicated he thought the public should be satisfied with what they see because staff is being completely responsive to all of the issues raised.

Jane Fox said the City is losing small businesses in this area and those are what create the character of the Historic District. This district may not get the big development but small businesses that provide the services for the neighborhood will be maintained and that is just as valuable, she said.

Mr. Papsidero said we hope to retain the small businesses and hopefully attract some new ones. He said one of the challenges may just be land values regardless of anything we do. The way the proposal for the Code Amendments reads is one is limited to several small lots and cottage size boxes for new construction that can connect to each other but the form would support small business or even a residential use. He said we will need to see how this plays out long term but in the short term, staff believes we have hit the mark in terms of what is important to everybody based on the feedback received.

Ms. Fox suggested there should be a restriction to combine two and three parcels in the Historic District so a really large structure cannot be built that would change the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Papsidero said there will still be the same lot coverage requirement and the same maximum square footage of a structure that can be connected. Theoretically, he said someone could buy multiple parcels but end up with smaller structures that are interconnected, which would make the massing to be comparable to what is existing. He said staff is recommending hallway-size appendages as the links between structures.

Everett Musser said he will be on vacation the end of June and will not be attending the ARB meeting on June 28, 2017.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:50 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on June 28, 2017.