

proposals in terms of size, scale, and massing but the applicant has been working to address these with the most recent rendition.

Ms. Burchett presented a rendering of the proposed building to show how the materials would be used and said overall, the proposal meets the Code requirements. She reported staff reviewed this proposal against the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and found the proposal compliant. She noted the *Guidelines* do not discourage modern architectural designs. She said this is not a representation of a historic structure but it complements the neighboring structures.

Kelly Burke, U Crew Holdings, reported that this proposal is a result of reviews by the ART, ARB, and the neighbors. Claudia Husak asked who the neighbors were that reviewed the proposal and Mr. Burke said there was no true HOA but the applicant had met with property owners directly adjacent to the site and told them to distribute information to anyone else in the neighborhood. He indicated that many of the surrounding neighbors were supportive of the proposal.

Ms. Burchett noted only outdated tree survey information was provided thus far and a new tree survey has been requested to determine size and quality of the existing trees. She said there are 10 trees that the applicant would like to cut down: three trees on the property line and seven others throughout and staff wants to ensure that trees are added to the site that are appropriate.

Mr. Burke said the law firm next door is supportive of removing the three trees on the property line between the two businesses.

Ms. Burchett asked the ART how they felt about the 8 by 8-foot open space plaza proposed between the two buildings. Staff had felt that open grassed areas in between buildings is more characteristic of this part of the Historic District. She said that due to the minimal amount of open space that would be required, the applicant could also pay a fee-in-lieu of open space.

Ms. Burchett said the next step is for the applicant to return to the ART on April 19, 2018 for a recommendation to the ARB for their meeting on April 25, 2018.

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

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D
18-007SPR**

**PID: 273-012703
Site Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for a mixed-use development for Block D of the Bridge Park Development, including four buildings with approximately 110,000 square feet of office space, 44,000 square feet of retail space, 35,500 square feet of commercial space, 186 residential units, and a parking garage with 671 spaces. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site in context to the existing Bridge Park Development, the proposed Development Plan outlining the roadway network with building pads and lot configuration, and the Landscape Plan for all the open spaces included in this block. She noted where Longshore Street bisects the site running north and south from Tuller Ridge Drive to John Shields Parkway and Larimer Street that connects from Mooney Street to Longshore Street. She said this proposal is similar to the Basic Plan but contains significantly more detail on materials, architectural design, and open space design.

Ms. Burchett provided an overview of the individual buildings starting with D1, which is a Corridor Building with six stories; commercial on the first floor, office on the second, and 43 residential condominiums on floors three thru six. She said D2 is a Corridor Building with six stories; retail on the first floor and office space on floors two thru six with balconies on various sides facing Riverside Drive and Longshore Street. D3, she said, is a Corridor Building with six stories; commercial on the first floor and 83 residential units on floors two thru six with an elevated courtyard open space facing Larimer Street. Lastly, she said, D4/D5 is a Corridor Building with six stories; commercial on the first floor with a loading dock from Tuller Ridge Drive and a parking garage on floors two thru six. She said the garage is lined with 60 residential units on floors one thru five, due to the grade change, that face Mooney Street and Larimer Street. She concluded by noting new materials are being introduced on buildings D3 and D4/D5, which are textured aluminum metal tiles.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, presented the northwest view of D2 from John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. Claudia Husak reported that the treatment of the recessed walkway was discussed at City Council; their concern was whether it is too narrow and if the walkway will feel publically accessible. Mr. Gonzalez said the illustrations provided thus far do not accurately depict the size of the walkway but he would obtain different renderings at the pedestrian level to better reflect the available space. Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said they did not have the massing last week but can now get pedestrian level renderings produced to share with staff.

Aaron Stanford asked if there was access to the underpass from Riverside Drive and Ms. Husak answered affirmatively. She said it appears tight from the tunnel wall to the face of the building, which further limits pedestrian access. Ms. Husak asked if the building overhang encroaches into the pedestrian space and right-of-way. Mr. Gonzalez said he would verify the distance and correlation with the right-of-way. He added the canopy extends over the first floor and the colonnade is for the retail spaces. Vince Papsidero inquired about the setback of the wall and façade from the right-of-way. Ms. Umbarger explained it is 9.6 feet wide at the closest point and widens out down Riverside Drive. She said it is purposeful for a pedestrian connection.

Ms. Husak stated the distance of the building from the pedestrian underpass still appears tight. Ms. Umbarger restated that the illustrations are not reflecting this area well and they will provide those at a future date. Mr. Stanford asked about the overhang distance to the wall of the pedestrian tunnel. He said they appear to not overlap but it is difficult to tell from the drawings. Shawn Krawetzki said the colonnade on Riverside Drive appears tight as well. Mr. Gonzalez responded it has been widened from the initial design.

Mr. Papsidero inquired about the shade of brick proposed for D4/D5. Mr. Gonzalez answered the brick is lighter than those previously used. Ms. Umbarger stated the applicant would bring in material samples for review at the next meeting. She added the lighter color was proposed to create variety in the design. Mr. Papsidero affirmed that a lighter brick is more appropriate for D4/D5. He asked about the materials used for the vertical and horizontal areas extending from the ground to top story. Ms. Umbarger clarified the vertical black material is black brick and the horizontal material is a metal panel.

Ms. Husak asked if there is an entrance on Riverside Drive for Building D1 and Ms. Umbarger answered affirmatively and added the main entrance for the residential is from Longshore Street on the east elevation.

Ms. Umbarger indicated that D1 consists of a darker red brick with the retail use on the first floor, office use on the second floor and condominiums above. She pointed out the open space on the north side of the building. She said brick and wood would be used to enclose the utilities. John Woods, MKSK, said cedar planks of wood would be used between the brick for a fence/gate.

Mr. Gonzalez presented the southwest view of D4/D5 that includes retail on the ground floor and the entry into the parking garage. Mr. Papsidero indicated that the roofline appears flat when viewed straight on and that more variation should be provided to the facade. He suggested that if it is illuminated at night it would appear more interesting especially for vertical features. He encouraged the applicant to play off the warehouse feel they are trying to project elsewhere. He suggested the main entrance have more presence at the street level and inquired about the proposed materials. Ms. Umbarger stated the dark gray was fiber cement panels, the base material is limestone, and layered brick was used on the garage portion for more articulation.

Mr. Gonzalez presented the northwest corner view of the D3 building. Ms. Husak asked if any vegetation would be used on the taller blank walls at the ground level. Mr. Gonzalez answered the walls will be covered with plant material. Mr. Woods added they have proposed to have planters running down the street. He said no parallel parking is proposed so they will use planter boxes to supplement areas near the main entrance. Ms. Husak indicated that if these elements do not materialize in the end, staff could not support the proposal. Mr. Gonzalez said he did not think that would be an issue. He said they have not yet prepared a definitive plant material plan but they would not use the same treatment every time; in one area they might use shrubs and in another they might use vines.

Mr. Woods stated the Code does not permit blank walls but they are proposing some blank areas because they are intending to have so much texture and consider that visual relief.

Mr. Papsidero said for the façade of the residential units along Larimer Street of D4/D5, more treatment should be added to the ground level to activate the pedestrian realm. He also noted the garage entry and the stair should have similar architectural design.

Mr. Papsidero asked about the entrances for the potential grocery tenant and if that is something that will materialize with this proposal. Ms. Umbarger indicated that until a tenant comes on, they are leaving the area flexible and cannot prescribe designs at this point. Mr. Papsidero suggested that maybe something could happen through creative signage or a public art piece to highlight the entrance.

Ms. Burchett said Waivers have been identified and most have been seen before in this development such as Maximum Block Length, Building Compatibility with Block H, wall heights, and number of entrances. Ms. Burchett said staff needs to see the material details and calculations to determine if primary materials are being met with this design.

Ms. Burchett asked about the commercial space and how that use is being calculated for the Parking Plan. Mr. Gonzalez said the office use and commercial use are differentiated as they would like to label areas commercial to leave it flexible for future tenants. He said he understands there are more stringent requirements on parking for restaurant use and they have used that requirement for the Parking Plan. He concluded true calculations will be difficult as they are designing for flexibility. Ms. Burchett suggested that the applicant state what requirements they are using when calculating parking for future reference once a tenant is determined.

Ms. Burchett asked if patios are proposed at this time. Ms. Umbarger answered patios were not proposed but may come with individual tenants. Mr. Gonzalez added space is available. Ms. Umbarger stated the arcade area was expanded to permit outdoor seating for the retail uses.

Ms. Burchett said the next step would be for the applicant to return to the ART in two weeks for a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their meeting on May 3, 2018.

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

**3. BSD-SCN – Tuller Heights
18-021BPR**

**PID: 273-008811
Basic Plan Review**

Sierra Saumenig said this proposal is for a four-story, approximately 140,000-square-foot retirement facility consisting of approximately 130 residential units - 20 of which may be allocated for personal care, two dining areas, two studio spaces, and a fitness center. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. 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. Saumenig said the official name for this facility is "Residences at Tuller Heights" and presented an aerial view of the site to support the 140,000-square-foot facility. Ms. Saumenig said she would turn over the presentation to the applicants and asked that they introduce themselves.

Julie Polletta, architect for Radelet McCarthy Polletta Architecture and Interior Design introduced herself; Denise Pompena, representative for Graziano, the developer and contractor introduced herself; and Chris Jaeger, with Graziano Construction introduced himself.

Ms. Polletta said the site for the new Retirement Living Facility is on the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said the residents' common areas will all be located at street level and highly visible facing the public street so the life of the residents can be seen. She said outdoor patio seating will be included for the Café and Bistro-style dining areas that wrap around the tower as to not show a cafeteria-style look traditionally found in retirement facilities. Other interior spaces clustered on the ground level, she said, include a pub-style recreation area, planting studio, art studio, library/lounge, salon, and fitness center. She said the apartment units are for residents living independently and for residents with personal care needs. She emphasized that this prominent location and scale of the proposed facility will provide both visual interest and opportunities for social interaction at the street level.

Ms. Polletta indicated they are still in the early stages of architectural design so they have not applied details to the building. She presented images to illustrate the types of design elements that will be incorporated. She stated they would use traditional materials such as brick as the primary material. She emphasized how they want to use porch elements to allow for more interaction between the residents and life on the street. She added a roof garden may also be incorporated.

Ms. Polletta said at the prominent intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway the facility will be set back 18 feet from the street. She said with a sidewalk and a patio there will be a fairly large paved area perceived as public space but in reality it would be their private space. She suggested this area would be good for public art installment and they would work with the Dublin Arts Council to determine what is most appropriate for this space.

Ms. Polletta stated many units will have porches and each will have a standing-seam roof. On the west end of the site, she explained the slab level will be several feet above the sidewalk so the porch will be raised from street level. At the northwest corner, she said, they propose a two-tier, outdoor plaza with one level at grade and the other at floor level. She said both levels would be accessible to the public. At the northeast corner, she said, they are proposing a similar two-tier plaza that will be screened from the service area by hardscape.

Vince Papsidero reported a lot of the issues have been dealt with at this point through bi-weekly meetings for the last year or so and the application is scheduled to be reviewed by City Council.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Waiver was approved as well as the Development Plan and Site Plan with a Parking Plan with three conditions as stated above and the vote was unanimously approved for the complete proposal.

INTRODUCTIONS

3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D 18-007SPR

**PID: 273-012703
Site Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this is a proposal for a mixed-use development located within Block D of Bridge Park. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She called on the applicants to present their proposal.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, said the block consists of four buildings with open space between buildings D1 and D2. Block D at Bridge Park, he said, is bound by Riverside Drive to the west, John Shields Parkway to the north, Mooney Street to the east, and Tuller Ridge Drive to the south. A graphic was presented to show the positioning of each building; D1 fronts the corner of Riverside Drive and Tuller Ridge Drive; D2 fronts the corner of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway; D3 fronts the corner of John Shields Parkway and Mooney Street; and D4/D5 fronts the corner of Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge Drive. Longshore Street bisects the four buildings with D1 and D2 on the west side of Longshore Street and D3 and D4/D5 on the east side. In addition, Larimer Street runs between buildings D3 and building D4/D5 which ends at Longshore Street and extends east to Dale Drive.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said there have been changes since the Basic Plan. He said originally a giant grocer was planned for D2 but now they are proposing a smaller concept and moved the grocer to building D5 to provide access and circulation in the parking garage utilizing a speed ramp and patrons will not have to cross any streets to get to the store after parking. Additionally, there is a loading dock for D4/5 off Tuller Ridge Drive.

Mr. Yoder said D Block includes the following:

- D1 – mixed-use, six story “podium” building - the ground floor is comprised of retail and restaurant over 23,000 square feet, the second floor is office use at over 22,000 square feet, and the upper four floors are comprised of 43, for-sale, condominium units.
- *D2 - office building with retail below (not submitted at this time)*
- *D3 - retail with residential above (not submitted at this time)*
- D4/D5 – 35,000 square feet of retail – store front all around with access to parking on ground floor (D4) residential liner with (D5) garage. There is an open out area for a north market or grocer.

Mr. Yoder said each building has a unique character, which is expressed through a variety of material finishes and details. An open green space is proposed between the buildings D1 and D2 to be a plaza marked by

large lushly planted raised planters that define spaces within the courtyard. Shade trees dotted through the space provide filtered light and an overarching canopy. Café style seating will provide a place for retail patrons to relax and enjoy a coffee.

Mr. Yoder said there is over 12,000 square feet of open space along John Shields Parkway and they will need to integrate a stair.

John Woods, MKSK, said they created something different for this block but not different than what was shown previously. He said they proposed green space with seating nooks, fixed bench seating, chairs to make areas more playful, and crushed aggregate. He said the transformers have been consolidated to one side. He said there will be areas for residents to gather around fire pits or for dining as there will be outdoor kitchens and areas will be screened with cedar trellises and plant material will be utilized for blank walls.

Both Mr. Woods and Mr. Yoder talked about and presented the various facades and materials proposed and noted the great views of the river and park that will be available from the extensive use of balconies. Building D2 will be the bookend for the development on the north side like Block A is the bookend on the south side at the roundabout for Riverside Drive and Bridge Street.

Mr. Yoder said they are very flexible but multiple Waivers still need to be requested. The following issues have been identified for all buildings and they could include:

- Ground Story Street Façade Transparency
- Upper Story Façade Transparency
- Number of Street Façade Entrances
- Blank Wall Limitations
- Vertical Increments
- Horizontal Façade Divisions
- Permitted Primary Materials
- Changes in Roof Plane
- Maximum Building Height

James Peltier, EMH&T focused on bollards, parking moved on John Shields Parkway, and brick added to islands.

Aaron Stanford inquired about Tuller Ridge and circulation needed north and south. He noted there are no crossings at Longshore and asked if that is because of grade changes. Mr. Peltier answered yes and no.

Mr. Stanford asked why there is just crossing available on just one side of the intersections. Mr. Yoder said they could do both sides. Mr. Stanford asked if there are any right-of-way encroachments and Teri Umbarger, EMH&T, answered there were not. She explained Larimer Street is steep so no on-street parking is permitted, just loading zones.

Mr. Stanford asked if sidewalks will be blocked when loading/unloading is occurring. Mr. Peltier answered trucks can pull all the way in so sidewalks would not be blocked.

Mr. Stanford inquired about lighting for the loading dock area. He said an island could be an option but it could get hit.

Tim Hosterman asked why the intent is to force traffic on Tuller Ridge. Mr. Stanford answered that decision came from the traffic department.

Sergeant Hosterman inquired about the entrance to the garage for north traffic. He asked how many parking spaces there were. Mr. Peltier answered 671 spaces and some are reserved spaces for condominiums and those will be gated.

Sergeant Hosterman asked where parking would be available for the apartment tenants. Mr. Yoder answered the upper floor.

Vince Papsidero concluded there will be plenty of work sessions to deal with all of this. He asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

**4. SRN – Bridge Park, Amendment to MSP for VASO Rooftop Bar 6540 Riverside Drive
18-020MSP Master Sign Plan**

Claudia Husak said this is a proposal for an amendment to the Master Sign Plan for the Bridge Park Development for the VASO Rooftop Bar located in Block A of the Bridge Park Development, zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of Riverside and Banker Drives. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for an amendment to the Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066, and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines.

Ms. Husak explained there is an elevator on the north side of the building that provides direct access to the rooftop bar. She said there is a sign proposed for the rooftop bar at the AC Hotel that is a panel type screen that extends up from a patio platform with the sign integrated into the center. She said the four powder coated, precision-cut aluminum metal panels will be a copper color and the sign box in the center is aluminum at 3 inches deep to be powder coated to match the existing storefront mullions. Ms. Husak said the box will have pin-mounted, dimensional, face-lit letters with the text "VASO" made of perforated day-night vinyl to match the copper color that will glow white at night and the text "Rooftop Bar" beneath "VASO" will be flush-mounted metal, dimensional letters to be painted the same copper color.

Ms. Husak said based on the proposed design and high quality materials, the applicant was encouraged to move forward with the addendum to the Master Sign Plan. She stated there were no window signs proposed currently, which would be required to adhere to the approved Master Sign Plan. She said what currently exists today will be removed and replaced with 1.5-square-foot door signs on the entrance to the elevator.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:40 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on April 19, 2018.



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 7, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

**PID: 273-012703
Preliminary Plat**

Proposal: The subdivision of ± 5.3 acres into five lots and public right-of-way to facilitate the future development of Block D of Bridge Park with three buildings containing 174 residential dwelling units, approximately 125,000-square-feet of commercial uses, and a parking structure.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Applicant: Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying.

Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: <http://dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/17-022>

MOTION: Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve this Preliminary Plat because it is consistent with all of the applicable review criteria and the Subdivision Regulations, with one condition:

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

*Nelson Yoder agreed to the above condition.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: This Preliminary Plat will be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak, AICP
Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager



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

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

~~Mr. Yoder concluded he received great feedback.~~

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

**PID: 273-012703
Preliminary Plat**

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

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

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

Motion and Vote

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

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

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

COMMUNICATIONS

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

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

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



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, August 31, 2017

The Administrative Review Team made the following determinations at this meeting:

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

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

Proposal: A mixed-use development on approximately 5.3 acres, including three buildings containing 119 residential units, approximately 78,000 square feet of office space and 48,000 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and a parking structure lined with 55 residential units.

Location: East of Riverside Drive, south of John Shields Parkway, west of Mooney Street and north of Tuller Ridge Drive.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners

Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

REQUEST 1: ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTURES

Request for a recommendation of approval.

1. §153.062(O)(5)(a)(2) - Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage – Required: 80% maximum; Requested: 88% for building D3.
2. §153.062(O)(5)(b) - Height, Ground Story Height - Required: 14-feet maximum; Requested: 15.5 feet.
3. §153.062 (O)(5)(b) - Height, Upper Story Height - Required: 12 feet minimum; Requested: 10.7 feet.

Determination: The three Administrative Departures were approved.

REQUEST 2: WAIVERS

Request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for nine Waivers:

1. §153.060(C)(2)(a) - Maximum Block Size (requested: 583 feet) (required: 500 feet maximum)
2. §153.062(C)(1) - General Building Type Layout and Relationships (requested: incompatible building types, corridor to single-family attached) (required: no incompatible buildings)
3. §153.062(O)(6)(a) - Building Siting, Street Frontage, Front Property Line Coverage (requested: 83% property line coverage) (required: 95% minimum coverage)
4. §153.062(O)(6)(a) - Right-of-way (requested: pedestrian bridge between D1 and D4/D5) (required: awnings, canopies, eaves, patios, and projecting signs only)



5. §153.062(O)(6)(a)(3)(b) - Building Height (requested: six stories) (required: five stories, maximum)
6. §153.062(O)(6)(c) - Uses and Occupancy Requirements (requested: parking in ground story of D3) (required: parking within buildings permitted in rear of the first three floors or fully in any basement)
7. §153.062(O)(6)(f) - Uses and Occupancy Requirements (requested: Parking on ground floor facing John Shields Parkway, Longshore Street, and Larimer Street for Building D3.) (required: Occupied space requirement a minimum of 30 feet depth facing streets)
8. §153.062 (O)(5)(b)(5) - Buildable Area (requested: 90% for Building D4 and D5) (required: 80% maximum)
9. §153.065(B)(5)(a)(1) - Entrance/Exit Lanes (requested: three exit lanes) (required: One exit lane shall be provided for each 200 spaces)

Determination: The nine Waivers were recommended for approval to City Council.

REQUEST 3: DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND BASIC PLAN REVIEWS

Request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for Development Plan and Basic Plan Reviews with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant record an easement for the encroachment of the bridges to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 2) That the applicant revise the building plan to recess all entrances within 5-feet of the property line to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(6)(3);
- 3) That the applicant file a conditional use application for the podium parking for buildings D3 and D5; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the building plan to ensure all door swing areas will not encroach into the public right-of-way to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(5)(b)(4).

Determination: The Development Plan and Basic Plan Reviews were recommended for approval to City Council with four conditions.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Vince Papsidero, FAICP
Planning Director



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, August 31, 2017 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Ray Harpham, Interim Chief Building Official; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Alan Perkins, Fire Plans Examiner; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Tammy Noble, Senior Planner; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: James Peltier, EMH&T (Cases 1, 2, & 5); Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan (Case 1); Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T (Cases 2 & 5); Tracy Perry, NBBJ; (Case 2) and Linda Menerey and Steve Nixon, EMH&T; Denise Valenta, Embree Asset Group, Inc. *[participated by phone]* (Case 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the August 24 meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

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

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

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for a mixed-use development on approximately 5.3 acres, including three buildings containing: 119 residential units, approximately 114,117 square feet of office space; 38,361 square feet of retail; 12,850 square feet of restaurant uses; 0.96 acres of open space; and a parking structure containing 749 parking spaces to be lined with 55 residential units. She said the site is on the 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 §153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted block D is on the northern edge of the Bridge Park Development with frontage on John Shields Parkway to the north but the prominent façade is on Riverside Drive.

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

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and highlighted building D1, which is a 6-story, mixed-use building with an overall height of 80 feet. The first two floors will consist of retail/restaurant and office space, she said, with condominium units on the upper stories; a pedestrian bridge will connect to building D5 to provide access to parking.

D1 Administrative Departure:

Maximum upper story height 14 feet (permitted); 15.5 feet (requested)

D1 Waivers:

1. Awnings, canopies, eaves, etc. permitted to encroach; pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street to building D4/5 (requested).
2. Maximum building height (five stories); six stories (requested).

While specific materials have not been selected, Ms. Burchett presented inspirational images provided by the applicant and described the examples as having a contemporary aesthetic with brick and glass and storefront style windows on all floors, similar to building B3 in the Bridge Park Development.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and highlighted building D2, which is at the corner of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway that is at the northern boundary of the Bridge Park Development. This building, she said, consists of six stories with an overall height of 90 feet. She said retail is on the first floor with five floors of office above. The 6th floor, she explained, steps back to create an outdoor terrace on the west and south elevations. No residential uses are proposed, she noted.

Ms. Burchett presented contemporary images for this building, which have a predominantly glass and metal panel building facade, similar in character to building A3 (AC Hotel). She said the architectural intent for this building will reflect but not mimic the AC Hotel as it serves as a bookend for the overall development on Riverside Drive.

D2 Waiver:

1. Requirement: Minimum 95% front property line coverage; Request: 83% front property line coverage

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

D3 Administrative Departures:

1. Maximum of 80% impervious lot coverage (permitted); 88% impervious lot coverage (requested).
2. Minimum ground story height of 12 feet (required); 10.7 feet (requested).

D3 Waivers:

1. Requirement: incompatible building types are not permitted directly across the street from one another or on the same block face; Request: corridor building D3 across from single-family attached buildings (block H).
2. Requirement: parking within building permitted in rear of first three floors and fully in any basement; Request: parking on ground story.
3. Requirement: Minimum of 30 feet depth facing streets for occupied space; Request: parking on ground floor facing John Shields Parkway, Longshore Street, and Larimer Street.

Architectural complementary details will be forthcoming, Ms. Burchett reported, and then she presented inspirational images that reflected predominantly brick and metal panel/cementitious panel building facades, similar in character to buildings B1, B2, and C1 in this development.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and pointed out building D4, which is the Corridor Building Type portion of building D4/D5. She stated it is a five-story building with an overall height that varies from ± 60 feet at the west elevation to ± 45 feet at the east elevation. She said the first floor facing Larimer Street is comprised of retail, lobby space, bike parking and support space, and is partially below grade at the eastern end of this wing of the building. Residential units are proposed on all other floors, she said, including the first floor of the wing facing Mooney Street.

Building D5, Ms. Burchett explained, is the Parking Structure Building Type portion of building D4/D5. She stated it is a five-story building with an overall height of ± 47 feet. Retail use is proposed on the first floor facing Longshore Street, she said, as well as a portion of Tuller Ridge Drive.

D4 Administrative Departure:

Requirement: Minimum ground story height of 12 feet; Request: 10.7 feet.

D4/5 Waivers:

1. Requirement: Incompatible building types are not permitted directly across the street from one another or on the same block face; Request: Corridor building (D4) across from single-family attached buildings (block H).
2. Requirement: awnings, canopies, eaves, etc. permitted to encroach; Request: pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street to building D1.
3. Requirement: Maximum impervious lot coverage is 80%; Request: 90% impervious lot coverage.

Ms. Burchett presented inspirational images that reflected predominantly brick or stone and glass building facades, similar in character to other buildings in the development.

Ms. Burchett concluded the Development Plan and Basic Plan Review criteria were met and the Waiver Review Criteria was met as well.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for three Administrative Departures:

1. §153.062(O)(5)(a)(2) - Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage – Required: 80% maximum; Requested: 88% for building D3.
2. §153.062(O)(5)(b) - Height, Ground Story Height - Required: 14-feet maximum; Requested: 15.5 feet.
3. §153.062 (O)(5)(b) - Height, Upper Story Height - Required: 12 feet minimum; Requested: 10.7 feet.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to City Council for nine Waivers:

1. §153.060(C)(2)(a) - Maximum Block Size (requested: 583 feet) (required: 500 feet maximum)
2. §153.062(C)(1) - General Building Type Layout and Relationships (requested: incompatible building types, corridor to single-family attached) (required: no incompatible buildings)
3. §153.062(O)(6)(a) - Building Siting, Street Frontage, Front Property Line Coverage (requested: 83% property line coverage) (required: 95% minimum coverage)
4. §153.062(O)(6)(a) - Right-of-way (requested: pedestrian bridge between D1 and D4/D5) (required: awnings, canopies, eaves, patios, and projecting signs only)
5. §153.062(O)(6)(a)(3)(b) - Building Height (requested: six stories) (required: five stories, maximum)

6. §153.062(O)(6)(c) - Uses and Occupancy Requirements (requested: parking in ground story of D3) (required: parking within buildings permitted in rear of the first three floors or fully in any basement)
7. §153.062(O)(6)(f) - Uses and Occupancy Requirements (requested: Parking on ground floor facing John Shields Parkway, Longshore Street, and Larimer Street for Building D3.) (required: Occupied space requirement a minimum of 30 feet depth facing streets)
8. §153.062 (O)(5)(b)(5) - Buildable Area (requested: 90% for Building D4 and D5) (required: 80% maximum)
9. §153.065(B)(5)(a)(1) - Entrance/Exit Lanes (requested: three exit lanes) (required: One exit lane shall be provided for each 200 spaces)

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to City Council for a Development Plan and Basic Plan Reviews with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant record an easement for the encroachment of the bridges to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 2) That the applicant revise the building plan to recess all entrances within 5-feet of the property line to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(6)(3);
- 3) That the applicant file a conditional use application for the podium parking for buildings D3 and D5; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the building plan to ensure all door swing areas will not encroach into the public right-of-way to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(5)(b)(4).

Ms. Burchett presented the overall open space for block D and stated the following:

- Based on the proposed square footage, 0.88 acres of publicly accessible open space is required with this application.
- A .20-acre segment of the John Shields Greenway is proposed on the north side of building D3.
- A .07-acre segment of the John Shields Greenway is proposed on the north side of building D2. This area coincides with a Gateway location as described and illustrated in the Scioto River Neighborhood Standards. The design of this open space will be developed in the future as the City explores design and functionality of the greenway space in its entirety.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the three Administrative Departures were approved by the ART. He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the nine Waivers were recommended for approval by the ART and forwarded on to City Council. He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Development Plan and Basic Plan Reviews were recommended for approval to City Council with four conditions and would also be forwarded on to City Council for their meeting on September 11, 2017.

2. ~~BSD P - Columbus Metropolitan Library, Dublin Branch~~ 75 N. High Street
~~17-088DP/SPR~~ Development and Site Plan Reviews

Jennifer Rauch said this is a proposal for the construction of a new 46,000-square-foot library and associated site improvements located on the northwest corner of the intersection of North High Street and North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Development Plan and Site Plan Review under the provisions of the Zoning Code Section 153.066.



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 24, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

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

Proposal: 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.

Location: East of Riverside Drive, south of John Shields Parkway, west of Mooney Street, and north of Tuller Ridge Drive.

Request: Informal review and feedback of a Basic Plan Review prior to review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.

Planning Contacts: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager; and Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us; or (614) 410-4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission informally reviewed this proposal for a mixed-use development in Block D of the Bridge Park Development. They commented on architecture, site layout, open space, and amenity areas. The Commission was supportive of the overall design and layout. The Commission recommended creating a visual impact with the prominent entrance on Building D2 and further enhancing the open space areas with how the spaces connect throughout the entire development.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Absent
Chris Brown	Absent
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 24, 2017

AGENDA

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

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

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bob Miller asked what happened to the proposed grocery store discussed at previous meetings. He asked what concerns staff may have had with building D4/5. Ms. Burchett indicated a much of the discussions with staff and the ART have been regarding the layout, how to best work the prominent corner across from residential units and how the building would interact with the street level activity. The questions raised, she said, had been about the location and screening of mechanicals as well as a way to avoid a blank wall space and those details have not necessarily been worked out.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Yoder said it is also going to be important the people want to be in those open spaces is why they programmed this one a little bit differently. He said they are proposing a Bocce Court that could also be

used as a Corn Hole Tournament. He said they are investigating 'Best of Class' examples around the country. He said they are considering having a chalkboard at the side where someone could sign in and reserve a time would be useful, why they are waiting for their table. He said it would give people more of a reason to be in that space. He noted the Pavilion space over by Cap City Diner and the (future) Fado restaurant/bar currently provides live music at different times. He said the other space that has the charismatic boulders in it, should be open within 60 days at the outside. He said we will begin to start watching people. He said it is kind of like the Oval at The Ohio State University where you can see where people are walking from place to place.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Newell addressed the discussion questions. She said overall, the arrangement of the block is fine. She said she understands staff's concern about the one drive and why it was eliminated. In terms of architecture, she said it is a little hard to make a comment on it because she has some great photographs in front of her that are inspirational images but not the final design of the building. She indicated she has confidence that great designs will come for the buildings. She said when she looks at all the images, they take brick all the way up to the top of the buildings and almost all of the buildings presented for this

project have a steel back up to the skin. She said she does not know how the applicant plans to do the other development but encouraged them to do cold-form framing on the exterior wall and if the interior is framed with wood, it will give better variety in architecture and maybe the applicant will not struggle with the details they have been. She said she wanted to see D2 as a bookend to the other at the south end and she is confident a great design will come forward. She emphasized the building should be uniquely different but complement the other building. She concluded she loves to take her large dogs to the dog park and but the current dog parks are mud pits. She recommended the applicant consider using synthetic turf instead of putting in grass which turns to mud that the dogs will track through. She explained synthetic turf has anti-microbial properties to them. She said they use this material in Arizona in their dog parks because they can clean it and replace it and move it periodically. She said it is good for the dogs and it would be good for the development; it will also look nicer in the long term in a very public setting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Stang presented the tree preservation and landscaping plan and explained that due to the existing conditions of the site, the applicant is removing a total of 34 trees, which amounts to 549 caliper inches. The proposed landscaping plan, as shown, he noted, replaces 26 trees or 65 caliper inches, leaving the remaining amount of 484 inches to be paid for with a Fee-in-Lieu. He indicated that Staff is conditioning

~~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 - 1st floor
- Office - 2nd floor
- 43 Residential condominiums - floors 3-6
- Elevated pedestrian bridge connection to the parking garage - 3rd floor

Building D2

- Corridor Building
- 6 stories
- 97,000 square feet
- Retail - 1st 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) - 1st 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 - 2nd floor
- Bridge to D4/5 – 3rd floor

D4/5

- Corridor Building
- 5 stories
- Parking Garage/Residential Liners
- 637 Parking spaces
- 55 Apartments on floors 2-5
- Retail/Restaurant - 1st floor
- Pool/Amenity Space – 5th 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 24th, ART recommendation to City Council on August 31st, and City Council review on September 11th. 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 there 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.

Approved by the Administrative Review Team on August 17, 2017.

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 20th 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 6th and make a recommendation. She added an informal review of the Basic Plan will be conducted by the PZC on April 20th 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 compactor 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 30th and the applicant to return April 6th for further review and final comments.

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