



## MEETING MINUTES

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 24, 2017

### AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Block D  
17-022BPR** **PID: 271-012703**  
**Basic Plan Review (Discussion only)**
- 2. Tuttle Crossing West Corridor PCD – Motel 6  
17-072FDP** **5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard**  
**Final Development Plan (Tabled 5 – 0)**
- 3. NE Quad PUD - Emerald Fields  
17-080AFDP** **4040 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard**  
**Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Victoria Newell, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, Stephen Stidhem, and Bob Miller. Amy Salay and Chris Brown were absent. City representatives present were: Vince Papsidero, Lori Burchett, Logan Stang, JM Rayburn, Lia Yakumithis, Michael Hendershot, Shawn Krawetzki, and Laurie Wright.

### Administrative Business

#### Motion and Vote

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

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated the NE Quad PUD – Emerald Fields case is eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening. She determined that case would be heard first based on staff's recommendations followed by the Motel 6 case and Block D to be heard last. However, she said the minutes are recorded in the order of the agenda.

- 1. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Block D  
17-022BPR-INF** **PID: 271-012703**  
**Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for a mixed-use development on approximately 5.3 acres, including three buildings containing 119 residential units, approximately 78,000 square feet of office space, 48,000 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and a parking structure lined with 55 residential units. She said the site is east of Riverside Drive, south of John Shields Parkway, west of Mooney Street, and north of Tuller Ridge Drive. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback of a Basic Plan Review prior to a review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.



Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site followed by the process and schedule for this application. She explained City Council will be the final reviewing body on this project and they will take into account the feedback received during this evening's informal review as well as the reviews from the Administrative Review Team (ART). She indicated the tentative schedule is for a recommendation from the ART on August 31 and the project to be heard by City Council on September 11, 2017. She added City Council will determine a reviewing body for future applications, which has historically been the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed development plan where she highlighted Block D for context of the overall Bridge Street Development. Blocks A, B, and C, she reported, are currently under construction with Block C nearing completion. She said Block A is at the south end of the project and will have a hotel and events center and Blocks B and C will be mixed-use development with residential, office, and retail. She said three public parking garages are located within each block. Block H she said was approved for townhome units and are currently under building permit review. Additionally, she said Block G received Basic Plan Approval for a mixed-use development with residential and commercial components.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan for Block D that includes four buildings on three blocks created by the extension of Longshore Street and Larimer Street. She said the applicant is proposing to extend Larimer Street west and terminate at Building D2; Longshore Street is proposed to be extended through the block to John Shields Parkway.

Ms. Burchett noted building D1 on the proposed site plan presented with the prominent façade on Riverside Drive. She explained building D1 is proposed as a 6-story, mixed-use building with an overall height of 80 feet. She said the first two floors will consist of retail/restaurant and office space, and the upper stories will contain condominium units. She said a pedestrian bridge will connect to the third floor of building D5 to provide access to parking.

While specific materials have not been selected, she said, the applicant is proposing a contemporary aesthetic with brick and glass with storefront-style windows on all floors, similar to building B3 also within the Bridge Park Development. She provided some inspirational images from the applicant.

Ms. Burchett noted building D2 on the proposed site plan which is located at the corner of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway that is the northerly boundary of the Bridge Park Development. She described building D2 as having six stories with an overall height of 90 feet. She said no residential uses are proposed for this building. Retail space is proposed for the first floor, she said, with five floors of office space above. The 6th floor, she explained, steps back to create an outdoor terrace on the western and southern elevations.

Again, she provided inspirational architectural images from the applicant. This building she said has a predominantly glass and metal panel building facade, similar in character to building A3 (AC Hotel), at the southerly end of the overall development acting as bookends on Riverside Drive for the Bridge Park Development.

Ms. Burchett pointed out that building D3 fronts John Shields Parkway. Due to the change in grade from Mooney Street to Longshore Street, she explained this building is five stories in height on the west side with only four stories on the east side. She described the first floor as a partially, below-grade podium parking deck with a pharmacy proposed for the northwest corner with a drive-thru integrated into the parking area. Although further review is needed, she indicated that podium parking may require a Conditional Use, which would be reviewed by the Commission. She said residential units are proposed on the four upper floors and a pedestrian bridge connects to building D5 at the third floor level.

The inspirational architectural images provided, she said, reflect a predominantly brick and metal panel/cementitious panel facade, similar in character to buildings B1, B2, and C1 all included in the Bridge Park Development.

Ms. Burchett presented the open space details for the private open space terrace that includes seating areas and landscaping that is proposed for the third story of building D3.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan where building D4/D5 is highlighted on the screen. The D4 portion of the building, she explained, is the Corridor Building Type consisting of five stories and the overall height varies from  $\pm 60$  feet at the west elevation to  $\pm 45$  feet at the east elevation. She said the first floor faces Larimer Street and is comprised of retail use, lobby space, bike parking and support space, and is partially below grade at the eastern end of this wing of the building. She said residential units are proposed on all the other floors, including the first floor of the wing facing Mooney Street.

Ms. Burchett stated building D5 is the Parking Structure portion of the building. It is a five-story building she said with an overall height of  $\pm 47$  feet. She indicated retail use is proposed for the first floor facing Longshore Street as well as a portion of Tuller Ridge Drive. She presented the open space details for the fifth floor of the parking structure and noted in the northwest corner a private amenity space, including two pools, a bar, a party room, and restrooms that are proposed. She indicated a portion of this space may be rented for event use by non-residents.

Ms. Burchett presented the inspirational architectural images for building D4/5 that reflect a predominantly brick or stone and glass building facade, similar in character to the other buildings in this development.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic showing the overall open space for block D. Based on the proposed square footage, she noted, 0.88 acres of publicly accessible open space is required with this application. A 0.20-acre segment of the John Shields Greenway is proposed on the north side of building D3 and a .07-acre segment of the John Shields Greenway is proposed on the north side of building D2. She said this area coincides with a gateway location as described and illustrated in the Scioto River Neighborhood Standards. The design of this open space, she indicated, will be developed in the future as the City explores design and functionality of the greenway space in its entirety.

A 0.16-acre 'Public Open Space' is proposed between buildings D1 and D2, she said. She presented the proposed design of this space that includes 'Outdoor Dining' spaces adjacent to both buildings, a central 'Bocce Court' flanked by trees and other plantings, with moveable tables and chairs on decorative paved areas.

The remaining 0.28 acres proposed to meet the open space requirement, she said, is utilizing nearby Riverside Crossing Park. She noted, the applicant will continue to work with the City on these details.

To summarize, Ms. Burchett stated the applicant is proposing four buildings on three blocks created by the extension of Longshore Street and Larimer Street. She concluded her presentation by presenting the following discussion questions for the Commission's review this evening:

1. Is the overall proposed block arrangement consistent with the surrounding context?
2. Is the proposed architectural mass, form, and conceptual character of each building appropriate?
3. Is the proposed open space for public dedication appropriately located and sized?
4. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Bob Miller asked what happened to the proposed grocery store discussed at previous meetings. He asked what concerns staff may have had with building D4/5. Ms. Burchett indicated a much of the discussions

with staff and the ART have been regarding the layout, how to best work the prominent corner across from residential units and how the building would interact with the street level activity. The questions raised, she said, had been about the location and screening of mechanicals as well as a way to avoid a blank wall space and those details have not necessarily been worked out.

Mr. Miller said when one is coming down Riverside Drive, he noted D2 is critical to be an entryway to Bridge Park from the north. Ms. Burchett agreed. He said that building has to be special just like the AC Hotel is pretty special.

Mr. Miller inquired about the pool/bar area as he did not have a full understanding on if it was public or private. Ms. Burchett indicated it is going to be a predominantly private space as an amenity space for the residential units throughout Bridge Park but the applicants can better address that question.

Steve Stidhem inquired about a drive-thru pharmacy proposed in the parking garage. Ms. Burchett said the applicant can speak to the flow of traffic through there and other details. She explained it is a smaller space in the corner and it can be associated with another business where it is just the drive-thru portion of it.

Mr. Stidhem thought the original plan was to have office space in that building and then he heard access to the parking is going to be for the condominiums or apartments. He asked where the people that are working there are going to park. Ms. Burchett said parking is accounted for within the parking structure as far as how they would access the building but the applicant could speak to that as well.

Cathy De Rosa requested clarification on all of the green space next to buildings D2 and D3; did it all belong to the City. Ms. Burchett confirmed the entire space belongs to the City and extends in front of block H and through Tuller Flats.

Victoria Newell inquired about the community space. She said in the Planning Report it stated that the text needed to be reviewed in order to account for that open space. Ms. Burchett explained the open space is being proposed as part of this project. She stated our Code allows for using open space that is available near the development and having that contribute to the total open space area required for each block. She said there have been some interpretation concerns with what the applicant would need to do as far as using that space to count towards their open space requirements. She said the Development Agreement speaks to dedication for specific Blocks but there is also some language about paying a fee-in-lieu. She indicated that staff and the legal team are looking into that further as to how to properly account for open space off-site.

Ms. Newell asked staff if they believe it is otherwise compliant with the text to which Ms. Burchett agreed. Ms. Burchett explained 0.28 acres are designated in that off-site location to account towards the open space requirement, likely with a fee-in-lieu. She said they are continuing to work with the applicant to define what that area would look like. Ms. Newell asked Ms. Burchett if she knew exactly where that 0.28 acres was located. Ms. Burchett said the overall requirement is 0.88 acres and the 0.28 acres they are using off-site has not been specifically addressed yet.

Ms. Newell asked have included private outdoor seating areas that will be included in the open space for the other developments and the other parks.

Ms. Burchett noted that when staff saw the first proposal for block H, she recalled a portion of that was going to be a private space that included a pool area that has since been removed as part of a separate application.

Ms. Newell clarified for all of the other blocks that are currently under construction, within open spaces there are not private dining areas. Ms. Burchett said she did not recall any. She added the proposed dining space between the buildings D1 and D2 would be public.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, said he would try to answer the Commission's questions but then would like to hear feedback from the Commission. He introduced others from his team to also answer questions. Mr. Yoder noted the Pedestrian Bridge between the parking garage and the condominium building is for the residents of the condominiums only so they will have reserved parking on the upper levels. He added the office employees will park in the general open garage, just like they do currently over on C block. He indicated they are not interested in pampering the office worker on their way to and from the spaces but they do the condominium dwellers.

Mr. Yoder addressed the question about open space. He said they will not count seating areas that are private seating areas for restaurants as public open space. He explained the way they work all of the blocks is there is a public use access easement to enable the public to be able to go through there. He said when you get behind a patio rail, where the public cannot flow through, those spaces cannot be counted anymore. He indicated they are going to be purchasing from the City, about a 0.3-acre parcel right up the road to be traded. He said a dog park is proposed there in Sycamore Ridge to accommodate the people in Bridge Park that are having trouble crossing Riverside Drive with their dogs. He said that will be counted towards open space as well.

Mr. Yoder addressed the question about the grocery store. He said the large format grocery store that they started working with ended up not wanting to go into this particular location which turned out to be a real blessing for the project. He said that was the 'tail wagging the dog' on this entire block. Everyone concerned decided the issues over having tractor trailers backing up right across from residential areas was not preferable. He said they would still like to get a grocer into this area that is walkable but it will be a smaller format version so the block was split in half to allow Longshore Street to continue all the way through. He indicated that one of the happy accidents now is when one stands on Longshore Street now, when standing in different parts of Bridge Park, the road curves so that the view corridor is cut off and one would feel like they were anywhere.

Mr. Yoder said they agree that building D2 has to be something special, which is why it appears curvy and tries to serve as a bookend to the development. He said they will be careful to ensure D2 does not look too much like the other end. He indicated they would use a lot of glass and a sculptural shape will be appropriate to bring some pizzazz to that corner.

Mr. Yoder addressed the earlier question about a drive-thru pharmacy. He explained a lot of smaller format grocery stores still have a pharmacy component to them so they wanted to make sure they preserved the flexibility to cover that very important programmatic need. He said it is a big profit center for some of them so they found they needed that in order to get them to sign a lease. The circulation was then explained by Mr. Yoder.

Mr. Yoder reported he has been inundated with questions about a pool in this development. He said they are proposing it for the D garage and by putting it up on this level and positioning it in the gap between the buildings, one will be able to see a framed view of the Scioto River. With it being on the fifth floor, for someone that lives somewhere else in the community, they are able to drive up to the fifth level of the parking garage, park, and walk directly through a gate, into the pool area. He said it is set up so there is two different zones: 1) a reserveable private party area; and 2) the rest is open to the community members' pool. He said there is a sizeable population at Bridge Park now, and this is not the typical apartment complex by any stretch. He said 64 condominiums on block H are coming online and 43 condominiums along Mooney Street. He said this is a Bridge Park-wide amenity for both condominium

owners and apartment owners. To answer why at this location – he said there is really no ground space they want to take up with this and being at this height, it allows for more privacy as cars cannot drive by and support some pretty decent views. He said they are trying to build some excitement that can be generated from below that cannot be physically seen.

Mr. Miller noted there was a pool in block H which was eliminated. He indicated this rooftop pool may be a larger financial commitment than that pool would have been. He asked how locked in they are to this concept. He said Mr. Yoder already stated the demand is there. He did not see any revenue being generated from this, so he asked if the pool is real or just on a wish list. Mr. Yoder answered as far as he knows it is real and having it as a community-wide amenity to 700+ residential units is the intent, which is different than a pool at block H, which only had 64 residential units. He added a community-wide fee would be collected.

Mr. Stidhem said he loves the curve on D2 and he is interested to see how close it goes to the pedestrian tunnel area. He asked if there would be an overhang on that. Mr. Yoder said they could use a cantilever overhang but this has yet to be determined. Mr. Stidhem said he would like to see something really interesting.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, explained one of the massing studies showed that is an idea to provide a covered plaza to that area to be very functional off of John Shields Parkway.

Mr. Yoder presented a graphic with columns for the same visual impact and make that area wider as the overhang without columns did not work.

Mr. Miller said he cannot believe how many people are asking where to park. He asked Mr. Yoder if he is hearing that in the development. He asked him if he had an opportunity to redo the parking signs, if he would do them differently. He said he does not even see those parking signs that are up high.

Mr. Yoder indicated when people pull in, they are overwhelmed, and the parking signs up high go away, it is completely out of their view shed. He said they are more concerned with not hitting a pedestrian, etc. He added we have to over sign the parking in order to have the impact that we want and that goes outside the current Master Sign Plan that has been approved. He said the parking sign is 8 feet wide and 60 feet tall that reads "PARKING" and we need to do that to get someone in there. He indicated it is a learning curve for everyone on what the user experience is like coming into Bridge Park and they will try to get that corrected on the next phases.

Mr. Miller suggested the sandwich boards are effective, he would assume. But as much time and effort that went into the parking signs from staff, the Commission, and the applicant, do not seem to be effective and we should learn from that. People need to know where to go, he added; we as a Commission need to understand that.

Ms. Newell said height is not always the solution for signage because if a person gets too close to a building when starting to look for the parking space, you are no longer looking up, there is a roof and trees in the way so putting signs up high is not always the best solution. Mr. Yoder said that was a very nice way to say "I told you so" but it is true. Ms. Newell said she meant it politely.

Vince Papsidero added the City has put in temporary wayfinding signs along Riverside Drive because complaints were coming into the City that people could not find a parking garage. He said there is a permanent wayfinding system to be installed shortly. He suggested that as we are trying to find signs for the Historic District Garage, this issue will be revisited.

Mr. Yoder noted that people visiting the area now are coming for the very first time but next time they will figure it out. He said they hope to get a lot of first-time visitors in here.

Ms. Newell said it is a nice compliment for the architecture if people are looking at the buildings and they cannot tell which ones are the parking garages. She said, somewhere along the line, we all did our job.

Ms. De Rosa asked how many other lessons has the applicant learned that are going to be applicable here. Mr. Yoder said for the earlier phases in Bridge Park, he would say no thin brick as they have had a terrible time with that. He suggested the lack of skilled labor that exists right now is really causing a problem, beyond the fact that there is a huge amount of construction going on. He reported that they do a very diligent job of making sure that everyone that is on their projects is a legal immigrant and he thinks what is going on is there are some awesome artisans that are not legal immigrants in the country and they are not on our projects. He said they are limiting their talent pool on their projects, unintentionally. He said the labor shortage is at least region-wide. He said it is harder to stick on brick then it is to lay it and they have had to tear off huge walls of brick and replace on several buildings so that is a big problem.

Mr. Yoder said they are starting to put in the liner retail into the ground floor of parking garage so the street feels more double-loaded on day one (Longshore Street).

Deborah Mitchell said the dog park is a great idea. She encouraged the applicant to talk to pet owners as they design the park because things like shade and drainage are really important. She said it is a huge blessing that the large format grocery is not coming in because retail trends are such that they would be an albatross pretty soon. She indicated that all the retail experts are saying that very soon, anything that are sold in the internal aisles of the stores (packaged) will be attained through Amazon or other delivery mechanisms. She suggested that people are going to visit grocery stores to buy items they cannot get delivered to their house such as fresh food and things that people in Bridge Park would love but you do not need a large format grocery for. She said we are not going to need all those big trucks unloading a zillion boxes of cereal. She pointed out that D2 not mirror the hotel at the other end but that they complement each other but be really different. She underscored D2 on the north end has to be striking and beautiful but it has to be unique, too. She said sort of like it is a member of the family but different from what is located on the south end.

Mr. Stidhem said a lot of positives were expressed this evening and the applicant has done a good job and applauds what they have done with the roads like Longshore and Larrimer Streets. He said he likes the views that will come from the pool that include the river as well as the open space there. He said he is really interested to see the design for D2 because there is a lot of potential there, as well as some challenges. He added he likes the idea of keeping the open space that runs all the way up John Shields Parkway is consistent. He concluded this looks like a pretty project within the big project.

Ms. De Rosa wants to see D2 reflects the hotel at the end of the day but not mirror images. She said she worries a little bit that it is all going to start to feel the same but if there are interesting bookends, then she could recognize this as a complete community. She emphasized the applicant not shy away from what was accomplished on the south end. She reported she has been to the development a couple of times now. She understands they want the ability to pull people through and get them to walk around. She said the green spaces and the pocket spaces are going to be so important to that. Maybe it is because they are not completed yet, but she said when she has been down there and there is not a lot finished yet, she does not feel the urge to walk around and explore. She recognizes it is a timing thing but it is an important part of this.

Mr. Yoder said it is also going to be important the people want to be in those open spaces is why they programmed this one a little bit differently. He said they are proposing a Bocce Court that could also be used as a Corn Hole Tournament. He said they are investigating 'Best of Class' examples around the country. He said they are considering having a chalkboard at the side where someone could sign in and reserve a time would be useful, why they are waiting for their table. He said it would give people more of a reason to be in that space. He noted the Pavilion space over by Cap City Diner and the (future) Fado

restaurant/bar currently provides live music at different times. He said the other space that has the charismatic boulders in it, should be open within 60 days at the outside. He said we will begin to start watching people. He said it is kind of like the Oval at The Ohio State University where you can see where people are walking from place to place.

Ms. De Rosa said it would be interesting to hear what they have learned about that when they return to this Commission. She has been questioning how those pocket parks are going to engage with the building itself. She said it is going to do a lot with whether one enters the garage (once they found it), do what I want to do and then I am going to leave or one is going to find their way to do what we need to have happen in that space. She said that is as important as the architecture.

Ms. De Rosa said the granite curbs have been causing tire damage.

Mr. Miller said he witnessed a driver doing a really bad parallel parking job and then all of a sudden, WHAM!

Mr. Yoder said that was a city-wide issue.

Mr. Papsidero reported Engineering has been going back and grinding the edges off the granite that has been installed. He indicated reflectors are being installed now at the bump outs. He said part of the problem is behavior, as we adjust to an urban setting plus when the parking is not full, and people are going too fast, they drive into bump-outs. He suggested that once there is more activity and the place gets full, behavior will change, people will slow down and pay more attention. Due to what they have seen, they will update the Code to pull back the bump-outs a little bit and the lane width, especially on secondary streets so there may be some tweaks in terms of the standards but they will be minimal.

The speed limits were briefly discussed, which may be changed per the traffic study.

Mr. Miller stated he absolutely loves the project and he cannot wait to see it and hopes they take buildings D1, D2, and D3 and put their stamp on it. Unfortunately, he said he does not have any feedback to provide that the applicant could take back and use. He said he is pleasantly surprised to see the office demand is so high; that is great for the City. He concluded, overall, the project is really cool and awesome.

Mr. Stidhem said rooftop amenities like what he has seen in other cities and what the applicant has done with the pool, etc. would be awesome. He suggested a building could be neat but the experience could be awesome when something attracts people to the rooftops.

Mr. Yoder said the office building on the corner, by stepping the massing back, they can open up the rooftop. He said they did it on their office building and it is a great experience for everybody that is in the office and people on the lower levels can have that kind of experience since we have stacked it back.

Ms. Newell addressed the discussion questions. She said overall, the arrangement of the block is fine. She said she understands staff's concern about the one drive and why it was eliminated. In terms of architecture, she said it is a little hard to make a comment on it because she has some great photographs in front of her that are inspirational images but not the final design of the building. She indicated she has confidence that great designs will come for the buildings. She said when she looks at all the images, they take brick all the way up to the top of the buildings and almost all of the buildings presented for this project have a steel back up to the skin. She said she does not know how the applicant plans to do the other development but encouraged them to do cold-form framing on the exterior wall and if the interior is framed with wood, it will give better variety in architecture and maybe the applicant will not struggle with the details they have been. She said she wanted to see D2 as a bookend to the other at the south end and she is confident a great design will come forward. She emphasized the building should be uniquely



different but complement the other building. She concluded she loves to take her large dogs to the dog park and but the current dog parks are mud pits. She recommended the applicant consider using synthetic turf instead of putting in grass which turns to mud that the dogs will track through. She explained synthetic turf has anti-microbial properties to them. She said they use this material in Arizona in their dog parks because they can clean it and replace it and move it periodically. She said it is good for the dogs and it would be good for the development; it will also look nicer in the long term in a very public setting.

Mr. Yoder said they want to make sure they get the massing right so if there is more feedback you would like to share, please contact staff and they will be in contact and try to factor that into their design process as they go along.

**2. Tuttle Crossing West Corridor PCD – Motel 6 5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard  
17-072FDP Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for the development of a three-story, 42,000-square-foot hotel with 100 guest rooms on an approximately 2.8-acre site. The site is on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Britton Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in anyone intending on addressing the Commission in regard to this case.

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site for context and noted it is on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Emerald/Britton Parkway. He pointed out the site is heavily wooded and contains an existing residential dwelling on the southwestern property. He explained the proposal includes a total of three properties amounting to approximately 2.8 acres. The zoning for this property is unique, he said, as the planned district encompasses the majority of the properties on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard with the exception of one. As such, he said the Development Text speaks to a lot of cross access between the sites due to the existing design of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and the only full-service intersection being located at the southeastern corner of the site.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed site plan for the three-story, 100 guest room hotel. The hotel, he highlighted, is on the west side of the property with the main covered entrance on the east façade. He said the site is served by a single shared-access point with Extended Stay to the east with a cross-access easement being established from the existing entry to the western property line to allow for future connections. He stated 112 parking spaces are proposed in the center of the site, which meets Code, with a small storage shed and dumpster enclosure located in the northeast corner of the parking lot. Running along the northern property line is a Stream Corridor Protection Zone, he said, that prohibits development to ensure preservation of the natural features within this area.

Mr. Stang presented the tree preservation and landscaping plan and explained that due to the existing conditions of the site, the applicant is removing a total of 34 trees, which amounts to 549 caliper inches. The proposed landscaping plan, as shown, he noted, replaces 26 trees or 65 caliper inches, leaving the remaining amount of 484 inches to be paid for with a Fee-in-Lieu. He indicated that Staff is conditioning that a cluster of evergreen trees be preserved along the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard frontage to aid in enhancing the treatment and an existing landscape feature located at the access point will be incorporated. He added the plan provides for buffering along the north and west sides from the neighboring residential but will require additional plantings to sufficiently meet the Code requirement. Staff has also made some substitution suggestions in the staff report, he said, for plant materials that will need to be addressed with the building permitting review.

Mr. Stang presented graphics of the proposed elevations and described the architecture as consisting of a hip-style roof with gable accents above the entrances. He said the proposed materials consist of fiber cement siding used in a board and batten style for the middle structure and a horizontal style for the northern and southern masses, brick masonry on the first level, cedar siding accents above the entrances, and dimensional asphalt shingles for the roof. He reported the Development Text requires that materials be in earth-tones and at least 25% of each facade is comprised of brick or stone. He said the applicant has provided two color schemes for review tonight as shown: color scheme one has a dark grey fiber cement board with light brick while color scheme two has a light grey fiber cement with a darker red brick. He stated the text also states that architecture shall reflect a quality in keeping with the surrounding development to provide for a cohesive architectural theme.

Mr. Stang indicated staff is conditioning that the applicants move forward with Color Scheme 2 and in addition that the brick be replaced with a complementary stone, subject to staff approval, to match the architectural theme of the existing development established to the east.

Mr. Stang indicated the applicant has not provided any sign details for review but as stated in the Planning Report, would be eligible for either a ground or wall sign meeting the standards of the Development Text. He added staff is conditioning that the applicant file the appropriate zoning application for the review and approval of the sign details but the applicant has indicated the approximate location for where the ground sign would be placed, if and when they do get that reviewed.

Mr. Stang presented photographs of the Extended Stay America and Holiday Inn for context as they were designed under the same development standards.

Mr. Stang concluded approval is recommended for a Final Development Plan as it meets the criteria with nine conditions:

- 1) That the applicant use "Color Scheme 2" as submitted with this application when filing for building permits;
- 2) That the applicant replace the proposed brick with complementary stone, subject to staff approval, prior to filing for building permits;
- 3) That the applicant combine the three properties included in this application, prior to filing for building permits;
- 4) That the applicant adjust the interior landscape islands to meet maneuverability requirements for the largest fire apparatus to the satisfaction of the Fire Marshal, prior to issuance of a building permit;
- 5) That the applicant revise the landscape plans to preserve trees #15013-15018, subject to staff approval;
- 6) That the applicant provide an updated photometric plan meeting the requirements of the Development Text with the building permit submittal;
- 7) That the applicant file the appropriate zoning application for the review and approval of the sign package;
- 8) That the applicant update the landscape plans to address the comments outlined in this staff report with the building permit submittal; and
- 9) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate compliance with water quality stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Victoria Newell confirmed the front building line is at the 60-foot setback.

Cathy De Rosa asked about the setbacks for the Extended Stay America next door. Mr. Stang said the parking matches the location of Motel 6 and thought both the Extended Stay America and the Holiday Inn are at the minimum requirement but said he would verify.

Deborah Mitchell clarified the applicant could have a ground sign or a wall sign but not both. Mr. Stang added that there are more requirements for the ground sign than the wall sign in the Development Text. He indicated the applicant is leaning towards the ground sign to achieve the best visibility.

Steve Stidhem said he was concerned about the amount of light that could be radiating out on the west side of the hotel into the residential area. Mr. Stang reported the applicant is preserving a number of trees along that western property line and they are supplementing that with more landscaping to provide a nice buffer.

Mr. Stidhem indicated the landscaping would provide a buffer for the first floor but was concerned about the amount of light that might stream from the upper floors. Mr. Stang said many of the trees the applicant is preserving are mature.

Ms. Newell asked if the parking layout could be adjusted to save more landmark trees that could reside in islands. Mr. Stang said some of the trees located in the site are in poor condition but he is not sure which ones line up with their proposal.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, 300 Spruce Street, Suite 300, Columbus, Ohio

Max Paton, America Structure Point, 452 W. First Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

Vishal Patel, Next Hotels, LLC, said he resides at 5572 Queens Park Drive, Dublin, Ohio.

Mr. Gonzalez said he had material boards to present and schemes to discuss. He explained that both architectural schemes are essentially equal except for the colors. He said there is brick for the base and fiber cement for the upper stories in a board and baton design with horizontal lap siding on the ends. A synthetic wood is being used, he said, as an accent above the entry and facing Tuttle Crossing Boulevard on the south elevation to provide a pop of color and texture. He said the shingles are asphalt, the windows are trimmed in white, and more transparency is provided for the lower story on the south elevation where a meeting room is located.

Bob Miller inquired about the cedar siding. Mr. Gonzalez said the Allura product is a synthetic cedar, similar to a fiber cement product.

Mr. Miller said he was not familiar with the product so he asked staff for guidance on the appropriateness of the material. Mr. Stang indicated staff would want to see some additional details with the building permit to verify the type of product that it is and to ensure it is a high quality and durable material. Mr. Gonzalez said he could provide that information.

Ms. De Rosa recognized that staff is recommending a stone base instead of a brick base and requested comments. Mr. Gonzalez answered a cultured stone would be acceptable, similar to what is used in the vicinity.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the applicant is considering the ground sign, which Mr. Gonzalez answered affirmatively. Mr. Gonzalez said ground signs were used at the neighboring buildings so another ground sign would be compatible.

The Chair invited public comment.

Mr. Paton proposed that Condition #5 would be eliminated because the Norway spruce trees are different than the other trees on Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and if those were to remain, there would not be a very

good site line to the hotel from the street. He added those trees are also very close to their access drive. The Chair said the Commission would take that into consideration.

Linda Childs, 5382 Crossing Lane, said her residence is right behind and slightly west of this property. She indicated she does not have a problem with a hotel going into this location but the pictures do not make it appear like something that would belong in Dublin, due to the look and feel of a lesser quality product. She inquired about fiber cement siding. Ms. Newell answered fiber cement board siding is used all over the City. Ms. Childs said she only sees stone and stucco repeated on Emerald Parkway and said she would hope this product would not look inferior. Ms. Newell said she was an architect and fiber cement siding is a prevalent product used in residential housing. She explained it is made with cement and paper and is very durable; it does not rot unlike wood siding and comes in a variety of textures. She reported a lot of it is used in the Bridge Street District because it comes in siding, trim boards, and very large panel sizes.

Ms. Childs voiced her concern about the 15-foot setback between the building and the property line and how the lights from the third floor may cause an issue for the residents on the west side.

Ms. Childs indicated this is a high-crime area for Dublin and she does not want to see another hotel possibly add to the current problems. She asked how long someone is permitted to stay in an Extended Stay America suite. Vince Papsidero indicated those rules would fall under state law.

The Chair closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Patel said they worked with Structure Point to make sure that the building setback is the approximately the same as Extended Stay America and the Holiday Inn. He explained a portion of the building is an extended stay and only half of the property is on maid service. He said based on franchise codes, guests are not permitted to stay longer than 30 days. He said most of the people stay Monday through Friday; an average guest would be staying five nights per week.

Mr. Stidhem recalled Ms. Salay had asked during one of the previous meetings if a hotel study had been conducted and how much hotel space is needed in the City. He posed the same question. Mr. Papsidero said the City does not study that. He indicated the Visitor's Bureau may have that market information but he knows that the market is strong and Dublin competes with downtown Columbus in terms of the number of rooms, which he has heard from our Economic Development Department.

Mr. Stang reported he spoke with the President of the Convention and Visitor's Bureau and they agree there is a demand for additional hotels of certain types in Dublin.

Mr. Stidhem said he does not have a problem with the style of the building but is not impressed by the architecture either. He said he trusts staff will ensure the setback will not allow for light pollution to the adjacent residents.

Ms. Mitchell said the substitution of stone instead of brick makes a big difference and the ground sign with stone will help a lot. She said since she is not an architect, she asked if other things could be done with the architecture for more consistency with the surrounding area.

Ms. Newell reported she visited the surrounding architecture and while some of the materials are similar, the text about architecture states "considered overall architecture should reflect the quality in keeping with the surrounding multi-family, office, commercial, and single-family development." She said this proposal is lacking aesthetic detail; they are not complying with the Development Text. She noted that everything on the review criteria is met with conditions so while reading the conditions without working with staff through all the issues, the proposal does not comply with those criteria, either. She said the building has poor massing, the breadth and length of the building are extremely long in proportion to its

identifying entry feature, which needs to be wider, more prominent, and with more detail added to the building to match the similar characters of the other buildings.

Ms. Mitchell agreed as that is how it felt to her; it is very flat and lacking detail.

Mr. Gonzalez said that is certainly something they can revisit. He said a story had to be removed, so that is why the hotel became so long. Ms. Newell confirmed there is a limit in the text for the maximum height permitted.

Ms. De Rosa concurred this design is one-dimensional in its look and feel compared to those surrounding it. She asked to see graphics again showing the setbacks. Mr. Stang pointed out the Holiday Inn and the Extended Stay America locations in context. Ms. De Rosa indicated the setback in the back of those hotels appears greater than 15 feet. Mr. Stang said the rear would be greater than 50 feet as there is a Stream Corridor Protection Zone. He indicated the Extended Stay America may have been developed before that zone was established. He explained the 15 feet is in reference to the side yards. He said the Holiday Inn has a 75 to 80-foot setback in the front; Extended Stay America is probably a little bit further back. He said this one will be 10 – 12 feet closer to Tuttle Crossing than the Holiday Inn.

Ms. De Rosa said when one drives down that road, with the landscaping in the front and the setback, it is important to make sure architecturally it feels like the surrounding community as well as keeping the same setbacks. She emphasized she wanted the same consistency of the surrounding area. As for Condition #5, she would not be in support in removing those trees as requested by the applicant.

Mr. Paton noted their location aligns with the Holiday Inn in terms of setbacks.

Mr. Miller referred to the analysis criteria and said it is causing him quite a bit of concern.

Ms. Newell said if the Commission goes through the review criteria, #1 states the proposal is to be consistent with the approved Preliminary Development Plan. She stated the applicant has to meet all criteria in order to have the Commission's approval. She said to her, the applicant does not meet that one because their building is not coming to the same quality in terms of surrounding development given the care and details provided. Nearly all of the other staff recommendations, while they say criteria met with conditions, she said normally that occurs just occasionally and generally they are minor issues compared to the applicant not complying with the Basic Development Text here. To begin with, she indicated, they fall short if they have to keep negotiating with conditions throughout. She finds this proposal has come before the Commission before it was fully developed.

Mr. Miller said his concern with this building is that it is architecturally boring and needs some pizzazz; it needs to be broken up, needs character, and needs to come alive. He said he would have a hard time supporting this proposal as presented today. He said that might be due to the length of the building in the sense that it feels like a typical low-rise apartment complex built in the late 70s or early 80s. He said he believes it can be brought to life without blowing the budget all apart.

The Chair asked the applicant what they would like to do this evening. Mr. Gonzalez requested to table the case.

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Mitchell moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to table the Final Development Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0)

**3. NE Quad PUD - Emerald Fields  
17-080AFDP**

**4040 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard  
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for modifications to an existing park to construct two new sand volleyball courts, two new tennis courts, and associated site improvements. She noted the approximately 34-acre park is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District – North East Quad - Subarea 2. She said the site is northwest of the intersection of Wyandotte Woods Boulevard and Scioto Crossing Boulevard. She said this is a request for a review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in anyone interested in addressing the Commission with regard to this case.

Lia Yakumithis presented an aerial view of the site and noted previous approvals for this site include:

- 2001 - Playground (north of site)
- 2006 - Restroom facility
- 2007 - Baseball fields, parking area, plaza, extension of bike path
- 2009 - Playground (central site), covered shelter, restroom facility
- 2016 - Public input for future site improvements was conducted in October whereas the residents requested tennis courts, etc.

Ms. Yakumithis presented the Master Plan that has almost been completely built out with the exception of athletic courts proposed this evening. She presented the proposed site plan that includes: two sand volleyball courts, two tennis courts, and 49 replacement trees.

Ms. Yakumithis reported staff has reviewed this proposal and finds it consistent with the criteria for the Amended Final Development Plan, therefore, approval is recommended with three conditions:

- 1) That the color of the chain link sports barrier and accompanying gate enclosing the tennis court area be black;
- 2) That the applicant provide photometric lighting details for the proposed tennis court lighting, prior to permitting; and
- 3) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Steve Stidhem asked if there is a fence proposed around the volleyball courts. Ms. Yakumithis said no fence is being proposed for that area. Mr. Stidhem asked staff if there was any concern about balls going into the road. Ms. Yakumithis said the road is pretty far away.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there were plans for lighting, especially around the tennis courts. He asked if there is renewable energy planned there.

Shawn Krawetzki, Parks and Recreation, answered there are not any solar panels but they are using new LED technology that has a real good zero cut-off both towards the ground as well as toward the sky so they are energy efficient.

Bob Miller asked about the orientation of the tennis courts. Mr. Krawetzki confirmed they are going towards the ball field. Mr. Miller asked if it would make more sense to turn those to the other direction. Mr. Krawetzki said if they rotated them, players would look right into the western sun.

Cathy De Rosa said she thought the volleyball courts were interesting and if there were any others in the City of Dublin. Mr. Krawetzki said there are sand volleyball courts in Tullymore Park and Avery Park. She asked what the other City recommendations were, other than volleyball. Mr. Krawetzki answered due to

the public input received, those were the top two choices and basketball was also in the mix. Ms. De Rosa indicated the basketball courts always seem so busy. Mr. Krawetzki said they shifted from basketball to tennis per the public input.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Miller moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan for the Emerald Fields Expansion with three conditions:

- 1) That the color of the chain link sports barrier and accompanying gate enclosing the tennis court area be black;
- 2) That the applicant provide photometric lighting details for the proposed tennis court lighting, prior to permitting; and
- 3) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

## **PLANNING ITEMS**

### **1. Historic and Cultural Assessment**

The Chair, Victoria Newell said this is a comprehensive review of the results from the historic and cultural assessment of the built resources, landscape features, and archaeological sites within the entire Dublin Planning Area, and a list of preservation strategies appropriate to Dublin.

JM Rayburn said this assessment was initiated to accomplish four goals:

1. To provide an update to the Ohio Historic Inventory;
2. To develop strategies to encourage historic preservation efforts for property owners;
3. To access contributing/non-contributing buildings in Historic Dublin; and
4. To lend general historic architectural assistance.

Mr. Rayburn said this is a review to understand the project and ask questions of the consultant prior to being presented to City Council as a Resolution for Acceptance.

Mr. Rayburn introduced Anne Lee from Commonwealth Heritage Group to share more of the findings of the Historic and Cultural Assessment.

Anne Lee referred everyone to the Planning Department's website to read all the documentation for this study included in eight appendices. She said she works with three architectural historians and two GIS specialists and archeologists. She restated their objective was: to prepare a detailed inventory; look at what the key elements of Dublin's resources are and how they contribute to the unique sense of Dublin; and provide resources to the City Planners that would enable them to make decisions very easily.

Ms. Lee said the Dublin planning area is 34 square miles that covers three different counties. Before they even did data collection, she said, they developed historic context to put everything that they would identify into its proper place in terms of significance to see if it matched with any trends that they could identify. She said they identified important points of interest for the historic context from the Request for Proposal were building structures and archeology sites. She said they also reviewed the Washington Township Multiple Resources Area, which is a 1979 document that collects many of the national register properties together under one theme and the Ohio Historic Preservation Office themes like agriculture,

industry, religion, commerce and finance, and domestic architecture, etc. She said they focused on domestic architecture, agriculture, and commerce and finance for Dublin as they seemed to be significant.

Ms. Lee said they developed a fairly detailed history compiled from a lot of different sources. She said they did background research to compile a comprehensive list of all the previously documented resources as well as potential resources that had not yet been documented. She said they reviewed existing records, histories, maps, aerial photos, and identified seven resource types to investigate: buildings and structures; historic cemeteries; stone quarries, mills; stone walls; bridges; and archaeological sites.

Ms. Lee presented the Survey Map they established by gridding off the area into 167 data collection squares, all a half-mile square. She said the archaeological historians reviewed the buildings and structures (approx. 900 over 50 years old) and the archaeologists reviewed everything else. Everything was documented through standardized data collection forms and photographs, she said.

For buildings and structures, Ms. Lee said they chose to assess historical significance based on a standardized and widely accepted set of criteria, National Register of Historic Place (NRHP) criteria, which is what the National Parks Service uses. She said they determine if the resource is over 50 years old or not, then it must fit one of the four areas: Events, People, Architecture and Engineering, or Information potential. She explained if the resource meets one of those or more, then they determine if it still has integrity. She said they were viewed as individual structures and if they could be in groups that is where a district could be defined and within those districts, determine if the resources are contributing or non-contributing - meaning could the resource convey why it is historically significant or not.

Ms. Lee reported the following were investigated:

- 897 buildings over 50 years of age
- 4 bridges and culverts over 50 years of age
- 9 cemeteries
- 54 stone walls
- 5 potential mills
- 6 potential quarries
- 359 archaeological sites

Ms. Lee reported, as a result of this assessment:

- 23 buildings recommended individually eligible for listing in the NRHP;
- 17 buildings may be individually eligible for listing in the NRHP, but require additional research;
- 1 historic district recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP, pending additional research - Frazier Estates along Industrial Parkway;
- 2 new historic districts are recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP – Indian Run and Dublin Heights; and
- The Dublin High Street Historic District should have its boundary increased and the period of significance extended:
  - 1820-1966
  - Oldest extant building through mid-twentieth century (right before I-270 was built)
  -

Ms. Lee presented a map highlighting the existing Historic District boundary and where the historians recommend the boundary be expanded to and it contains:

Contributing resources

- 93 primary buildings and structures + ancillary structures



- 2 cemeteries
- 1 mill, 1 potential quarry
- Landscape features (stone walls)

In addition, Ms. Lee reported they found six other resources or groups of resources that they thought, while not eligible for NRHP, definitely contributed to the sense of place and unique character of Dublin and they include:

- Barns and farmsteads that are not eligible because they are stuck in the middle of a subdivision and the setting changed but they contribute to the telling Dublin's agricultural past story.
- 72 Stone walls were significant because they all came from Dublin's quarries and quarried by locals and then erected by the locals.
- Ashbaugh Road Bridge is a unique setting for Dublin because it is reminiscent of the rural past; it is a 1920 steel girder bridge but because the road was not developed and it is now a walkway it is a very rural setting left in tack.
- Snouffer Quarry #3 was verified as one historic limestone quarry found in Donegal Cliffs because it has an open edge.
- Joshua Corbin Stone Mill was a probable verification of the remnants of one historic mill.
- 2 significant prehistoric archaeological sites (Wright-Holder Earthworks and Davis Mound just outside the Planning border)

At the conclusion of this effort, the consultants made the following recommendations:

- Consider adding properties to the ARB process and giving them special consideration during Planning Department review of projects
  - Properties recommended individually eligible for NRHP listing
  - Contributing resources to proposed historic districts
  - Contributing resources to proposed Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase
  - Stone walls (some or all)
- Consider an intensive-level survey prior to authorizing actions near
  - Properties that may be individually eligible for NRHP listing
  - Proposed Frazier Estates Historic District
- Consider completing a formal update and amendment to the existing Dublin High Street Historic District, in consultation with the OHPO.

*Ms. Lee said it would provide the opportunity for property owners to be eligible for state and federal tax credits.*

- Consider pursuing a formal NRHP nomination for the recommended Indian Run Historic District and the recommended Dublin Heights Historic District, in consultation with the OHPO.

*Again, would provide the opportunity for property owners to be eligible for state and federal tax credits.*

- Consider undertaking restoration of Indian Run Cemetery
  - Restoration of stones
  - Interpretive plan (*stones were moved and do not have a great record of who or who is not buried there*)
  - Develop more detailed understanding of who is interred in the cemetery, which may result in individual eligibility for the NRHP.

- Consider ordinance that requires property owners to take into consideration impacts to potential archaeological sites

*Ms. Lee said there are a lot of old outhouses and probably great historical archaeology in downtown and it can fill in the gaps of what is left out of the history books: what people did not talk about on purpose; and what people did not write down because they did not think it was important. She added a collection of houses can be compared for social economics in terms of material goods between properties.*

- Dublin High Street Historic District
  - Potential locations of unverified cemeteries, mill ruins, and potentially significant archaeological sites
- Consider developing public outreach materials
    - The historical and cultural resources of Dublin

*Ms. Lee said they found some interesting modern houses that date 1966 – 1975 that are really cool and they are going to become historic in the next ten years. She indicated one of the first subterranean houses is in Dublin.*

- Materials for owners of properties within one of the historic districts

*Ms. Lee said people have interest in how to restore a home so it is historically appropriate by using historically accurate materials.*

Steve Stidhem asked why they would want to get a site on the National Registry so that... besides tax credits, which are a positive, what is the negative? Ms. Lee answered that in Ohio, specifically, in Dublin, there can be federal protection of properties or resources and archeological sites on the National Register and that protects one from any project that requires federal dollars or federal permits. She said we would have to evaluate what the project would do to the resource. For example: a road is proposed to run through a site, which requires excavation to put the road through. This does not save a house or archaeological site but it means the federal government has to take into consideration what they are going to do to the resource and that grew out of the interstates going through the middle of downtowns and historic communities. In Ohio, she said there is no state-wide legislation that protects anything but other states have that legislation. Within Ohio, it is mostly at the local level like the Resource Commission in the City of Columbus, the German Village Planning Commission, and Dublin's Architectural Review Board. She said as a community, we can determine if these things are important or not important and then give those protections of our own at this local level. She stated the consultants can make the recommendations of what they think is historic but then what the City does with that information is up to the City. She noted the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and how those are used or applied is up to the local entity.

Ms. Lee asked us to consider the number of people that may come to Dublin because it is historic and how much money that brings in. She asked if the historic aspect of Dublin adds to the amenities of this place as a community and sense of unique place to draw people in and increase commerce.

Deborah Mitchell thanked everyone for this work. She asked if there are follow up questions, who is the best point person to reach out to. JM Rayburn said he would be happy to take any follow-up questions. He restated that all of the information from the assessment is available online but they also have a few copies printed, one of which can be found at the library and one will be given to the Historic Society.

Cathy De Rosa thanked the consultants for the presentation and the work. She asked how people define a historical district and if that is entirely local. Ms. Lee answered it all depends on one's perspective. She said the National Parks Service has a criteria, which is part of the National Historic Preservation Act. It

encompasses Codes and implementation strategies. She noted definitions can be found in there as well as the criteria. She explained in order to go through the nomination process, we have to have 50% or more of the owners on board.

Ms. De Rosa said she was surprised at the size of this scope of work but the stories were very riveting providing an opportunity here.

Bob Miller said he only got through about 150 pages of the document but it was fascinating information. He asked if there is a negative impact to the property owners in some way, shape, or form. He indicated from his perspective, history is made every day and progress means that this street or resource will be eliminated. He said he kept wrestling with how to not infringe on property rights. He said there are owners that state they cannot afford to restore this 'resource' and that 'the City will not let me do this' and 'I am not permitted to do that'. Then what are the owner's options.

Ms. Lee said it depends on how the City decides to structure the Code, Rules, Regulations, etc. surrounding that property. She said there is a market for people that want to buy property on the National Registry. She suggested that if tax breaks are given to developers, they should also be given to homeowners as an incentive to keep their property up. And we should make the process of going through the ARB be as painless as possible to incentivize homeowners as well.

Mr. Papsidero said initially owning a historic home could be a burden on a property owner but being in a Historic District preserves, protects, and enhances property values. He noted German Village has the highest per-square-foot residential value in Franklin County. The City of Columbus has been exploring synthetic slates due to the cost of replacing a slate roof; they are testing that product to see how it weathers. He explained the Historic Preservation was under the Planning Division in the City of Columbus so he is familiar with a lot of that and a city has to be practical in how they apply their standards. He said there are a couple of districts on the east side of Columbus that are predominantly lower income and in those cases, the HRC is very flexible in applying standards and trying to maintain that economic sensitivity while keeping the character together so it does not fall apart any further.

Ms. Lee added the City of Columbus just revised their permitted material lists to take into consideration new materials.

Steve Stidhem said he was pleased this work was done and the history captured. He said by broadening the scope of the Historic District, he does not want it to tie our hands to progress.

Mr. Papsidero said in the Short North, all of High Street is in two different districts; it is that balance of how to allow the new to occur. He said new construction is to be of its time and should not replicate traditional, historic form so that is the challenge. He indicated the best districts allow for new construction of its time.

Ms. Lee added attaining the balance is at a subjective line.

Mr. Papsidero said the ARB will be looking towards Council for any kind of movement coming out of this; ultimately it is up to Council if any district was to be established.

Victoria Newell said she read the whole report because she loved it; it is a fabulous report that is extremely well written. She gave her compliments to staff for undertaking this project. She said that is not what she does for a living but it is what she wanted to do for a living. She reported her mother was a history teacher and she spent her entire life studying history and the history of architecture. She said she loves the recommendations to saving some of our mid-century properties because some of these residences, just like the ones with the original owners, sometimes have the inside of the house preserved just as much as the outside and that is incredible when that happens. She said sometimes architecture is

in the eye of the beholder so what she falls in love with not everyone else is going to be in love with. She indicated Dublin Heights is an absolute treasure to her and the value of that land will outweigh the house and that is where judgement comes in; she would like to see those protected. She concluded she hopes Council will take some of these recommendations and consider preserving those properties. She said the National Register is geared towards commercial property and that is where the federal funding comes into play. She said, when individuals decide to purchase a historic piece of property, it can become a burden but municipalities have the ability to allow tax abatements for redevelopment when preserving a site.

Ms. Newell encouraged everyone to consider what will be lost for new development and look at these properties for what they are. She said they are not in the best of shape but they served a purpose and they are really unique structures. She noted the bank sign on the corner as an example of a site that will probably be redeveloped someday. She said she would like us to consider extending the Historic District and looking at the other areas.

Ms. Lee said historic preservation does not mean no development, it just means being sensitive to preserving this district.

### **COMMUNICATIONS**

Vince Papsidero said Chris Brown had emailed to say he was delayed in Chicago, IL.

Lori Burchett said staff is trying to transition out of Drop box for materials and into One Drive that will provide much more capacity for sharing documents. Mr. Papsidero explained One Drive was purchased for the City so there is unlimited file space. He said the City is also going to be recycling I-Pads.

Ms. Burchett indicated that materials will be in both locations in September so staff will distribute instructions and screen shots so then by November, everything should be totally on One Drive for meeting materials.

The Chair asked if there were any additional comments. [Hearing none.] She adjourned the meeting at 9:19 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 21, 2017.