



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 10, 2016

AGENDA

- 1. Oak Park PUD, Subarea D – Oak Park Townhomes** **Oak Meadow Drive**
16-090INF **Informal Review (Discussion Only)**
- 2. Ohio University Dublin Framework Plan**
16-093ADM **Administrative Request (Approved 7 – 0)**
- 3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building C2, Cap City Diner** **6640 Riverside Drive**
16-080WR **Waiver Review (Approved 7 – 0)**
- 4. Perimeter Center, Subarea G1- Craughwell Village Condominiums**
16-084Z/PDP/FDP **6185 Craughwell Lane**
Rezoning/Preliminary & Final Development Plans (Tabled 7 – 0)
- 5. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Building C3 – Window Sills** **4550 Bridge Park Avenue**
16-098WR **Waiver Review (Approved 7 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Cathy De Rosa, Stephen Stidhem, Chris Brown, Bob Miller, Deb Mitchell, and Amy Salay (arrived at 6:36 p.m.). City representatives present were: Phil Hartmann, Lori Burchett, Jennifer Rauch, Tammy Noble, and Laurie Wright. Donna Goss arrived at 7:40 pm after the Oak Park case was reviewed.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Mitchell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Mr. Brown. (Approved 6 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. De Rosa moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the 2017/2018 meeting dates. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)



The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the following cases are eligible for the Consent Agenda: Case 4 – Craughwell Village and Case 5 – BSD, Building C3. At the request of one of the Commission members, she pulled Case 4 from the Consent Agenda. She said the cases would be heard in the following order: 5, 1, 4, 2, and 3 but would be recorded in the minutes in the order they were listed on the agenda.

**1. Oak Park PUD, Subarea D – Oak Park Townhomes
16-090INF**

**Oak Meadow Drive
Informal Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for single-family townhomes on four acres previously approved for townhouse condominiums on the west side of Hyland-Croy Road at the intersection with Oak Park Boulevard. She said this is a request for an informal review and non-binding feedback of a proposal prior to a formal application for rezoning.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site and noted the Final Development Plan was approved in 2007 for the 72 single-family and 36 townhouse units. She said the review tonight relates to converting 36 attached townhouse units to detached single-family units. She said the applicant has provided three options for discussion (Options A, B, and C).

Ms. Rauch presented Option A - the proposed conversion of the townhome and commercial area comprehensively to single-family. She said this option would provide 32 single-family lots with similar lot dimensions and would allow the same architecture, unit size and materials as the existing single-family development. She noted the challenge with this option, is the applicant does not control the commercial portion of the site, nor is the owner of the commercial portion an applicant for this application.

Ms. Rauch presented Option B - the conversion of the townhome area only, which the applicant controls, and would provide 20 single-family lots with smaller lots and lot depth; therefore, the product and elevations would need to be changed due to the reduced lot size. She reported the applicant has provided a revised architectural design and site layout for discussion. She said the site layout for these units would be rear loaded with the front elevation facing the existing single-family lots.

Ms. Rauch presented Option C – the conversion outlined in Option B for the townhome area, and then allow for future conversion of the commercial area and continue with the development pattern outlined in Option B at a later time. This option she said would provide 12 additional smaller, single-family lots and the dimensions, architecture and rear-loaded design would apply to these additional lots. Similar to Option A, she noted the ability to redevelop the commercial area would rely on the cooperation of the property owner.

Ms. Rauch stated the discussion questions:

1. Does the PZC support the request to pursue the conversion of the townhomes to single-family units? And the potential future conversion of the commercial area to single-family units?
2. Does the PZC support the proposed site layout and design?
3. Does the PZC support the proposed architectural style for Options B and C?
4. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Bob Miller asked about the lot size for Option A as compared to the existing lot sizes. Ms. Rauch answered the lot sizes are similar.

Chris Cline, 300 W. Wilson Bridge Road, Ste. 100, Worthington, Ohio, mentioned his team members that were present. He explained they are requesting an amendment to a planned district as it lacks flexibility. He said Oak Park started in 2005 and one of the key aspects is the seller retained a certain amount of

land for commercial development. In 2006, he said two uses were approved and in 2007, a filing was made for the commercial portion but nothing has ever happened with that property.

Mr. Cline presented the plat and explained the types of residential uses differed from what they had originally intended. He presented the original rendering from the Edge Group that was required for that application and have since realized there is not a demand for that product and it would be too costly. He indicated that over the years, Planning has not been receptive to altering the townhome lots because they were viewed as a transition to and a buffer from the commercial areas. He emphasized that the problem is the commercial piece has not been developed and the Final Development Plan was never filed. He presented the rendering for the commercial component from the Edge Group. He said he does not believe the commercial piece will ever develop for several reasons.

Mr. Cline presented the elevations for the two-story villa lots as well as the floor plans. He said these are plainer than the existing homes as the applicant would like to economize a bit. He presented what could be done instead of commercial development. He asked the Commission to provide guidance as to how the applicant should proceed.

Mr. Miller inquired about the chances of obtaining the commercial property. Mr. Cline said they have had discussions but believes the City could have done more over the years and could do more to encourage the rezoning under the Sunset Provisions. He said no pressure has been put on this developer through all this time.

Mr. Miller asked if Option A is what the residents want. Mr. Cline said that is what everybody wants.

The Chair called for public comment.

Melvis Houseman, 7134 Snowdrop Court, said she is one of the homeowners in Oak Park. She said the residents have met to discuss these plans proposed by the applicant. She said when they bought their home, they were told there would be a commercial area and townhomes would be built in between to act as a barrier. She stated there are many young families and the neighbors would like to see the whole area rezoned for single-family lots. She said they are concerned about the architectural integrity of the development as a whole along with safety and traffic if commercial would be allowed to develop. She said the consensus amongst the residents is that they like Option A but do not want to see it too compacted.

Tom Deshler, 7023 Greenland Place, said he had seen Options A & B but not C before this evening.

The Chair opened the Commissioner's discussion.

Cathy De Rosa asked about the timeframe for this PUD and if the commercial activity does not happen at some point in time, then what happens.

Ms. Rauch said the Code states, once a PUD has started construction they have a three-year window, whereas if it lays dormant for those three years, then the City can initiate a rezoning. She said in this instance, this PUD has been under construction since 2008. She said the PUD was placed on the whole development, and the commercial can be separated.

Phil Hartmann confirmed the Code speaks to an entire planned development.

Mr. Cline said he disagrees because under the Sunset Provision, it cannot be said that because the residential went forward, the commercial has no timeline requirements. He said another problem with the Code is there are three provisions in there and if you get approved and you do not build there is nothing to address that.

Mr. Hartmann said we agree to disagree on that point.

The Chair reminded everyone that this is an Informal Review.

Mr. Miller asked what latitude we have in rezoning the commercial piece that is not controlled by the applicant if it becomes a formal application. Mr. Hartmann said we would have no latitude and encouraged the applicant to contact the commercial developer.

Mr. Cline said the Commission could influence City Council and the Planning staff to rezone.

Ms. De Rosa said this is a lovely development so far with quality materials and the layout is very nice. She said she can appreciate that the residents want that to continue. She said the proposals felt fairly condensed and much tighter than the property as it exists today. She indicated the architectural designs of the townhomes as proposed are lovely. She said the architectural character being proposed this evening do not share the same character and the windows seem out of scale; it feels disconnected and heard the applicant say they would like to value engineer. She encouraged the applicant to make the proposed changes feel like the rest of the development that exists today; the density would only exacerbate the look of this.

Chris Brown said the residents would prefer Options A or C but the applicant is asking the Commission to leverage that other developer to modify what they want to do with that land and he is not sure that is the Commission's position. He indicated it is possible to value engineer the townhomes while keeping the basic character. He said the proposal for Option C is not to the level of detail that it should be.

Steve Stidhem said it is obvious the commercial development is not going to occur and if there is something the City can do, we should do it. He said the homes that exist are amazing homes and has heavily considered buying one for himself. He agreed the applicant should go forward with the same types of homes and quality that exist.

Amy Salay said she would like to see the City take a position as Mr. Stidhem suggested. She said we need to do something because she agrees that commercial is not going to happen. She said the town homes are probably not a good idea unless the commercial were to develop. She said she likes Option A because that gets us closer to maintaining the existing character. She said there is no reason to value engineer when there is a successful neighborhood that is beautiful and developing nicely. She indicated that Council will feel like something has to be done but does not know how to put pressure on an absentee landowner that does not appear to be concerned.

Deb Mitchell agreed action needs to happen and Option A is her preference.

Mr. Miller said he would like to see the City provide guidance to the residents for a path forward. He indicated he likes Option A and could see it playing out in Option B.

Victoria Newell said she would support the conversion from townhomes to the single-family homes because it is better for the residential feel of this particular neighborhood and believes that is what the residents would like to see. She said then the commercial would not fit but does not see it getting developed as commercial, anyway. In Option C she said, if you leave the commercial as future lots could get developed but does remain commercial, the open space that is there provides a buffer. She said the architecture presented does not have the same detail and is not fair to the residents as it does not follow the same detail of the existing homes.

Mr. Cline said the architectural drawing was conceptual to see if they had a product that would fit on there. He said if they do go forward the product would not be indistinguishable to anything existing. He

said they are not trying to do anything cheap but they are trying to compete and there is a lot of expense to this. He restated something has to happen quickly.

Mr. Brown concluded that the Commission is concerned for the existing residents. He encouraged the applicant to propose a layout and product that is equal to that, and talk to the other developer into permitting the applicant to develop some of that land, then the Commission would probably support Options A or C and if not then Option B is probably viable.

Ms. Newell indicated the Commission would not support any other architecture than what was approved.

Mr. Miller asked if it is possible for staff to provide this group with a path forward and how to approach Council regarding the commercial piece. He said he would like to provide a course of action to pursue.

Ms. Rauch said the informal this evening was the first step. She said there is an option for the applicant to go before Council requesting an Informal Review.

2. Ohio University Dublin Framework Plan 16-093ADM

Administrative Request

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a vision plan intended to offer a comprehensive view for how the Ohio University Dublin campus may evolve over time intended to guide future development for the campus located on the south side of Post Road, west of Eiterman Road. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for the proposed Ohio University Master Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.232.

Tammy Noble said this plan was presented to the Commission in September. She explained this has been a year-long process working with the university on how to expand in the West Innovation District. She noted at this point we will answer any questions the Commission may have and request the Commission make a recommendation to City Council.

Cathy De Rosa said she read the plan again and wanted to compliment the university and staff for all the work that has been done as it is a phenomenal plan and exciting to read. She said one of the previous comments from the Commission was encouraging the university to be architecturally bold and she sees some of that in the design. She said this is very well done, she loves the Main Street flow and she is excited to support this plan.

Bob Miller said the plan is awesome and exciting; he cannot wait to see it truly come to life. Steve Stidhem indicated he is quite excited about this plan for Dublin. He said kudos to all involved. Victoria Newell said the plan was fabulous, extremely well-written and very clear about the intention of the development. Chris Brown said the plan is fantastic. Amy Salay indicated City Council had discussed how to make a complete community and that included how important the university presence would be to our community long term from an economic development standpoint and a quality of life standpoint. She said it will be very impactful.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to recommend approval of the framework plan to City Council. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

**3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building C2, Cap City Diner
16-080WR**

**6640 Riverside Drive
Waiver Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the installation of operable weather screens at a new restaurant on the first floor of building C2 of Bridge Park on the east side of Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Commission regarding this case.

Lori Burchett said the applicant is proposing to use a vinyl screen for their patio enclosure and that is not one of the permitted material within the Bridge Street District. She noted the application was tabled at the last review to work with staff to address the concerns of the Commission that included material quality and the use of vinyl screens. She presented an aerial view of the site for context as it relates to the other blocks in the Bridge Park development and the conditions proposed by the applicant. She explained these conditions address specifications of the materials that were shown at the previous meeting as well as utilization of the screens and their replacement. The proposed conditions are as follows:

- 1) The applicant will install Corradi USA-SL 135 hand crank system with shy zip tracks. Material is 8” woven acrylic borders (tempotest USA-Tempotest marine with 10 year warranty, T40779-60 ‘Silver Tweed’) with clear vinyl windows (O’Sullivan Films-O’Sea clear vinyl; .030 gauge, marine grade), which is the same product as shown to the Planning and Zoning Commission at the public hearing. Sun shades will be Mechosystems-Mecho/5 with manual operation with finish housing to match patio columns. The shade cloth will be ThermoVeil, Basket Weave 2100 ‘black’ with 20% opacity.
- 2) The applicant will only utilize the screens during inclement weather events and as shade for patio patrons.
- 3) The screens are only permitted to be lowered during patio operation hours; at all other times, the screens shall be raised.
- 4) The screens shall be replaced every five years.

Ms. Burchett said material samples are available as well additional renderings. She presented graphics of the sunscreens as they would appear raised and lowered on the elevation that faces Riverside Drive and the corner of the elevation that faces Riverside Drive to the west and public open space to the north.

Victoria Newell asked if the graphic is a photograph of an actual sunshade lowered or a computerized image. Randy Roberty, Design Collective, LLC, answered the graphic is an image of the material that will go into the sunshade and Photoshop’d onto the rendering as the patio is not built yet.

Steve Stidhem inquired about the replacement time proposed of every five years. Ms. Burchett reported that staff discussed the possibility of permitting the Commission to view the product sometime after occupancy to get idea of what the materials would look like and how it works in this scenario. She agreed that additional language should be added to that fourth condition so if the applicant needs to replace the materials sooner they are permitted.

The Commission discussed whether “inclement weather” should be defined and if specifications for permitting the lowering of the screens needs to be clearly defined; various scenarios were considered. The consensus was to not get too specific as it would become too much of a challenge for Code Enforcement.

Ms. Newell questioned the opacity of the Mecco shades. Mr. Roberty demonstrated the drop screen system and the Mecco shade proposed, which are 5% or 10% opacity. Ms. Newell said she thought the agreed upon opacity would be 20%. Ms. Burchett said 20% is written into the condition currently and everyone agreed that was the right level of opacity for this location.

Mr. Miller inquired as to how the five-year replacement will be recorded and enforced. Ms. Burchett said staff would tie it to the date of occupancy.

Mr. Miller said if the Commission were to approve this material, then anyone in the BSD would be permitted as well. Ms. Rauch added that as the BSD Code was being revised, this material could be added as a permitted material. She suggested this be approved for a one-year period and the applicant would be required to come back to the Commission or ART to review if this is working out. She said this would permit the conditions to be fairly generic when it came to "inclement weather" and when the screens would be permitted to be lowered.

The applicant requested a two-year review timeframe due to the cost of the materials and installation.

Ms. Newell said she really liked that suggestion because it is difficult to visualize what this is really going to look like installed and that provision would provide the Commission an opportunity to back out if they find the screens are constantly down, etc. She added that a two-year time period may be more reasonable.

Mr. Brown asked staff if they had any objections to this being used throughout the BSD. Ms. Rauch answered that staff does have concerns but they are willing to see what this looks like and obtain some real data because this product has not been approved anywhere else in the City. She said taking this up on a case-by-case basis is important because this could potentially come up in the Historic District, where it may or may not be appropriate.

Ms. Newell said she is willing to take a leap of faith so that this restaurant can be as successful as possible, just as we want everything in the BSD to be successful.

The following conditions were included as part of the approval:

- 1) The applicant will install Corradi USA-SL 135 hand crank system with shy zip tracks. Material is 8" woven acrylic borders (tempotest USA-Tempotest marine with 10 year warranty, T40779-60 'Silver Tweed') with clear vinyl windows (O'Sullivan Films-O'Sea clear vinyl; .030 gauge, marine grade) which is the same product as shown to the Planning Zoning Commission at the public hearing. Sun shades will be Mechosystems-Mecho/5 with manual operation with finish housing to match patio columns. The shade cloth will be ThermoVeil, Basket Weave 2100 'black' with 20% opacity.
- 2) The applicant will only utilize the screens during inclement weather events and as shade for patio patrons.
- 3) The screens are only permitted to be lowered during patio operation hours when patrons are present. At all other times, the screens shall be raised.
- 4) The screens shall be replaced every five years or sooner as needed.
- 5) That the applicant come before the planning and zoning commission after two years from occupancy to ensure suitability of the product.

The applicant agreed to all the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown motioned, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the Waiver Review. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

4. Perimeter Center, Subarea G1- Craughwell Village Condominiums 16-084Z/PDP/FDP 6185 Craughwell Lane Rezoning/Preliminary & Final Development Plans

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a rezoning to amend the approved development text of a Planned District to revise permitted building materials and architectural elevations and the replacements of roofing and building materials for an existing condominium development on the south side of Perimeter Drive at the intersection with Craughwell Lane. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan and a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Commission regarding this case.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site as well as the existing building conditions. She noted the development text is very specific with regard to architectural designs and elevations. She said the applicant is proposing to renovate these buildings due to significant maintenance and material life cycle issues, water infiltration, and lack of installation details when the structures were originally built. She noted the renovation will consist of replacing the existing wood shake shingle roof with dimensional asphalt shingles, remove all stone from the buildings, repair and replace all damaged sheathing and framing and replace the stone at the lower level in kind and install stucco in the upper two levels in a matching color and finish. She said all the windows and existing stucco and stone chimneys will remain in existing condition.

Ms. Rauch presented a proposed design from the southeast perspective as part of the Final Development Plan. She said the applicant is proposing to change the location of the building materials; where there is a stone section they are proposing to remove the stone but the lower level will be replaced with stone and the upper stories will have stucco. She presented a before and after graphic. Two different colors of stucco are being proposed she said depending on cohesion of the building; the existing brick detailing will remain. She indicated the overall style of this development is remaining.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended of the Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan with no conditions to City Council and approval is recommended for the Final Development Plan with no conditions.

Bob Miller confirmed the garages have asphalt shingles on them currently.

The Chair invited the applicants to present.

Lisa Pearson, Case Bowen Company, 6255 Corporate Center Drive, and Jim Bender, JL Bender Inc., Architects and Planners, 3340 Riverside Drive, Upper Arlington, Ohio.

Mr. Bender said he has had some very challenging technical problems with this development that are not on the surface. He said they want to preserve the architectural appearance of the development. He said the stone on these massive stone structures are causing all the problems so that is where their focus is. He indicated they want to improve the value for both the community and the people that reside there and the way to make it better is to lighten it up and make it fresher for a 2016 look. He said the stone is not real stone, it is constituted stucco and they believe that by removing some of the stone and replacing

it with stucco will lighten it up. He reported there are serious mold issues that even can be smelled from the street so they really need to change the roof. He said they are proposing a heavy duty shingle in two different colors so the six buildings alternate to provide more variety. He said they are expecting to find extensive water damage when they remove the brick so the new synthetic stone, stucco are going to be installed as a rain screen technology so it should prevent water infiltration for 30 – 40 years. He said the roof is a fire hazard; it is extremely costly for the residents to install that now. He presented a material sample of the stucco of which this will be the first installation in this area. He said the guarantee on the roof shingle is 50 years and 20 – 30 for the stucco without all these water problems. He concluded after these renovations proposed, the value of the buildings will increase.

Amy Salay said she understands the shake shingles were beautiful but they are not working. She said it would be helpful if she could see a material sample. She indicated she is not sure she likes alternating the colors on the buildings. She said she has a problem with changing the stone into a stucco as it will fundamentally change the appearance of the building and not in a good way. She indicated she is nervous about this brand new product. She noted her parents had a home built of brick and stone and it never leaked so she is questioning if the installation was done correctly. She stated she wants to see the materials that are out there maintained but the problems resolved. She said she is fine with changing the roof material.

Vicki Newell said she respectfully disagrees with the presentation. She said it is a lovely building the way it is designed right now. The proposed aesthetic changes to the exterior of the building she said are not an improvement. She said she does not believe the water issues are a result of any of the materials that have been used but rather how the building was constructed. She stated she cannot support changing the shake roof; it is part of the character of the building; and other applicants have requested the same and have been denied so she wants to be consistent. She said Colonial Williamsburg has a number of buildings that have the appearance of shake shingles to preserve the appearance of historic structures, so the shingles they used are actually clay and they are available on the market. She concluded she could not support the changes in the Development text as this proposal does not warrant it.

Chris Brown said he agrees with Ms. Newell and if the stone is changed, the replacement has to match what is there. He said cedar shakes work just fine if properly ventilated and put on slats and the attic is ventilated properly. He indicated it is a 50-year product if installed in the correct manner. He would not mind if the stone was replaced with stucco on the back side of the buildings but the fronts are paramount to keep the character, particularly the clubhouse. He encouraged the applicant to explore other options.

Cathy De Rosa said she agreed with her fellow Commissioners. She said the proposed changes would absolutely change the character and she would not support those changes. She said she would defer to her colleagues on the roofing materials.

Steve Stidhem said he did not know anything about roofing but in general he hates stucco and the stone is a better look.

Deb Mitchell said the stone is really important from a branding perspective and the look and feel for the whole area. She said those buildings are part of other things which all flows together as stone is one of the integrating elements. She encouraged the applicant to find materials that would preserve the look. She said structures need to be brought up-to-date in terms of their durability, sustainability, and functionality but not the look.

Bob Miller said he thought since the complex was tight and each building was three stories that he liked the asphalt shingles that are on the garages and not the shake shingles on the rooftops. He stated he would be supportive of the asphalt shingle roof. He agreed with the applicant in terms of replacing the stone with the stucco would refresh the look of the complex and the only proposed change he questions

is matching the stucco. He applauded the investment into the property because it is good for Dublin, overall.

Mr. Bender said the buildings are 75 – 80% brick but they are proposing to remove 12 – 15% of the brick. He said the biggest change is probably the roof; they selected the heaviest and best shingle on the market. He said clay shingles would be six times as expensive.

Ms. Newell said cost is not an issue that the Commission takes into consideration. She said they look at review standards and when the applicant is proposing a lesser quality material than what was there before, and the applicant stated in their presentation that they are doing some of these things as a cost-saving measure and she understands doing that for the residents but this is a review of the full development text so everything else in the same development has to face the same standards. Looking at the review standards, she stated she did not think that it met the effect of the adjacent uses and is not consistent with the surrounding development so it did not comply with condition 9 for coordination and integration of the building and site relationships because it is changing the development standards of all being replaced for this property and the surrounding development and this was done to coordinate with the Village Center when it was built.

Mr. Bender said there is a difference on all six buildings between the street presence and the garage side. He explained there are two peak roofs in the middle of each façade and that is where they had planned to replace the stone with stucco.

Ms. Newell said she understands the applicant's argument is water infiltration but if the stone is installed properly and detailed properly it is a durable finish on the exterior of a building so she does not see the need to change materials and it would aesthetically change the appearance that was there and change the development text.

Ms. Newell said the Commission can vote on this application this evening or the applicant can request to table the case. Mr. Bender asked to table the case.

Motion and Vote

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

5. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Building C3 – Window Sills 16-098WR

4550 Bridge Park Avenue Waiver Review

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the approval of a Waiver Review to permit the windows within siding clad walls to not have a projecting sill within Building C3 in Bridge Park. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Commission regarding this case.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown motioned, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Waiver Review with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:55 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on January 5, 2017.