



## MEETING MINUTES

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 7, 2017

### AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block A (A1 Office Building) PID: 273-012721**  
**17-082INF Informal Review (Discussion only)**
- 2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D PID: 273-012703**  
**17-022BPR/PP Preliminary Plat (Recommended for Approval 7 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, Stephen Stidhem, Bob Miller, Amy Salay, and Chris Brown. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Lori Burchett, Phil Hartmann, and Flora Rogers.

### Administrative Business

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the July 13, 2017, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes, Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated Bridge Park, Block D is eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening. She determined the Consent Agenda case would be heard first, followed by Bridge Park, Block A but the minutes will be recorded in the order they were presented on the Agenda.

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block A (A1 Office Building) PID: 273-012721**  
**17-082INF Informal Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for a four-story, 80,000-square-foot office building and associated site improvements on a 0.77-acre site zoned BSD SRN, Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is northeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback on this proposal prior to



the submission of a Final Site Plan application to the Planning and Zoning Commission. We typically limit informal review applications to a 30-minute time limit, she said.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted Block A is northeast of the roundabout at Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road. She presented the proposed site layout. She reported that three buildings were approved in Block A in 2016 and are currently under construction. The AC Marriott Hotel and The Exchange at Bridge Park Event Center are there as well as a public parking garage.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed four-story office building is at the southeast corner of the block. She noted there is a grade change of 14 feet from the eastern property line down to the western property line, adjacent to The Exchange Event Center.

Ms. Burchett presented the final site plan. She explained the proposed building A1 site layout consists of a rectangular shaped building with angled façades and a plaza area on the southeast and northeast corners of the building to delineate main entrances and connect to the public realm. She said a three-tiered landscaping terrace is proposed in the southwest portion of the site with at-grade connections to W. Dublin-Granville Road. She added a sidewalk connection exists along the western property line to provide additional mid-block connections through the site.

At the review of the Final Site/Development Plan for Block A, Ms. Burchett reported two conditions were made that applied to Lot 7, the (future) office building. A mid-block pedestrianway is required to be developed with Lot 7 in between the office building and the event center. The existing sidewalk connection and associated design will serve to meet this condition with the Final Site Plan Review for building A1. The design has to meet the requirements for a mid-block pedestrianway, which includes continuation of the streetscape using materials, furnishings, landscaping, and lighting.

Ms. Burchett said the current proposal is for a passive open space and pedestrianway due to existing mechanical units, grade change, and building orientation. Any additional required public open space, she said, is to be dedicated with the development of Lot 7.

Ms. Burchett presented a proposed rendering of the building as viewed from the northeast and noted the architectural design for building A1 is intended to create unique character while incorporating elements of neighboring development within the block. She said the façade is comprised primarily of a curtain wall with metal paneling as an accent to define the massing of the building. Private terraces are proposed, she said, on the north and south elevations for all four stories with a canopy proposed along the northeast corner to define the main entrance from Longshore Loop and provide more prominence.

Ms. Burchett presented a rendering that shows a view of the proposed building from Riverside Drive in context with the other buildings within Block A. She then presented additional renderings to show the building from multiple vantage points. While specific materials and details have not yet been finalized, she stated, the graphics show the general concept of the proposed building.

Ms. Burchett concluded by restating the applicant is requesting an informal review and feedback regarding the proposal. She presented the following questions to help facilitate the discussion:

1. Is the overall site layout consistent with the surrounding context?
2. Is the proposed architectural mass, form, and conceptual character of the building appropriate?
3. Is the proposed open space treatment appropriately located, sized, and designed?
4. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said he was in attendance to draw comments from the Commission.

Brian Sell, Moody Nolan, said there is a lot of glass to create a conversation with the hotel so they are using a very similar façade system, which uses the relationship between metal and glass. He explained a warmer metal color is used in the more solid part of the building and their hope is to soften how the building hits the sky. He added they created a nice strong base with the same stone that is used on the base of The Exchange and Hotel – the white material. He said the terrace cascades down towards the green space.

Bob Miller inquired about the retaining wall on the southwest side. Mr. Sell said they will use Ariscraft Stone and there will be no raw concrete.

Mr. Miller asked about sidewalk on Riverside Drive and on the south side of that building to which the applicant answered affirmatively. He asked if it is a mixed-use path. Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said the path that goes between the event center and office is an extension of the sidewalk that is currently in the plan for The Exchange.

Cathy De Rosa asked the applicant if they are anticipating retail on the bottom of this building or if it is exclusively planned for office use. Mr. Yoder answered there could be one restaurant for breakfast and lunch only on the ground floor to be along the terrace but they are not counting on it and there are two ground floor tenant spaces that could be used for offices.

Ms. De Rosa said she thought this was an entire multi-use development and did not see retail on the bottom of this building, which was interesting to her and she wonders about that in terms of character.

Mr. Yoder said the unusual part about this office building is that it is easy to see but hard to get to from a retail perspective because one has to go around the roundabout. He said the office-type users that will be in that space and allowed to be on the ground floor are the kind to walk in to see (quasi-retail/office user) like a bank perhaps. He said a breakfast/lunch establishment would not compete for parking as much. He said if there is an event going on at The Exchange, and the hotel is full of guests, having to introduce another group of people into that tight area, a breakfast user would be better. He explained how the circulation works on the site in relation to the parking garage.

Deborah Mitchell asked if the interiors were designed to be flexible and if they were set up to change over time. She indicated in the last 35 years, office spaces have changed a lot. She noted that one of her clients is a major agency for the State of Ohio and actually got approval to gut their building because they felt they could make a case that was accepted by legislators that they could be much more productive if they changed how they worked inside their building. Having been in Metro Center, she said, people have talked about the limitations of that space.

Mr. Sell said the reason the building is not separate bays is to avoid columns and other restrictions. He indicated all glass is the price a developer pays for that type of flexibility, which they feel is really important. He said they are trying to get an all-glass building to not read like an all-glass cube from the exterior. He indicated that closed offices are now in the middle of spaces.

Mr. Yoder said with everything pulled to the middle and having it all be all glass on the outside they can balance it; building Code dictates that their stairways and elevators have to be enclosed. In his office building, he said, Crawford Hoying is a full-floor tenant and they opted to not have corridors, it is wide open, so everything could be reconfigured in the future.

Steve Stidhem inquired about retail because so far he is seeing a lot of restaurants. He said this building location cries out to him as a great location for other types of retail and that is what he expected to see at this location.

Mr. Yoder indicated retail is pretty much dead across the country; there are very few exceptions to that. He said in general, people are not actively signing leases like they were ten years ago. He said they are beating down the doors of every retailer they can to try and get them interested in coming to Bridge Park to add the retail dimension. He said they just found out yesterday they are getting a men's retailer in Bridge Park; they will come into an incubator space they are creating as a way to entice a retailer – somebody that does not sell food. He said they are going after the safe bets and the leasing brokers that represent them; Polaris and Easton are safe and those leasing brokers, are not ready for Bridge Park to be in that list but he would like to think they will be there in a year or two, or three. He said what they are doing now to prepare for it is by being flexible.

Chris Brown indicated that overall, he likes the massing and how it responds to the hotel and the event center, who came back wanting to change their sign because they did not want to be confused as being part of the hotel. He said he hates to see too much sameness but also likes the way the hotel and this office building would respond to each other. He stated he loved the curtain wall and the panels, but is hoping for color variation or some element that makes that building unique and distinctive from the other two on that block. He indicated that a restaurant on the ground floor concerns him a little bit but he can see leaving the space flexible. He said with the entry way pushed along Mooney Way, he likes how it appears as it is its own distinct little neighborhood there on the corner. He said he likes the views and the great relationships there. He reported he visited the site both by car and as a pedestrian. He indicated the 'neighborhood' needs to be reinforced. He inquired about valet parking for the hotel and what is reserved for the office space. He said he would like to see more of a presence on the actual street so that people see it, not just the canopy extending, but an entrance from the AC Hotel and The Exchange. He indicated people will need to be picked up and dropped off there at the entrance of the office building, while not blocking and stopping traffic. He suggested playing off the parking structure tower because the interplay and relationship at a pedestrian level is as important as how it relates driving by.

Mr. Yoder asked for clarification. Mr. Brown had suggested the entrance should be on the west side of the building. Mr. Yoder pointed out the elevator and stair core. Mr. Brown said that helps but at a pedestrian level he wants to see the entrance relate to the event center and the hotel. Mr. Yoder explained the reason for the current entrance placement was driven by the grading.

Mr. Sell noted the pink terrace actually has a lot of presence and they can think of it almost as an entrance that can have more brick than the terraces above it but they will consider other options for other entrances.

Deborah Mitchell asked if there is an integrated plan for public art; art can really help these kinds of considerations, too. She indicated significant public art can provide visual cues and help people figure out where the main places are. Mr. Yoder answered art is an active consideration of theirs; they have met with the Dublin Arts Council as well as an art gallery, most recently. Mr. Brown added he could not agree more about public art. He said people are going to see the new art installation at the Columbus Convention Center.

Cathy De Rosa indicated the design of the proposed office building feels a lot like a traditional office building in its form. She indicated how the hotel is incredibly effective as it curves around and fits that lot. She said despite the terraces that are angled, the proposed office building still feels square on a more curved lot. She suggested they push the design to not look so traditional and dense and to better fit the space, especially on the southwest corner.

Mr. Yoder said they had the same debate internally. He said they considered different forms because the hotel is so beautiful and says 'look at me' but the buildings appeared to be competing with each other and a simpler design seemed to help. Ms. De Rosa added now they are competing in a symmetrical way. Mr. Yoder clarified Ms. De Rosa is stating the buildings are contrasting. He added they were trying to create a 'background' building so all eyes are on the hotel but it sounds like they are not quite there yet. Steve Stidhem stated the office building appears like it could be anywhere and was not what he was expecting. He indicated he likes some aspects of it but it appears too much like a normal office building. He said if that is what they were going after they achieved it but it is not what he was hoping for. He suggested in order to attract the younger office workers, there needs to be amenities, outside space, access to outside – which is more than just a window. He said he really liked the terraces as that is exactly what they should incorporate. He also suggested more roof access, perhaps.

Ms. Mitchell recalled talking about building D2 at the last meeting and she had said D2 should be a complement to the hotel. She said the hotel, building D2, and this building should all be members of the same family and the hotel is like big sister – flashy but the others should be remarkable too, in their own quiet way. She stated those three buildings are really important and the hotel should be the main focus. She said the glass is a good relational aspect but it needs to go a little bit further. She emphasized this family has to be really idiosyncratic, have to be really identifiable; every member of the family should shout Bridge Park.

Amy Salay said the roadway is curved and the cool thing about the hotel is that it is curved and asked if the corners of the office building could be rounded off, matching the curve of the roadway. She said she liked the earlier comment about wanting to start a conversation with the hotel. She said she liked mimicking the glass and the building materials of the hotel. She said she agrees with her fellow Commissioners about the entrance and the outdoor spaces. She asked if the south end of the building could be more interactive with the street, even with the grading issues.

Ms. Salay asked the applicant is there were tenants interested yet. Mr. Yoder answered a couple different full-floor tenants are interested and he has leads for prospective tenants to fill about half of the proposed office building so far.

Ms. Mitchell indicated it is interesting to think about the visual language to define the brand of the family. She said the glass is definitely part of the visual language but there could also be other more distinctive elements. She suggested that if the applicant makes this a brand and it is very exciting, they will not have a problem attracting tenants that will reinforce that brand.

Mr. Nelson said they had an internal debate and maybe that is what got them off onto their design approach. He explained they did not want this to be like - there is Bridge Park over here and then there is A Block as its own thing, and it is completely disconnected. He said they wanted to introduce more massive elements to coordinate with the other structures in Bridge Park.

Ms. Mitchell stated Dublin's brand is not all glass, there needs to be masonry and other elements. Mr. Yoder explained they pulled the masonry into the base of this building and then let the glass carry the top. Ms. Mitchell noted building D2 again and said as bookends, this could say this is all integrated. Mr. Yoder said he would consider that.

Bob Miller said he really liked the building and it fits very well on that site and brings a little diversity, which is what their objective was, originally. He recommended the applicant bring back more detail around the plazas to help the Commission visualize what it is going to look like, coming out of that roundabout or going south on Riverside Drive. He suggested the applicant add interesting details into the design as it needs to be special as a bookend building. He indicated the Commission is not yet getting the applicant's vision from the graphics presented.

Victoria Newell said overall she liked the building and the massing but there are little things that do not sit well with her. She said she is not comfortable with the canopy entry as it just feels tacked onto the building and not really integrated into the design. She said the entry should be pulling us into the space. She noted that on the east, west, and north sides there is a nice play of metal panels on the building but they are not on the south elevation. She said this end should be the most prominent view and yet it was not interesting. She concluded by checking the discussion questions to make sure the Commission had covered them all.

Mr. Brown reinforced the north elevation and how it integrates with the neighborhood. Mr. Yoder reported that boulders are being placed right now.

Mr. Yoder concluded he received great feedback.

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D  
17-022BPR/PP**

**PID: 273-012703  
Preliminary Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for the subdivision of ±5.3 acres into five lots and a public right-of-way to facilitate the future development of Block D of Bridge Park with three buildings containing 174 residential dwelling units, approximately 125,000 square feet of commercial uses, and a parking structure. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. She stated there was one condition of approval and asked if the applicant had agreed to the condition as follows:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Claudia Husak reported this is a standard condition to which the applicant had agreed.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Recommended for approval 7 – 0)

**COMMUNICATIONS**

Claudia Husak said Vince Papsidero and several Planners will be attending the ULI awards dinner.

Ms. Husak said she brought copies of the application for the Insight 2050 Academy that MORPC facilitates. She explained this would be a commitment for three evenings (Tuesdays) in October for a nominal fee, which the City would cover, if anyone is interested; the application needs to be submitted to MORPC by September 25<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Husak said the packets are being moved to the OneDrive platform that is available on a mobile device as well as a desktop. She said there will be dual meeting packets – in Dropbox as before but also now in OneDrive for two meetings as a test run and then go live with just OneDrive. She asked the

Commission if there was anything staff could do to assist the members to get started and trained. Lori Burchett showed the Commission the OneDrive and said the folders could be set up similar to Dropbox.

Ms. Husak indicated staff would do a dummy version on an I-Pad and would print step-by-step instructions for how to access it for the Commissioners.

Victoria Newell inquired about projects that had been tabled and have not come back before the PZC. She asked if there was a status report available that possibly included a timeline. Ms. Husak answered Motel 6 submitted materials so they would be eligible for the meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> of September. She said the cell tower on Rings Roads are still working through the plan with the neighbors and church for different alternatives. She said they have a deadline of sometime in November.

Ms. Husak noted the West Innovation District project is coming forward to the PZC in October.

Ms. Newell reported she had attended several meetings for Legacy and wanted to know when they are coming forward. Ms. Husak answered they will be going to a Council work session first.

The Chair asked if there were any additional comments. [Hearing none.] She adjourned the meeting at 7:30 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 2, 2017.