



MEETING NOTES

~ JOINT SESSION ~ Planning & Zoning Commission and Architectural Review Board THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2018

Administrative Business

Mayor Greg Peterson performed the Oath of Office for Kristina Kennedy as she was appointed by City Council to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

AGENDA

Bridge Street District – Code Amendments - Introduction

Vince Papsidero, FAICP, Director of Planning, began the Joint Session at 6:36 p.m. The meeting was held prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission's regularly scheduled meeting.

Attendees: Mayor Greg Peterson, Victoria Newell, David Rinaldi, Steve Stidhem, Shannon Stenberg, Jane Fox, Gary Alexander, Warren Fishman, Deborah Mitchell, Jeff Leonhard, Kristina Kennedy, Vince Papsidero, Jennifer Rauch, Lori Burchett, Thaddeus Boggs, Sierra Saumenig, and Laurie Wright.

Mr. Papsidero said Planning will be updating the Bridge Street District (BSD) Code Amendments over the next year. He said in April 2017, Planning presented potential changes to the Code and are now ready to move forward with the first package that focuses on process, submittal requirements, and the role of the Administrative Review Team (ART). He explained this is an introduction and no action will be taken this evening. Another joint work session will be planned, hopefully in April 2018, when the Code changes themselves would be presented and that will be a very technical meeting.

Mr. Papsidero said the Project Goals are as follows:

- To conduct a diagnostic assessment of the process and standards of the BSD district based on over five years of application experience;
- To identify issues/concerns based on the administration of the Code;
- To interview stakeholders (customers) to ascertain their perspectives on the process and standards; and
- To recommend incremental Code amendments that address the goals.

Mr. Papsidero briefly recalled the background that included the City hiring Clarion/Codametrics to assist Planning with the Code changes, which identified the following process changes:



As the consultant found...

- Process is too lengthy
- Too much detail is required too early in the process
- Too few administrative approvals

Goals as a result...

- Shorten the process without compromising standards and outcomes, while ensuring appropriate flexibility
- Adjust submittal requirements accordingly
- No changes to administrative approvals

Mr. Papsidero presented the table in the Code that summarizes the processes and all of its components. He said the current process has numerous steps based upon the application type and whether or not an Economic Development Agreement (EDA) is associated with a project:

- Basic Plan
- Development Plan
- Site Plan

Over the past two years, he said, additional informal steps have been added as a practice without amending the Code – examples being Informal Reviews by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) and the Architectural Review Board (ARB), which add time, cost and resources to the review process. He said he would like to provide an example of the review process for one of the three steps in the BSD approval process. He stated a Basic Plan with an EDA includes reviews by Staff, ART, PZC/ARB, and City Council.

Mr. Papsidero said this process is the lengthiest and most complex as the following steps are taken:

1. Staff meets with the applicant to discuss a concept
2. Applicant submits a refined concept
3. Staff reviews that concept and provides feedback
4. Applicant submits a Basic Plan with an EDA
5. General Staff Review (GSR) analyzes the Basic Plan (*meets twice a month*)
6. Staff issues comments to the applicant
7. Staff introduces the Basic Plan to the ART for comment
The ART is made up of staff as a formalized staff body that was included in the Code initially for the West Innovation District (WID) and then applied to the BSD Code. He said it provides a formal step in the process but it is redundant and staff supports and recommends its extraction from the Code.
8. Applicant tweaks the Basic Plan based on the ART's comments
9. Applicant presents revised Basic Plan to the ART
10. Applicant MAY tweak the Basic Plan
11. ART issues comments to the applicant
12. PZC/ARB packet is prepared
13. Packet is posted and delivered to members
14. Basic Plan is presented to PZC/ARB
15. Feedback is shared by the PZC/ARB for the applicant
16. Applicant MAY tweak the Basic Plan
17. Applicant presents revised Basic Plan to the ART
18. Applicant MAY tweak the Basic Plan – *He said this happens when the ART is not satisfied the proposal has been responsive to the comments of the PZC/ARB.*
19. ART issues a formal recommendation

20. Staff Planning Report is issued and the Council packet is prepared
21. Planning Report and the packet are delivered to Council
22. Basic Plan with an EDA is presented to Council
23. Council approves the Basic Plan with an EDA
24. If approved, the applicant moves to the next steps to file a Development Plan followed by a Site Plan.

Mr. Papsidero concluded the multiple steps listed above currently could take several months and that is the first phase of a three-phase process, per the Code. Typically, each phase: Basic Plan (with EDA), Development Plan, and Site Plan would take one to three months. Therefore, staff is recommending to reduce the role of the ART and eliminate its recommendation role.

Warren Fishman asked if staff thinks the ART's role is not valuable. After all, he said, it is comprised of staff.

Mr. Papsidero said they believe the ART adds value but the question is at what cost to the process. He suggested the ART's role, potentially adding two to three months to the process, is not helpful. He explained that by eliminating the ART more work may be generated for the other reviewing bodies, but he said he thinks that is appropriate because the reviewing bodies bring a broader perspective.

Jeff Leonhard questioned how the ART's comments are used. Mr. Papsidero said the ART's role with the WID is important where it is less important for the BSD.

Mr. Fishman said he did not have a problem with that. He said since it involves the same staff, the process can be handled however Planning wants but the more refined an application is by the time it gets to the PZC/ARB, the easier it is for those reviewing bodies to make decisions. He said he respects the way staff goes through the submittals, because they are much more detailed than they used to be.

Jennifer Rauch added staff would still review the submittals through the General Staff Review (GSR) process, even if the formal ART process was eliminated. Mr. Papsidero said the General Staff Review, which had disappeared for a number of years, was brought back, and creates a more formal internal review process for staff across divisions and departments to work together, which has added a lot of value to the process.

Victoria Newell asked how often the public has been present at ART meetings. Mr. Papsidero answered, generally the public never appears. Ms. Newell said she was asking because she understands the developers' side and what it is like presenting to the PZC/ARB. She said one of the things we used to face in the City was the Planning Report. She said in many cases the client or applicant was never brought in to discuss the application with staff and they were never told what staff was concerned about until the afternoon of the PZC/ARB meeting. She said this did not permit any opportunity to work with staff or address any concerns. She thought that process had given Dublin a bad reputation for being really hard to work with. She said a lot of clients would address some of those concerns because they wanted to get staff's support via the Planning Report before going in front of the PZC/ARB for review. She suggested that when this process was conceived, they did not intend for the ART's involvement to be such a lengthy review process but rather an opportunity for open discussions with staff. She said even if a GSR is conducted, it needs to be formally communicated back to the applicant.

Mr. Papsidero said when a project is complicated, staff currently meets with applicants on a weekly or bi-weekly basis, throughout the entire process. He said discussions with the architect, engineers, the owner, have made a huge difference in terms of keeping applicants informed and engaged. He agreed, the applicant should not be hit cold at the PZC/ARB with all the concerns as it would not be fair to them, the City, or the system/body hearing the case.

Ms. Newell thought the point of introducing the ART to the process was to prevent the applicant being caught unaware. She said she does not have a problem with eliminating the ART because it has created a much more tedious process and in the same vein, the Commission does not always agree with the Planning Report. She said she understands it can be frustrating for the applicant after all the time staff and the ART on a project and not having the opportunity to come before the PZC or ARB for feedback, particularly if PZC or ARB are not supportive. Mr. Papsidero agreed absolutely.

Ms. Newell indicated that is why the Informal Review process was introduced. She said the City requirements used to be very stringent for the amount of information that had to be submitted for an application. She said applicants spent a lot of money up front doing complete detailed drawings that then had to be revised several times. She said the informal review was and still is extremely valuable for any applicant.

Mr. Papsidero said Planning recommends reintroducing that step, more formally. Ms. Newell suggested that as an option to any applicant if they so choose. Mr. Papsidero agreed.

Mr. Fishman asked if everyone on the ART is still part of the group that meets with the applicant. Mr. Papsidero said Planning and Engineering is always present and other departments are engaged as needed. Mr. Fishman indicated the more informal meetings early the better.

Mr. Papsidero said in this development climate, it is far more competitive and staff wants to encourage investment into the City. He mentioned when he worked for the City of Columbus, the process was much easier and faster.

Ms. Fox asked if it is possible in the informal review to brainstorm a little bit and incorporate more members of the ARB or the PZC in those meetings since staff does not want to see an applicant come before PZC/ARB and meet some contradictory opinion after the applicant has gone all the way through staff. She indicated other cities do it so there is an opportunity to address some of the issues that PZC frequently brings up that are not necessarily Code issues but expectations that are the softer things proposed. We should have the easiest and most expedient process that we can. She asked if there was a way for more collaboration with the informal review to gain general consensus, and ensure the applicant moves forward in a positive direction.

Ms. Newell said the Informal Review happens in front of the PZC as part of a public meeting. Ms. Fox suggested a proposal headed for the ARB would include an ARB member at the meetings between the staff and the applicant to discuss the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines and the Code. She said perhaps the members take turns attending. She said she is trying to avoid the scenario where the PZC/ARB hear the proposal and it is just not right or it should never get there. She asked how Commissioners and Board Members participate in helping that applicant.

Mr. Papsidero said that is part of the point of having the Informal Review option for either body's review before a lot of work is even completed. He said the applicant would bring a concept for early feedback. He stated there are clear differences in the roles of each body and staff. He said there is a public role that you have to adhere to and an authority that you are charged with, under the Code, that is very different than a review by staff.

Thaddeus Boggs indicated he can look more deeply in terms of the implications that might arise but for now, thinking about a member of the reviewing body participating in early reviews with the applicant outside of the normal public forum, which acts as a quasi-judicial body, causes concern as to whether that creates potential legal issues down the road when the development plan application moves forward. He said he wants to give that a second thought. He indicated that if a case is ultimately disapproved by the reviewing body (PZC in this scenario), then the applicant could turn around and say Commissioner X

was against it from the outset and he/she turned the rest of the Commission against it. He said this prior discussion happened outside of the record that was created at the public proceeding.

Gary Alexander said there is a community that is already doing what Ms. Fox is proposing now. He said Upper Arlington has a monthly scheduled work session that includes staff and a smaller group of the board. He said staff encourages the applicant to bring a potentially contentious project before the work session for feedback. He said it is considered a public forum but the formal applications are not needed. He said that neighborhood notices are not provided but it is considered a public meeting. Mr. Alexander mentioned when proposals do not look like they are going to be approved, rather than have them vote it down, the option is always to table it and come to the work session. He said they will spend a lot of time reviewing the proposal.

Ms. Fox indicated that might be what she is looking for. She said she wants that place where the applicant does not have to come in front of the PZC/ARB during the final processes and face a lot of angry citizens, or the ire of the Commission because they were not well informed of the process and what the expectations were. She concluded she is trying to find a collaborative way to get an applicant in front of the Board or Commission earlier and in a more productive manner.

Steve Stidhem reported he has been to a couple of the ART meetings and he has witnessed staff interact with the applicants. He stated the ART has said "this is what we think PZC would consider". He said staff is with us at our meeting and they know how we think and staff brings up good points. He said he does not want to speak for the rest of the Commission but that also puts an extra burden on staff.

Mr. Boggs said to speak to Upper Arlington's process, he believes what Mr. Alexander is referencing is probably more analogous to the informal review at Dublin whereas Ms. Fox suggested having a member of the Board involved in the staffing of the development application review. He said Upper Arlington has a staff group that meets during the work day and it is not a public body, it is a technical review team. He said the review team includes the Fire department representative, building official, and police, which is the same for ART, but that is in a staff setting and not a public meeting. He said the Work Session is a public meeting in the evening and off weeks when Upper Arlington is not having regular hearings. He said there is opportunity for give and take with the Board and staff and the applicant, as it is not formal review or the evidentiary type of hearing.

Ms. Fox said she is looking for something in that manner.

Mr. Alexander said it is feedback to let applicants know where they stand. He said it is held after hours and they usually have the majority of the members who serve on that particular board but not the whole board. He said the members do not make any promises, but rather gives the applicant guidance. He said the boards rely heavily on staff.

Jennifer Rauch said the City did that for a period of time, offering a work session option as a standard part of a PZC meeting. She said applicants would bring cases forward to get informal feedback ahead of the final formal review. She said in the end, it did not work so the process was abandoned. She stated that is not to say that process could not be revisited in a different format.

Shannon Stenberg asked Mr. Alexander if he felt the work session helped speed up the process if we are trying to reduce the steps. He answered affirmatively. He said, as an architect going to those meetings, he found it to be a big help and particularly when the bounds of particular zoning issues are pushed.

Mr. Papsidero said we can look further at this but this suggestion is broader than the Bridge Street District and would apply to the entire City and both bodies.

Ms. Newell said she found preliminary gave her the opportunity to hear PZC and ARB thoughts were and allowed her to respond to those comments and bring something in that ultimately the board would accept. She said having the public be a part of those meetings is helpful, because the applicant would hear what the public thought of the proposal. She concluded the process should be simple for an applicant to come in and get some basic feedback on a project they are considering, not something complicated.

Mr. Papsidero presented the comments provided by the stakeholders regarding the submittal requirement. He stated the consultant found the following:

- Too many submittal requirements
- Too much detail is required too early in the process
- Too much variation among various processes throughout the City
 - BSD vs PUD vs WID

He stated staff's goals as a result was to:

- Simplify the submittal process without compromising standards and outcomes, while ensuring appropriate flexibility
- Establish a framework for updating processes in WID and Metro-Blazer to ensure consistency within business districts

Mr. Papsidero presented the review steps for the four major business areas of the City as follows:

BSD

1. Informal
2. Basic Plan
3. Development Plan
4. Site Plan

PUD

1. Concept Plan
2. Preliminary Development Plan
3. Final Development Plan

WID

1. Informal
2. Development Plan
3. Site Plan

Metro-Blazer

- Steps to be determined

Mr. Papsidero explained this would provide an opportunity to streamline BSD, WID and Metro-Blazer requirements and process to be comparable to PUD (but without the PD/zoning provision). He said that is a critical piece because it simplifies the process by having zoning in place.

Mr. Papsidero indicated staff will look into the idea of work sessions for both PZC/ARB. He said the following recommendations were built off the PUD provision:

Concept Plan

- Mandatory per specific criteria (200,000 square feet, adjacent to single-family residential, etc.)
- Otherwise optional but could be recommended by staff or the PZC/ARB

Preliminary Development Plan

- Mandatory
 - Unless waived by the Planning Director per specific criteria (smaller projects, not adjacent to single-family residential, etc.)

Final Development Plan

- Mandatory

Mr. Fishman said the recommendations are for single-family residential and he feel people living in multi-family residential should have the same protections. He suggested we make it residential and not specifically single-family areas.

Mr. Papsidero answered multi-family could be included. He said in the past couple of years, any objection or interest in a development project has come from single-family residents not from multi-family residents, which was originally the idea, which the higher level of process was triggered by.

Mr. Fishman noted the City has hardly any multi-family residential currently except for Bridge Street. Mr. Papsidero stated there was a little bit around WID but generally not and most of it is embedded within a neighborhood. Mr. Fishman indicated it is a whole new world with the Bridge Street. He said people in there are clued into sight, sound, and all those things.

Ms. Newell said she read through several of Mr. Papsidero's memos and asked him to highlight what the applicant should be submitting with each of these phases - whether it be a Concept Plan, Preliminary Development Plan, or a Final Development Plan.

Mr. Papsidero said it is actually a long list and they have been rewriting parts of the Code to address that but it is very similar to what is in the PUD submittal process.

Mr. Papsidero explained the Concept Plan does not require Engineering; it is a conceptual layout, land use density, unit count, general buffering/landscaping but nothing is a detailed design.

Ms. Newell asked if any architecture would be presented in the Concept Plan. Mr. Papsidero said they suggested the idea of conceptual or aspirational architecture with imagery of what the buildings might look like. He said it would be very general and preliminary.

Mr. Papsidero said the Preliminary Development Plan includes engineering and more detailed plans.

Mr. Papsidero said the Final Development Plan should include all of the final details. He said even with the preliminary and conceptual architecture, building materials ought to be presented.

Ms. Newell said when she read through all of the information, she had the impression architecture was not going to be brought in until the Final Development Plan. She said that would not make this process easier for an applicant. Mr. Papsidero agreed.

Mr. Papsidero said a lot of the ART process is not reflected in the Code, and ART is defined in three different sections of the Code in different ways. He said the recommendation is to formalize the process and consolidate the references in the Code.

Mr. Papsidero said staff is recommending to establish rules and regulations for ART to clarify inconsistencies among Zoning Code Sections that address:

- Meeting schedule, notice and agendas
- Minutes, motions and votes, and records

- Membership
- Quorum

And clean up reference specific Zoning Code Sections:

- BSD (Minor Project Reviews, Administrative Departures)
- WID (projects not otherwise forwarded to PZC)
- Chapter 99 Wireless Communications (equipment replacement)
- Metro-Blazer will be completed in the future

Ms. Fox asked if the ART had slowed processes down, why it would continue to be used in other areas of the City. Mr. Papsidero answered with the WID the goal was to promote 'speed the build' in an economic development area. He said the Code allows the ART to kick up projects to the PZC when they have a community impact. He said staff wants to clean up and make that process clearer. He stated if a project is submitted and it meets Code and the plan, then it ought to be approved and go right to building permitting. He emphasized that was the original purpose of the ART in the beginning. He suggested Mr. McDaniel will argue that it is still a valid goal in the WID.

Mr. Papsidero indicated staff suggested the ART be applied to the Metro-Blazer area to encourage investment, particularly with the expansion of existing buildings. He said when potential development impacts a neighborhood or is a certain size of complexity, it would be brought to the Commission for review. He said under Minor Projects and Administrative Departures in the Bridge Street District, the ART plays a valuable role.

Mr. Papsidero said the minor modifications tend to be very small projects such as a patio expansion on a restaurant or a minor change in materials. He said the Code permits approve of material change if it is equal to or better quality than what was approved. He said when you think about a project that is under construction, and the owner realizes the wrong balcony railings was received, do you stop construction for two or four weeks to go through a lengthy review process. He said this flexibility is helpful to the development process. He stated staff does not recommend any changes to the minor modification section because it is proven to be a benefit and these approvals have been non-consequential in the big picture.

Ms. Newell asked if there were guidelines within the Zoning Code outlining when a project would get kicked to the Commission. Mr. Papsidero said the Bridge Street Code is very clear and lists a series of categories defining a Minor Project.

Ms. Newell said asked if a completely new building could get approved as a Minor Project. Ms. Burchett said it is possible but the square footage is limited.

Mr. Papsidero noted within the WID the ART has complete authority to approve an application but for a recent project they felt the proximity to residential, potential traffic impacts, and architecture and landscape details it would be more appropriately reviewed by PZC.

Ms. Newell asked if a property was zoned PUD prior to the BSD Code, an applicant would be allowed to develop under the PUD. Mr. Papsidero confirmed there were provisions to address that and he added if we move forward with Metro-Blazer, we would maintain that same provision.

Mr. Papsidero stated he had concluded his presentation. He encouraged the group to meet one-on-one or share additional comments with staff.

Mr. Fishman asked if PZC and ARB will have the opportunity to discuss these proposed revisions together.

Mr. Papsidero answered they could but he was not planning on doing that tonight. He said we can revisit this when Don Elliott will be here in April.

After reading this information, Mr. Fishman said he would really like to discuss the information provided by staff and Don Elliot.

Ms. Fox emphasized she would like to have conversations about it the consultants results and she would like to have this conversation prior to the formal review of the Code language.

Ms. Newell said she thought the use of the BSD Code in the Historic District has been a real disadvantage for the ARB. She stated she does not think the Historic District should be part of the BSD Code, and should be allowed to function as its own separate entity. She said this would permit the ARB to have great flexibility to treat each property individually because they can more sensitively address matters. Since the ARB is all present, she requested their opinion.

Mr. Rinaldi said the ARB has dealt with lots of conflicts between the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the BSD Code and he thinks they are in a better place at this point.

Ms. Newell said from her perspective the Code made things harder for the ARB because they were given building forms automatically. She explained an applicant could bring in a building form that fit the ARB's building forms in the Code, but that building form might not ultimately be sensitive to whole fabric of the District.

Mr. Rinaldi said the ARB had a recent application where the applicant showed the form without any articulation and there was a lot of pushback from the public because there was not enough detail. He said it can be frightening for the public until they see more.

Ms. Fox said she agreed with Ms. Newell. She said she worked on that requirements and the reason it came about is because there was such contradiction between the Code and preservation of the Historic District that it was the only mandate they could find to stop the intrusion on the Historic District and the destruction of the fabric of that neighborhood. She said no matter what is in the *Historic District Design Guidelines*, they were always dealing with the BSD Code. She said the two do not meld, particularly if we are trying to preserve a historic district. She stated they are at total odds with each other. She absolutely agrees the Historic District needs to be separated out. She said in the BSD Code there are no neighborhood standards for the Historic District.

Ms. Mitchell said she agreed with Ms. Newell, too. She said she has talked about this on occasion. It should not be a form based code. She said the BSD Code is great for Bridge Park and related kinds of areas but the fabric of the Historic District is completely different and so varied. She said you can have a building built in the 1800s and less than a block away a building that is mid-century modern. She stated to deal with all those different kinds of properties you can have a form based code.

Mr. Alexander asked for clarification if the approval process for the ARB allows them to approve projects that may not comply with the Code, given their knowledge of historical precedents or architectural background.

Mr. Leonhard suggested the ARB can also override the ART's recommendations.

Ms. Newell told Mr. Leonhard the ARB can, but she thinks it makes it harder for the ARB to do that. Ms. Mitchell suggested it would also affect what comes in for review. She said she thinks this will affect what is submitted, not only how hard it is. She said if we can get better at things at the beginning of the pipeline, maybe it makes the whole process easier.

Ms. Stenberg agreed and said the ARB has seen examples where the developer/applicant will state they followed the Code but the ARB states the *Guidelines* also have to be followed.

Mr. Fishman said the disapproval is much harder than the approval. He said an applicant will state they followed the Code but the ARB has disapproved it based on the *Guidelines* and we have occasionally been sued. Therefore, he said he agreed with Ms. Newell, 100%, that the Historic District should be separated.

Ms. Fox said it is difficult because the Zoning Code is the law, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are guidelines. She said the BSD Code has one small sentence, buried somewhere deep that states the ARB has the ability to utilize their standards of review. She said for the developer/applicant, she feels very sorry for them because it is almost like a hidden enemy in the closet. She said the applicant comes to the ARB with the opportunity for some infill in the Historic District, thinking they are complying with everything in the Code, and they may have, but then all of a sudden, this statement buried in the Code gets pulled out and says these different standards have to be met.

The Chair adjourned the Joint Work Session at 7:36 pm.

The regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission commenced after a short break after the Joint Work Session.

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 15, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block A (A1 Office Building) PID: 273-012721**
17-102SPR Site Plan Review (Approved 6 – 0)

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 7:42 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Steve Stidhem, Jane Fox, Deborah Mitchell, Warren Fishman, and Kristina Kennedy. Bob Miller was absent. City representatives present were: Vince Papsidero, Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Lori Burchett, Sierra Saumenig, and Laurie Wright.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the January 4, 2018, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block A (A1 Office Building) PID: 273-012721**
17-102SPR Site Plan Review

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the construction of an approximately 80,000-square-foot, four-story, office building and associated site improvements on a 0.77-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood District. She said the site is

northeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road/SR 161. She said this is a request for a review and approval for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She said the Commission has final authority on this case and witnesses will need to be sworn in.

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

Lori Burchett reported the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) had the opportunity to review this application informally and grant approval for the Basic Plan, which brings us to the final Site Plan Review this evening.

An aerial view of the site was presented as well as a graphic showing the Bridge Park Development Plan including all of the blocks for context and Block A was highlighted. Ms. Burchett said this is the final building proposed within Block A, which is at the southern end of the development and building A1 specifically is located at the southeastern corner of the A Block. She said the block has frontage on West Dublin Granville Road to the south, Mooney Way (a one-way private street) and Longshore Loop (a private drive.)

Ms. Burchett stated the applicant is proposing a four-story, 80,000-square-foot office building and associated site improvements. The proposed site plan was presented. She said a tiered, landscaped, open space area is proposed at the southern corner near the events center as well as a pedestrianway that will allow access between the proposed building and the events center.

Ms. Burchett reported the applicant has worked with staff and the Administrative Review Team (ART) to satisfy many of the comments received from the PZC during the informal review in September 2017, particularly regarding architectural design and the interaction of the building at the street level.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant is requesting approval of a Parking Plan, as part of this application that would allow for 477 spaces for Block A where 489 would be required. The applicant provided a parking availability assessment of Blocks A and B with the current mix of uses, she reported, and it was determined that Blocks A and B would require 1,241 spaces for all of the mix of uses and 1,371 spaces are provided with the garages for Blocks A and B along with on-street parking. She noted the Block B parking garage is within a reasonable walking distance to all buildings in Block A and the ART found that the Parking Plan would be sufficient to meet the parking needs for both blocks and has recommended approval of the Parking Plan.

Proposed elevations for the December 2017 review from different angles were presented. Ms. Burchett described the building as a contemporary aesthetic with a mix of glass and brick materials. The balconies, she said, would include a wood element underneath to soften the overall design and add another material to warm up parts of the façade. She said the building had a “wrinkling effect” on the east elevation to add interest to that prominent, long façade.

Ms. Burchett then presented a proposed rendering of the building from near Riverside Drive with a prominent entrance with stairs in the middle and the open space plaza shown to the left as proposed for this review as well as the proposed building shown from Longshore Loop with the event center on the right-hand side. The final rendering she presented provided context for Block A – an image taken from a drone with the proposed office building super imposed in the correct location to show its relation to the entire block.

Ms. Burchett reported as part of the review by the ART, they approved four Administrative Departures for this project, which allow for minor deviations from the Code, generally within 10% of the requirement. She noted the approved departures included lot coverage, primary façade materials, and upper story transparency requirements.

The applicant is proposing 22 Waivers as part of this review, Ms. Burchett said, and she briefly reviewed each one with graphics included to illustrate the requests:

1. Parapet Height - Required: Between 2-6 feet; Requested: north and south ends: ± 1 foot
2. Parapet Wrapping - Required: Wrap all sides; Requested: Not wrapped on the east elevation
3. Façade Material Transitions - Required: Transitions between different colors; Requested: 2 colors on same plane for brick
4. Windows, Shutters, Awnings, and Canopies - Required: Appropriate lintels or trim; Requested: No trim or casing
5. Required Front Property Line Coverage - Required: Minimum 95%; Requested: 0% at W. Dublin-Granville Rd.
6. Front Required Building Zone - Required: 0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 10-20 feet; Requested - ± 19 feet on W. Dublin-Granville Rd.
7. Required Build Zone Treatment - Required: Patio/streetscape treatment; Requested: Landscaping at the roadway
8. Loading Facility Permitted - Required: Loading to the rear; Requested: Located at the west side of the building
9. Upper Story Height - Required: Between 10-14 ft. Requested: 25-feet at north end
10. Ground Story Street Transparency - Required: 65%; Requested: 44% north, 30% east, 35% south
11. Number of Entrances - Required: 1 per 75 feet; Requested: 0 on the east elevation, 1 on the south elevation
12. Vertical Increments - Required: No greater than 45 feet; Requested: No more than 65 feet on the east and 95 feet on the west elevations
13. Horizontal Façade Divisions - Required: Within 3 feet of the ground story. Requested: No divisions
14. Required Change in Roof Plane - Required: Change at 80 feet; Requested: 115 feet on the east elevation, 98 feet on the west elevation
15. Open Space Size - Required Minimum: 0.10 acres; Requested: 0.03 acres
16. Fencing and Walls - Required: No greater than 36 inches in height; Requested: Not to exceed 65 inches in height
17. Maximum Impervious/Semi Pervious - Required: Max: 30%. Requested: 37% impervious
18. Required Loading Spaces Location - Required: On parking spaces; Requested: Open space
19. Required Loading Spaces Number Required - Required: Two spaces; Requested: One space
20. Foundation Planting - Required: Within 10 feet on all sides; Requested: No plantings within 10 feet
21. Walkability Standards Design - Required Minimum: 14 feet in width; Requested: No less than 8 feet wide
22. Walkability Standards Design - Required: Continuation of the streetscape; Requested: Change material to concrete

Ms. Burchett reported staff and the ART reviewed the Site Plan against the applicable review criteria and found the project to be consistent. She said the ART has also reviewed the Waivers against the applicable review criteria and found it to be consistent, as well.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended by the ART for 22 Site Plan Waivers:

1. §153.062 - Parapet Height (D)(1)(a) - Required: Between 2-6 feet; Requested: North and South ends ± 1 foot
2. §153.062 - Parapet Wrapping (D)(1)(b) - Required: Wrap all sides; Requested: Not wrapped on East elevation

3. §153.062 - Façade Material Transitions (E)(2)(c) - Required: Transitions between different colors; Requested: 2 colors on same plane
4. §153.062 - Windows, Shutters, Awnings, and Canopies (H)(1)(f) - Required: Appropriate lintels or trim; Requested: No trim or casing
5. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) Required Front Property Line Coverage - Required: Minimum 95%; Requested: 0% at W. Dublin-Granville Rd.
6. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Required Building Zone - Required: 0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 10-20 feet; Requested: ±19 feet W. Dublin-Granville Rd.
7. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) – Required Build Zone Treatment - Required: Patio/streetscape treatment; Requested: Landscaping at roadway
8. §153.062 – Parking & Loading (O)(6)(3) – Loading Facility Permitted - Required: Loading to rear; Requested: Located at west side of building
9. §153.062 – Height (B) – Upper Story Height - Required: Between 10-14 feet. Requested: 25 feet at north end.
10. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Ground Story Street Transparency - Required: 65%; Requested: 44% north, 30% east, 35% south.
11. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(3) – Street Façade: Number of Entrances - Required: 1 per 75 feet; Requested: 0 on east, 1 on south.
12. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments - Required: No greater than 45 feet; Requested: No more than 65 feet on east and 95 feet on west elevation
13. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) – Horizontal Façade Divisions - Required: Within 3 feet of ground story. Requested: No divisions
14. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) – Required Change in Roof Plane - Required: Change at 80 feet; Requested: 115 feet on east, 98 feet on west.
15. §153.064 – Open Space (G)(1)(a) –Size Required at a minimum: 0.10 acre ; Requested: 0.03 acre
16. §153.064 – Open Space (G)(4)(h) – Fencing and Walls - Required: No greater than 36 inches; Requested: Not to exceed 65 inches
17. §153.064 – Open Space (G)(4)(h) – Maximum Impervious/Semi Pervious - Required: Maximum 30%. Requested: 37% impervious
18. §153.065 – Required Loading Spaces (B)(7)(b)(2) – Location - Required: On parking spaces; Requested: Open space
19. §153.065 – Required Loading Spaces (B)(7)(c)(1) – Number Required: Two spaces; Requested: One space
20. §153.065 – Landscaping and Tree Preservation (D)(7)(a) – Foundation Planting - Required: Within 10 feet on all sides; Requested: No plantings within 10 feet
21. §153.065 – Walkability Standards (I)(2)(a)(4)(B) – Design - Required: Minimum 14 feet in width Requested: No less than 8 feet
22. §153.065 – Walkability Standards (I)(2)(a)(4)(B) – Design - Required: Continuation of streetscape; Requested: Change material to concrete

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended by the ART for a Parking Plan to allow for 477 parking spaces in Block A where 489 are required and the Site Plan Review with 10 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to revise the landscaped area of the pedestrianway closest to Longshore Loop to better accommodate pedestrian flow;
- 2) That the applicant revise the Site Plan to demonstrate a minimum 14-foot-average width for the entire pedestrianway;
- 3) That the applicant continue to work with staff to screen the remote Fire Department Connection (FDC) unit, while maintaining functionality of the unit to the satisfaction of the Washington Township Fire Department;

- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff to identify appropriate planter locations around the building;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to include exterior lighting to add more interest to the façade;
- 6) That the applicant conceal any roof penetrations (including fans, exhaust vents, etc.) and they shall not be visible from principal frontage streets;
- 7) That the applicant not use highly reflective glass;
- 8) That the applicant design the principal entrances to include full glass and full operating hardware;
- 9) That the applicant work with staff on refining details around the loading area to mitigate any potential impacts of pedestrian circulation; and
- 10) That the applicant continue to work with staff on identifying loading spaces.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant was present to answer any questions.

Jane Fox said she was not on the Planning and Zoning Commission at the time of the Informal Review. She indicated she saw quite a few suggestions that were made from the Commission for the applicant to go back and address. She noted on the Site Plan Review analysis that it is substantially similar, but there were questions about poor interaction at the street. She stated there was a recommendation to change the element of the building face, a suggestion of commercial space on the ground level, and this building was particularly similar to other suburban office park architecture. She said for this review, there does not appear to be any major changes. Victoria Newell said the building looks completely different this time around.

Ms. Fox said she has questions about the vitality at the street level, such as the doorway entrances and the way the character of the building interacts with pedestrians. She requested an explanation of how this plan is different. Ms. Newell asked staff if they had the pictures of the original proposal available and subsequent iterations to show Ms. Fox. She indicated that when the applicant comes forward, they can also address Ms. Fox's questions.

Ms. Burchett presented previously proposed renderings from September 2017 – this is what the Commission had initially reacted to during that Informal Review, she said. She presented the next slide presented showing what ART reviewed in November 2017 but the applicant be pulled the application prior to PZC meeting in order to further refine the architecture.

Ms. Newell referred to the south, east, north, and west elevations and recalled part of the Commission's discussion about engaging the street and that one could not tell where the entrance to the building was by looking at those four elevations.

Ms. Fox said, in looking at the new proposal, she still had a concern because this is a gateway. She said this developer is responsible for developing the entire area and she does not want a monotonous appearance along the entire street but rather a distinctive and different look complementing the event center.

Warren Fishman inquired about the variance on the green space. He asked if it was more space or less space being requested. Ms. Burchett answered the Waiver for the green space is only for the type of green space. Overall, the open space dedication will be compliant with what the Code requires.

Mr. Fishman asked if the open space would include plantings. Ms. Burchett said there will be landscape materials as part of the open space.

Ms. Newell explained the applicant could have defined this under the smallest park provisions that we have in the Code, but that would have required more waivers. She understood the proposed open space did not clearly fit into any of those provisions.

Mr. Fishman asked why concrete is used instead of brick material. Ms. Burchett said the buff concrete was utilized in other landscape areas and the applicant was looking for a continuous look from the streetscape, to encourage people to walk into that area. However, she said, the applicant could provide additional information regarding specific design choices.

The Chair called the applicant forward.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners arrived and the Chair swore him in. He said he was at the last meeting and he wanted to provide a little more color from what they saw and what they were responding to for Ms. Fox's benefit. He said one of the comments they heard was the building seemed too similar to the AC Marriott hotel but there was a division on the Commission between whether or not the proposed building needed to look more or less like the hotel or how exactly they could put their finger down on something that would work.

Mr. Yoder referred to the rendering on the screen and noted the building on the right no longer looked like any of the other buildings in the frame. He said the building now has its own personality. He said they tried to create a different fenestration pattern in the building than what they have with any of the other buildings.

Mr. Yoder indicated the comments about the entry to the street was something they took to heart, creating a solid connection to Riverside Drive and then as importantly to Longshore Street. He said the former Commissioner, Chris Brown, called this to their attention. He reported that Mr. Brown had said when a person was standing on Longshore Street, or by the AC Marriott hotel, or further to the north looking down at this proposed building is was an important anchor to that experience and they should try to draw people around the corner. He said as a result, the applicant moved the building entry and created commercial space that had not previously existed on the ground floor, as it was 100% office space and created an open space on the corner as well for a potential restaurant. He indicated they are not sure they will have a restaurant there but they are setting it up so they could as well as a retail space around the corner.

Mr. Yoder stated, they created a grand gesture at the end of Longshore as one looks up the street and is drawn into the building from Longshore Street. He said on Riverside Drive they did a similar expression where there is now a staircase that draws one in from Riverside Drive from SR 161 into the structure.

Mr. Yoder said they also introduced new natural materials that do not exist anywhere else in Bridge Park and he pointed out the wood material on the face of the building that creates new textures to make this building look different. He pointed out the massing has been completely changed in the sense that the monolithic glass windows they presented before have been eliminated and replaced with a more punched window opening style. He said the "crinkling" was a playful thing to do on the side facing the dealership. He indicated they were trying to stretch the design envelope a little bit to create something that is of extremely high quality to reflect this corner. He added after six or seven months of work they tried to elevate the design.

Brian Sell added this view was great to demonstrate the difference between the east and west elevations because in the previous schemes, those elevations were long, monotonous, glass facades with some variety to them. He said they have now created a commanding composition. He suggested on the west side they took in very subtle cues from the event center, which has the big bay window. He pointed out the big 'front living room type' window on the event center facing the roundabout was used as inspiration

in a subtle way as the big windows for this proposed building. He said that “crinkling effect” mentioned earlier is a cut-out. He added it is the opposite of the west façade so it is trying to make a big bay window on that façade, a larger scale, drivable scale. He said when one comes up close, they experience all the pedestrian level entrances and detailing that Mr. Yoder referenced.

Russ Hunter added on the previous renditions of this building, all of the façade materials were composite, metal, and glass. He explained that is part of why they pulled the application back in November because they felt it was too much like the AC Marriott hotel and not enough like the rest of Bridge Park. He said as a result, they added the brick and the wood to warm it and soften it up to pull the Bridge Park flavor back down into the A1 building.

Mr. Yoder said there are two stacks of balconies that create this balanced feel as well as a covered dining area and potentially an outdoor break area for an office tenant. He said outdoor space is important to office users and in this case, now they have two balcony opportunities per floor for these buildings, which allows them two tenants per floor, not just one that would have the benefit of the views. He said it is important for them to attract good tenants and also important for the City to attract good tenants, too.

Ms. Fox asked to see better pictures of the restaurant and plaza areas Mr. Yoder was speaking about. Mr. Yoder suggested a landscape plan with some color might help Ms. Fox.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the bollards as the material used for the bollards in Bridge Park appears to be rusting. Mr. Hunter said they are trying to figure out what is wrong because it is stainless steel and by its very nature is not supposed to rust.

Ms. Burchett presented the graphics Mr. Yoder was referring to. He pointed out the staircase that leads up to the lobby space for the offices. He also noted the outdoor seating area that is partially covered for the office or restaurant tenants. He pointed out a seating area that is accessed off of Riverside Drive or SR 161/roundabout. He said the staircase now creates the visual cue and entrance for the space being set up for a restaurant. He then noted the space intended for retail and the ground floor office. He explained one could enter from the parking garage or crossing the street at grade as the office and restaurant can both be accessed at grade level. He said as the grade falls, one could enter the ceremonial impactful staircase and pointed out other entrances.

The Chair asked to view the roundabout picture as she thought this would help address Mr. Fishman’s question about using concrete as opposed to brick on the plazas.

Matthew Blackburn, landscape architect at MKSK, explained they used the brick along the signature streets such as Riverside Drive and in the special places such as the plaza outside the event center. He said the bricks fill in the places and walks that are special and the concrete leads to the next special place and then there are transitions in materials each time one has arrived to the new special place.

The Chair asked Mr. Blackburn to highlight all the places the concrete retaining wall is used.

Mr. Blackburn explained that brick runs all the way down Riverside Drive, all the way down to Mooney Way, bricks are within the plaza, the sidewalks, and the areas in front of the entrance to the AC Marriott hotel from Longshore Loop; concrete is on each side of that leading from one place to the next.

Mr. Fishman said brick looks better than concrete and will last longer. He said when one walks around the Bridge Street development the brick looks good. He asked if a different colored brick could be used instead of concrete to differentiate areas.

Mr. Hunter said he is trying to make sure he understands the question. He said part of the logic is that there is a lot of brick in Bridge Park, but there are a lot of other materials too – different coursing, different colors, granite, regular concrete, and buff washed concrete in different colors. He indicated if everything were brick, then nothing would feel special or different. He said they are trying to use the materials as best as they can in different places to make sure they all feel a little different. He said some of the buff washed concrete they have used in some of the open spaces on C block are just as beautiful as the brick paver pattern. He stated it is a different material and not the broom concrete used on a typical sidewalk.

Mr. Yoder asked if the area Mr. Fishman was talking about was at C Block between RAM Brewery and the parking garage. He said there is brick at the landing and brick at the other end with concrete between the two to serve as a connection. He said the concrete is not used from a cost perspective but to create a sense of 'this is important' with the brick versus 'this is connective tissue' with the concrete. He reiterated different materials allow a pedestrian walking around Bridge Park to have more of a sense of place in each one of these individual nodes. He said if it became a requirement to have brick everywhere it would not disturb them from a cost perspective but from a visual perspective as it is better with a variety of materials.

Mr. Stidhem asked what the square footage is on (except for the first floor), the other three floors for useable office space. Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, 300 Spruce Street, answered there is ±19,600 square feet on the second, third, and fourth floors.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there is rooftop access. Ms. Umbarger answered there was not; mechanicals are screened in up there. Mr. Stidhem said that hurts an office space, as it is nice to have rooftop access to conduct a meeting or hang out for another experience.

Ms. Umbarger said they considered many iterations of the balconies where the best places were placement on the outside to allow for the best views. She said where they placed them on the north and south sides views can be seen without seeing the mechanicals on the event center. She noted there is a green roof on the event center but there are also screened mechanicals so they avoided putting balconies where people would look down into those mechanical areas.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the 65-inch Waiver for a wall and he is not clear where that is.

Ms. Burchett answered there is a series of walls for the terracing in the landscape area and a couple of locations were determined to be 65 inches in height. She explained if it were considered a retaining wall, it would meet the requirement but this particular is a seat wall and requires a Waiver. Mr. Stidhem emphasized he wanted to ensure it is not a walkable area where there is a 65-inch drop off.

Mr. Sell said that area is the terrace for dining and it has a continuous railing around it. He said you do not see the plantings that hide that one low part where it is ±60 inches but the plantings will never allow anyone to see the full wall. He said they are using the Adair Stone for the walls, not concrete. He noted the material creates the site walls, similar to what was used on the hotel and the event center.

Mr. Stidhem asked if any art work was planned for that pocket plaza. Mr. Hunter said there is no artwork at the moment but he has been working with the Dublin Arts Council to come up with a more comprehensive public art plan that is more than Crawford Hoying Development Partners involved.

Mr. Stidhem indicated he was going to recommend that others need to be involved, too.

Ms. Newell stated the building looks terrific; the applicant did a really good job of responding to the Commission's questions and comments. She said the "wrinkling" façade treatment along the one side of

the building is very creative and a really nice feature on the building. She reiterated she liked the changes the applicant made. She indicated she likes seeing the window patterns the applicant came up with and how they carry it all the way down. She stated she loves the combination of the bricks chosen. She concluded the proposed building is very nice.

Mr. Stidem said he agreed and the building looks significantly better. He stated he loves the wood, especially as one will see it as they are driving around the roundabout. He said he likes the “wrinkling” of the one façade and the entrances. He referred back to Chris Brown’s comments; whereas, he made some great points about the flow of the street and bringing that together. He concluded it all looks fantastic.

Ms. Mitchell agreed and said this was a great example of incorporating feedback and also going further to make a really creative building.

Mr. Fishman said he did not see the preliminary plans but the building looked great.

Ms. Fox restated she did not see the preliminary plans either, so for her, she is looking at it holistically. She said she loved the way the building was presented with the terraced area and the pocket park.

Ms. Fox said she is concerned about the walkway and anticipates the event center will bring a lot of people out on the street. She said she is glad the applicant plans to put a restaurant there. She suggested, from having never seen this proposal before, if there is a way, as one goes down through the middle, to broaden the walkway to 14 feet.

Ms. Fox asked if there was a way to create an interesting façade for the pedestrians seeing into the restaurant. She asked if there was the ability to have a sense of intimacy in that walkway or if the windows could be opened in the summer time. She said she is suggesting something that would create a liveliness as one walks through that space because that can be a narrow and overpowering feel as one transverses a narrow walkway. She asked if there was some way to make that restaurant space “live” on the street for people coming out of the event center because that is the only reason anyone would walk through there.

Ms. Fox indicated she liked the idea that the applicant incorporated retail on Longshore. She emphasized we have to make sure for all these buildings, the street interacts with people. She referred to the Vision Principles, where there cannot be a wall of windows; they have to talk to the pedestrians.

Ms. Fox said her fear is that as we continue to build in Bridge Park, and what walkable urbanism asks of us, is that we can interact with the building spaces. She concluded the restaurant is a place, the retail spot is a place, and anywhere the applicant can create more livability on the street is a homerun for the area.

Mr. Hunter added the restaurants and the retailers are the ones that add that ground floor experience. He noted Local Cantina and Pins have several garage doors they added to their design which is when that creativity starts to happen. He said he anticipates the same thing will happen when this restaurant comes forward.

Mr. Yoder noted there are parts of Bridge Park that are not seen yet because the tenants are not there yet. He said Fado will have that flair inside and out; they will have a beautiful red exterior and will create this incredible bourbon bar that one can see into. He indicated Z Cucina is doing something with operable glass, as well. He believed Bridge Park is going to start coming alive this summer and it will be fun to see all the interactions that Ms. Fox is talking about. He added it is more creativity than any of us, the applicant, can add. He said it is all the tenant’s architects that are coming from their cities and bringing their own flair to the pedestrian-scale experience and he cannot wait to see it.

Ms. Fox said she appreciated that insight and did not realize that bringing tenants would do some architectural changes on that lower floor, which is something that is so important to all of us. She said she has seen this in other cities where they denote the difference, between the first floor and the next floor that gives the people on the street the sense this whole first floor level is active and different from the upper floors. She asked the applicant to speak to that and how the applicant creates that pedestrian sense of invitation.

Mr. Sell indicated they used stone and added a texture to that stone to differentiate it as a strong base on the hotel and the event center, for examples. He said it is incorporated through the whole event center since it is a one-story building. He said here we have the chance to do something different with that base so they maintained that interesting, random pattern and added the texture for another second look. He said they are lightening up the color as they want it to be more limestone looking. He said the lights will be effective at that level as well. He said the applicant was very pleased to have the ability to create this nice strong base.

Ms. Fox asked if it is possible to get outdoor seating. The applicant answered affirmatively.

Mr. Hunter pointed out the outdoor seating is shown on the site plans to address the grading. He said they did significant terracing to minimize the wall effect.

Mr. Yoder referred back to the elevation view and noted the outdoor seating. He said the canopy cover helped them add more interaction with the street and bring the scale down to that pedestrian level, which also addressed the Commission's comments. He said a tenant will come in and add a canopy and put it where they want but the applicant did this up front to set the table for another restaurant tenant to be able to come in. He said it makes it easier for the tenant and more impactful from the egress.

The Chair said she understands Ms. Fox's comments that she is making about the base of the building but noted the clean distinction on this elevation between the first and second floor. She said most of the structures in Bridge Street have a very strong, prominent base and the City has to be cautious if enforcing that requirement because if it were on every single structure, all the buildings would start to look the same. She stated this is something the Commission has consistently asked the applicant to get away from. She said the applicant has done a great job of coming up with a design that fits very well within this area, while responding to the Commission's comments and bringing in new elements into the building. She said when you pool all of those buildings together, they still have a wonderful play. She said if everything came across exactly the same, there would not be so much interest and that is one of the things required for a walkable environment. She concluded she really liked this building.

Mr. Stidhem said one of the things they have talked about is keeping this in its own little area at the end of the street with its own character and flair. He said he thinks that has been accomplished.

Ms. Mitchell said she wanted to share something exciting with everyone here. She reported, this past week, she met with her Ohio State undergraduate students and completely unprompted by her they started talking about Bridge Park. She said they know about it, about RAM Brewery, and some of the other places. She said they were talking about it like it was really hip and cool and she had to think to herself this is fantastic; it is bubbling up. She took that as a really positive sign.

Mr. Yoder reported they have millennials that work with them and one of them said that her friends know she works there and they asked her if she knew that Bridge Park was incredible, that it is more than Cap City, and it is a city within a city.

Ms. Mitchell added Bridge Park is starting to get buzz with the right people. Mr. Yoder said all of their efforts are paying off and he thanked the Commission for all of their assistance. He said we do not say it enough, it would not happen without the public-private partnership and it is working for everybody.

Mr. Hunter said there will be some very exciting additional things the Commission will see in the next four, six, and eight months. Mr. Stidhem said he was looking forward to it.

Kristina Kennedy said this was her first night serving on the Commission. She said coming fresh, and seeing this building, she is really excited about this design; it looks beautiful. She said she wanted to relay the same sentiment the other members have expressed that it is visually very appealing and she looks forward to seeing this come to fruition.

The Chair called for a motion of approval.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the request for 22 Site Plan Waivers:

1. Parapet Height §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a)
2. Parapet Wrapping §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(b)
3. Façade Material Transitions §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(c)
4. Windows, Shutters, Awnings, and Canopies §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g)
5. Required Front Property Line Coverage §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1)
6. Front Required Building Zone §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1)
7. Required Build Zone Treatment §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1)
8. Loading Facility Permitted §153.062 – Parking & Loading (O)(6)(3)
9. Upper Story Height §153.062 – Height (B)
10. Ground Story Street Facing Transparency §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1)
11. Street Façade: Number of Entrances §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(3)
12. Vertical Increments §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4)
13. Horizontal Façade Divisions 153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4)
14. Required Change in Roof Plane 153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4)
15. Open Space Size 153.064 – Open Space (G)(1)(a)
16. Fencing and Walls 153.064 – Open Space (G)(4)(h)
17. Open Space Maximum Impervious 153.064 – Open Space (G)(4)(h)
18. Loading Spaces Location 153.065 Required Loading Spaces (B)(7)(b)(2)
19. Loading Spaces Number Required 153.065 Required Loading Spaces (B)(7)(c)(1)
20. Foundation Planting 153.065 – Landscaping and Tree Preservation (D)(7)(a)
21. Pedestrianway Design Width 153.065 – Walkability Standards (I)(2)(a)(4)(B)
22. Pedestrianway Design Materials 153.065 – Walkability Standards (I)(2)(a)(4)(B)

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve a Parking Plan to allow for 477 parking spaces in Block A where 489 are required and the Site Plan Review with 10 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to revise the landscaped area of the pedestrianway closest to Longshore Loop to better accommodate pedestrian flow;
- 2) That the applicant revise the Site Plan to demonstrate a minimum 14-foot average width for the entire pedestrianway;

- 3) That the applicant continue to work with staff to screen the remote FDC unit, while maintaining functionality of the unit to the satisfaction of the Washington Township Fire Department;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff to identify appropriate planter locations around the building;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to include exterior lighting to add more interest to the façade;
- 6) That the applicant conceal any roof penetrations (including fans, exhaust vents, etc.) and they shall not be visible from principal frontage streets;
- 7) That the applicant not use highly reflective glass;
- 8) That the applicant design the principal entrances to include full glass and full operating hardware;
- 9) That the applicant work with staff on refining details around the loading area to mitigate any potential impacts of pedestrian circulation; and
- 10) That the applicant continue to work with staff on identifying loading spaces.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair announced this will be Ms. Mitchell's last Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as her term is up, and with conflicts with her work schedule, has chosen not to renew serving on this Commission. Ms. Newell thanked Ms. Mitchell for her service as she has been a tremendous asset to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Ms. Newell said she was really going to miss her because she has had such great input.

Mr. Stidhem said he was really going to miss her too. He said he appreciated the insights that she brought, and he was sorry to hear she is leaving.

Ms. Mitchell thanked them and said she was going to miss working with staff, Ms. Newell, Mr. Stidhem, and everyone else. She said there are lots of great things coming and she will still be here in Dublin and watch from the other side. She said she hoped to work with everyone sometime in the future.

The Chair asked if there were any further items to discuss.

Vince Papsidero said he had one announcement. He asked if any of the members had thought further about attending the National Planning Conference. He said the City offers to the Commissioners to attend. The conference is April 20 – 24 this year and it is in New Orleans, Louisiana. He explained it is an annual planning conference that Commissioners have often found as great value.

Ms. Newell said she would love to go but again this year, she has a work conflict, and cannot attend. She told, especially the newest members, the conference is a great learning experience. She said she knows it is hard when a member just gets here, to make that commitment but it is well worth attending, even if you can only attend part of it. She said staff is great at making recommendations on which seminars would be of interest to the Commissioners. Mr. Papsidero announced next year the conference is being held in San Francisco, California.

Ms. Fox reported that Ms. De Rosa had told her that if you do want to go, you want to be able to take advantage of the walking tours and that sometimes they fill up pretty quickly. She asked Mr. Papsidero if it is too late for that. Mr. Papsidero said there are also mobile tours/workshops. He encouraged the members to go ahead and register, if they are considering going. Ms. Newell said there is a plethora of continuing education opportunities, which she tends to gravitate to more than the tours as she finds she gets more out of them.

Mr. Fishman said he has been to a lot of the conferences and he has never been to one that was not worth attending. He said he does not take many of the tours, but likes to attend classes about future zoning, etc. He added you always learn a lot. He said we always think we are number one but when you talk to cities like Austin, TX and Chicago, IL, you really learn a lot. He asked how many Planners are going and Mr. Papsidero reported about half are going this year. Ms. Kennedy said she had a personal travel conflict, unfortunately, and could not attend this year.

Ms. Newell said there are also planning seminars, etc. to attend, locally. Mr. Fishman added he has participated in some good webinars.

The Chair asked if there were any further items to discuss. [Hearing none] She adjourned the meeting at 8:49 pm.

As RE-approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission May 3, 2018.