

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated the ART would make their recommendation to City Council at the meeting on August 17 to be forwarded to City Council for their meeting on August 28, 2017.

**3. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Block D  
17-022BPR**

**PID: 271-012703  
Basic Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this is a proposal 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 located 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 a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak reported Staff received the submission earlier this year but Staff and the ART had lots of issues. She said the applicant continued to work on a revised plan throughout summer, meeting weekly with Staff for this submission. She said this would go to City Council and they would designate a final reviewing body.

Ms. Husak presented Block D, which is on the north side of the Bridge Park development that includes three buildings approved in Block A, all the buildings in Blocks B & C, and six buildings in Block H. She said the two public streets that are proposed to extend into this block are Longshore Street (north/south), and Larrimer Street (east/west) that cross between the four buildings proposed.

Ms. Husak said this is the most southern building within the block and it fronts Riverside Drive. She described the buildings as follows:

**Building D1**

- Corridor Building
- 6 stories
- Retail/Restaurant - 1<sup>st</sup> floor
- Office - 2<sup>nd</sup> floor
- 43 Residential condominiums - floors 3-6
- Elevated pedestrian bridge connection to the parking garage - 3<sup>rd</sup> floor

**Building D2**

- Corridor Building
- 6 stories
- 97,000 square feet
- Retail - 1<sup>st</sup> first floor
- Office – floors 2-6
- Terrace component for the Riverside Drive side

**Building D3**

- Corridor Building
- 5 stories
- 76 Residential apartments - floors 2-5
- Retail/Parking (52 parking spaces) - 1<sup>st</sup> first floor retail includes drive kiosk (one way in/one way out) option for a possible drive through that could accommodate a pharmacy as an example
- Terrace - 2<sup>nd</sup> floor
- Bridge to D4/5 – 3<sup>rd</sup> floor

**D4/5**

- Corridor Building
- 5 stories
- Parking Garage/Residential Liners
- 637 Parking spaces
- 55 Apartments on floors 2-5
- Retail/Restaurant - 1<sup>st</sup> floor
- Pool/Amenity Space – 5<sup>th</sup> floor offered to all residents of Bridge Park

Ms. Husak reported Staff's latest reviews that identified a number of issues. She asked if there was a way to eliminate the exit function or move the entry/exit to align more with the open space across street. Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, explained the condominium floor is 2 feet higher than grade at H block so headlights might not go into the residential windows across the street. Lori Burchett said the lowest window is at 1.3 feet. Ms. Umbarger said she is still investigating that and noted the grade changes.

Ms. Husak suggested that John Shields Parkway be restricted in some way. Aaron Stanford explained a design such as the one shown will require a significant amount of frontage that disrupts the streetscape. He said they will need to work on an appropriate design for this intersection.

Ms. Husak reported Staff is suggesting to move the D2 building to the south to open up more room and the City would provide programming for that corner, not the applicant. She added the intersection interrupts the greenway and it is tight between the building and the pedestrian tunnel walls. Donna Goss stated the stairs leading to the pedestrian tunnel have been constructed. Vince Papsidero suggested the applicant consider modifying the building footprint by adding another story on the proposed office building. Ms. Husak emphasized shifting the building is the preference as this would decrease the size of the green space between building D1 and D2 so the green space at the corner can be increased and improved.

Ms. Husak noted that now that the C garage is open, there is a growing concern with pedestrian crossings. Mr. Stanford said there is too much access to the parking garage along Longshore Street and suggested consolidating the access points. He noted the curb is wide that leads to the compactor space so vehicles take that corner at a higher speed than is recommended and yet the entrance aisle is narrow. He said smaller van-type deliveries in the compact area would not be appropriate. He asked if detail could be provided.

Ms. Husak questioned what happens between the sidewalk and the area seven feet up. She asked if these are intended to be garden spaces or used for storage, perhaps. She requested building renderings of the elevations and to provide material samples for the design of the block.

Ms. Husak pointed out that the generators along Larrimer Street are adjacent to residential units and should be relocated elsewhere on-site.

Ms. Husak explained that the D3 terrace open space is a private area for D3 residential units. She indicated there would be trees in pots, etc. She presented the pool on top of the parking garage that is accessible to all Bridge Park residents but noted a party room with a smaller pool for special events.

Ms. Husak indicated the tentative next steps are an informal review at PZC on August 24<sup>th</sup>, ART recommendation to City Council on August 31<sup>st</sup>, and City Council review on September 11<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Husak noted the Preliminary Plat will not require an ART review but will go to PZC and City Council for reviews.

Steve Stidhem, Planning and Zoning Commissioner, asked if the Pedestrian Bridge was accessible for office employees or just residents. Ms. Umbarger answered it was mainly for the residents and not the office employees.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, explained the entry/exit for the garage is located where it is because the grade drops quickly as well as having a path to the ramp inside the building needing to be accessed. He asked if the exit could be eliminated while adding an exit to Longshore Street. Staff said the ramp needs to work on the interior while entering the garage as well. Mr. Gonzalez suggested a median at the south entry.

Mr. Stanford suggested there should be additional street parking because the current layout provides few spaces on the Longshore Street connection.

Ms. Umbarger indicated the applicant would consolidate entrances/exits like the D3 garage in block D.

Ms. Husak said she expects to see requests for Waivers because at a minimum, one will be needed for the length of this block.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said they had received a Waiver in 2014 for the block length and size so what is currently being requested is not out of the ordinary.

Mr. Yoder explained the northwest corner building is taller and tighter and the smaller it gets, the units get decreased in size. He said they may even need more elevators if they added a story. He said there are a lot of factors to consider. Mr. Gonzalez added the open space had to do with views to the pool. He said positive open space is a better size than found on blocks B & C. He suggested eliminating the top floor and making it a rooftop terrace. Ms. Husak said to consider public open space vs private just for a limited number of residents at the pool view.

Brad Conway said this corner space is located at an intersection of two really busy streets - John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. He suggested keeping the inner open space larger (between D1 and D2) because people would rather hang out there where they would feel more comfortable. He said shifting D2 south, still may not increase the size on the corner enough. He said he did not see people wanting to be on that busy corner.

Ms. Goss said she agreed with the exception of the tunnel area and suggested that corner may be more of a gathering space than one might think. Ms. Umbarger suggested carving away the first floor to integrate more space. Matt Earman said he would like to know what tenant goes in there because that could determine how busy that corner will be. If it is like a Starbucks, he said it would be heavily used.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated the ART would make their recommendation to City Council at the meeting on August 31 to be forwarded to City Council for their meeting on September 11, 2017.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:18 pm.

Mr. Stanford reported that EMH&T is doing a traffic study, concurrently and they will meet with staff to work out the layout for streets early.

Mr. Tyler asked the applicant to consider trash pick-up, emergency services, and mail pick-up and delivery as these will need to be addressed sooner rather than later.

Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross LLC, indicated the Zoning Code could change and asked where staff is in the process. Ms. Husak answered they have prepped for the City Council meeting on April 17 and the materials are being disseminated tomorrow. She explained the Code piece will be presented at a high level and the approach is going to be for areas affected by Code rewrites. She said Planning is hoping for Council to sign off on the process so it can move forward. She said Code rewrites will include changing "shall" to "should" and the consultant is recommending changes to the general use table. She emphasized that Mr. Goodwin will need to work within the current Zoning Code. She indicated that the West Innovation District will be the first to see changes to the Code.

Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to consider early on how they will deal with screening/fencing for patios and accessory structures since the lots are so close together and what will be allowed for accessory structures on individual lots. Mr. Suiter said those issues would be solved in the Homeowner Association documents. Mr. Suiter said marketing will be for sustainable living. Mr. Tyler said they should consider how to handle rain barrels and if trash cans should fit in garages because those have been big issues in other parts of the city.

Mr. Krawetzki suggested patios should be planned instead of being left open to interpretation due to the building design and proximity to neighbor's back doors. Mr. Suiter added that while this is a manufactured community, sometimes people want the option for privacy away from the more public spaces.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

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

**Riverside Drive & John Shields Parkway  
Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

Claudia Husak said this is a request for the development of three mixed-use buildings containing approximately 223 residential dwelling units, 76,000 square feet of retail space, and a parking structure. She said the site is on the southeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Husak said four buildings are proposed for this block counting the garage structure and the residential liners separately. She said ultimately, City Council has the decision-making responsibility for all three parts to this application: Basic Plan Review, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat. She explained the Preliminary and Final Plats will be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission to be forwarded to Council and that the plats are not under the ART's purview. She added that if the applicant and staff were prepared, an informal review of the Basic Plan would be conducted by the PZC on April 20<sup>th</sup> and their findings would be forwarded to City Council for review and determination of the Basic Plan.

Ms. Husak presented the aerial view of the site as well as the proposed Basic Plan and noted the three buildings, the greenway proposed, the tunnel under Riverside Drive, and the residential liners along Mooney Street. She pointed out where the grocery is currently proposed in Block D. She reported there has been a lot of discussion regarding the proposed extension of Longshore Drive. She said a development plan was approved that included all of the Bridge Park development but shortly after, additional development plans

were approved for each block separately due to the Zoning Code amendments. She added Block D was one of the outstanding blocks that needed to be revisited based on all the additional changes.

Ms. Husak asked the applicant why a Final Plat is part of this application. Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, answered the Final Plat can be postponed to a later application, which is probably more appropriate. Ms. Husak asked if the City was an applicant as the greenway along John Shields Parkway is currently owned by the City of Dublin. Mr. Quackenbush said the plat can be revised to both include the greenway and bring Dublin on as an applicant or adjusted to remove it completely.

Ms. Husak described the buildings in Block D.

Building D1: Floor 1 - restaurant, retail, commercial space; Floors 2 – 5 residential condominiums

Building D2/D3: Floor 1 - grocery and residential liner; Floor 2 - residential and terraces

Building D4/D5: Floor 1 - parking garage and retail; Floor 2 – parking garage and residential

Ms. Husak noted the following list of issues or concerns identified at a high level on the first pass:

- No meetings with staff regarding Block D to identify potential issues prior to submitting an application, which is unlike all the other blocks in this development.
- Building D1, Floor 1: currently has one lobby on (proposed) Longshore Street with a corridor that runs to Riverside Drive. She asked if a dual lobby makes more sense by adding a lobby at Riverside Drive directly across from the current one shown.
- Building D1: PZC was concerned that multiple buildings throughout the development look similar to other buildings in the Columbus area and they want to see a unique design that provides variety.
- Proposed Longshore Street as a thru street: Traffic and Engineering have concerns with the circulation and people trying to make a right turn onto Riverside Drive and crossing multiple lanes to connect to the (future) John Shields Parkway Bridge.
- Grocery and needs: in an urban development; movement of patrons and deliveries; and carts.
- Longshore Street should line up with Larimer Street. The proposed location for the loading docks would require the trucks to pull up to Larimer Street and then jog back into the loading docks across Mooney Street.
- Loading area/drop off areas for groceries appears large in front of the grocery store.
- There are condominiums located in Block H across from the proposed location of the loading docks and noise and visibility is a concern for those units impacted by this area.
- The open space proposed between building D2/D3 and building D4/D5. There is a retaining wall and reflecting pool with a 12-foot drop and only accessible if one maneuvers through the garage.
- Open space dedicated on areas separate from this site need to be documented; there needs to be a map of areas that are already designated for other blocks in the development.
- Tuller Ridge Drive is treated like 'back of house' as that is where all the transformers and generators are currently proposed. Screening walls would be required along Tuller Ridge Drive making this unfavorable to pedestrians.
- Residential units attached to the garage appear to have first floor access only through the garage and a "back door" area on Tuller Ridge Drive, which will not be very safe.

- Façade transparency and lack of information for the D2/D3 building.
- Number of entrances and proposed locations for residential and commercial areas.
- Proposed grocery does not yet have a tenant and therefore not able to be finalized. Possibly phasing this project may be appropriate. Some pieces are finalized and some are not.

Ms. Husak said Planning does not feel comfortable taking this to the Commission on April 20th and that would not be the best strategy as further review is needed.

Jennifer Rauch recommended that staff go through the additional list of concerns.

Aaron Stanford said the loading dock has major issues. He said that maneuvering into the public street that goes north (Larimer Street) would cross a pedestrian crossing, which would disrupt that path.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said they looked at many different location options for a loading dock and they were all negative but this plan was the least negative. She said with the grade issues they are facing it makes it a challenge to find a place for the loading dock because the trucks cannot maneuver a steep grade of roughly a 12% slope. Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, added he had previously expressed concerns about the path the trucks would have to take to enter and exit the loading docks and that this was not the first time Planning had seen this plan. He said they are not sure if they want a street there or not and finding a dock space has been a challenge.

Jeff Tyler said he understood the challenge as this building requires four-sided architecture so there is no 'back of house'. Obviously, he said this needs to be resolved before moving forward.

Ms. Rauch said more discussion needs to happen between the applicant and staff regarding these details. She said the proposed grocery location does not have a specific tenant and the grocery store space is driving the design of the block.

Mr. Stanford asked why there is not a T-connection to Larimer Street. He asked how the site will be serviced because the area does not currently have water, hydrants, or fire access. Mike Altomare said without water and a way to get in and out, he cannot commit a truck to that area immediately.

Mr. Quackenbush asked if a fire truck could pull into open space. Mr. Altomare said there is still the issue of no water service. Mr. Quackenbush asked if a hydrant could be added to the open space like a private hydrant. Mr. Stanford said Riverside Drive does not have a water main servicing this building and there cannot be a dead end main line from Tuller Ridge Drive.

Ms. Husak suggested moving transformers and generators from Tuller Ridge Drive and make Tuller Ridge Drive a more interesting street for pedestrians to promote activity.

Ms. Husak asked for clarification on what the support area includes within the parking structure. Ms. Umbarger said support would be provided the same as on buildings C4/C5.

Mr. Stanford suggested the entrance on Riverside Drive be one way up to Longshore; catching the person going north on Riverside Drive without having to go all the way around John Shields Parkway. Ms. Husak answered this is more than what we normally give comments on and that traffic engineers need to weigh in on these issues more thoroughly.

Ms. Husak said staff would compile a list of additional items needed for the review. She said currently the number of planning analysis waivers required is in the 40s because staff does not have enough information.

She said this can be provided on paper or staff can meet regularly to work these issues out. She restated that this application is not ready for a public meeting. She added taking this to City Council on May 22, 2017, might be aggressive and suggested the applicant go before the PZC, informally, to ensure all concerns are being addressed upfront.

Mr. Hunter said the elephant in the room is access and how the extension of Longshore will work for this site.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

**ADJOURNMENT**

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 3:45 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on April 20, 2017.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

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

**Riverside Drive & John Shields Parkway  
Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

Claudia Husak said this is a request for the development of three mixed-use buildings containing approximately 223 residential dwelling units, 76,000 square feet of retail space, and a parking structure. She said the site is on the southeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Husak said four buildings are proposed for this block counting the garage structure and residential wrap separately. She said ultimately, City Council has the decision-making responsibility for all three parts to this application: Basic Plan Review, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat. She explained the Preliminary and Final Plats will be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission to be forwarded to Council and that the plats are not under the ART's purview. She said the Basic Plan will be reviewed by General Staff next week and the ART will review it on April 6<sup>th</sup> and make a recommendation. She added an informal review of the Basic Plan will be conducted by the PZC on April 20<sup>th</sup> and their findings will be forwarded to City Council for review and determination of the Basic Plan.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, presented a site plan for D Block that contains four buildings. She explained Building D1 is a five story building with retail on the first floor and four upper floors of condominiums. Building D4/5 is a parking garage with a residential liner and retail elements. Building D2/3 is intended for a grocery tenant on the first floor with residential along the greenway. She noted the loading dock area on the southwest corner that has a 15-foot slope to its entry to be flattened out to be in line with the grocery and the walk-up residential units on the northwest corner. She said they are adding a variety of aesthetics. She indicated the 6-floor building is viewed as one book end for the development with the hotel being the other end. She noted John Shields Parkway and the greenway along the northern end of D Block.

Ms. Husak indicated there may need to be additional space left along the terrace area and pedestrian tunnel for maintenance along with an easement.

Ms. Umbarger said there is a pedestrian tunnel/patio off the grocery as well as rooftop terraces that include a pool for the entire community. She added the terrace for the residents serves more as a respite space. Lastly, she pointed out the reflecting pool between buildings D4/5 and D2/3 in the open area.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, said the open space between the grocer and the parking garage has a small retail space to help activate the open space.

Ms. Umbarger said Sullivan Bruck Architects designed Building D1 with a similar look as the B3 warehouse building with patio spaces that are capable of opening using accordion style windows. She said the building is mainly brick on Riverside Drive and the entry piece projects a small amount. She noted the Longshore Street view is similar but broken up with fiber cement and a darker rich brick on the north and south elevations.

Ms. Husak expressed concern over the similarity of the buildings. She said she liked the color but saw an issue with the box form as the similarity of buildings was discussed at length by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the other blocks. She indicated the building needed additional character. Vince Papsidero suggested breaking up the roof line of the 5-story building.

Ms. Umbarger said the architect wants a warehouse appearance on Riverside Drive and that the patio spaces will create a unique design when they are open.

Ms. Husak questioned the layout for the open space. Ms. Umbarger said this is unique for the property and they went through several iterations of footprints. She explained the first floor was for retail and the resident lobby was on the east side for access to the upper stories of residential units, which each has its own storage room; two parking spaces are designated in the garage for each unit; and a Club room is for tenants/owners.

Ms. Umbarger said that the grocer layout would depend on the tenant but that they have provided potential layouts to be reviewed. She said this could include a coffee shop or wine bar along the northwest plaza as the east side would be for back-of-house elements. She said the pool and open space on the upper level would be for the development and that public access was shown near the main entrance to the grocery store.

Ms. Umbarger stated that although it's a 6-story building, the fifth story is the last full plate story due to the grade change. She said the sixth story would be located along Riverside Drive to create a book end for the development. She said the design is more contemporary utilizing more glass than in previous blocks.

Mr. Papsidero asked if a story could be added to the grocery to enhance the book end element. Ms. Umbarger replied she would inquire if the City was supportive. Ms. Umbarger indicated the budget may be an issue because if they go higher the building would then require different construction.

Rachel Ray inquired about the look of the loading dock. She said it is a difficult piece to incorporate but is necessary for the proposed use. Ms. Umbarger said they would use glass garage doors or could incorporate frosted glass to help screen the loading area. She said trash would also be located in this area with a compacter placed on the inside wall.

Mr. Gonzalez said that cart storage is incorporated into the first floor of the garage with additional spaces on the upper floors. He said most likely one elevator near the main garage entrance would be a freight elevator to handle the carts.

Ms. Umbarger said handicap access is provided from the upper terrace area through a breezeway that runs adjacent to the open space between buildings D2/3 and D4/5.

Mr. Gonzalez noted the retail areas in Building D4/5. He said the trash compactor is located on the first floor along with trash for the adjacent building. He said they are proposing two pedestrian bridges from the garage to building D2/3.

Shawn Krawetzki asked why the two bridges were different. Mr. Gonzalez explained one bridge is similar to what has been approved for the other blocks and the other is an open bridge to fade into the façade as opposed to drawing more attention above the open space.

Ms. Ray inquired about the first floor of building D4/5 as it appears to be treated differently. Mr. Gonzalez said it is a more contemporary look to correspond with H Block across Mooney Street. Ms. Husak said she has requested more elevations from a street view to put the development into context.

Ms. Husak said the next step will be to have a General Staff Review March 30<sup>th</sup> and the applicant to return April 6<sup>th</sup> for further review and final comments.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]