



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 2, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the February 2, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Jamey Chinnock, Lance Schneier, Kathy Harter, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman, Kim Way

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell, Taylor Mullinax, Michael Hendershot, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Heidi Rose

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Supelak seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 01-19-23 meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call swore in meeting attendees intending to provide testimony on the cases on the agenda.

NEW CASES

1. **Dublin Scioto High School Athletic Outbuildings at 4000 Hard Road, 22-164AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan**

A request for approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for the construction of three athletic outbuildings behind the existing school that include a batting facility and concession stands for softball and baseball. The 54.30-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development, Northeast Quad and located ±520 feet northwest of the intersection of Hard Road with Emerald Parkway.

Case Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for the Dublin Scioto High School, 4000 Hard Road site. The 65.25-acre site is located approximately 520 feet northwest of the intersection of Hard Road and Emerald Parkway. The site is zoned Planned Unit Development District (PUD), Northeast Quad, and is located within Subarea 10. The development text permits uses and structures such as athletic fields and associated athletic outbuildings. The Commission approved a Final Development Plan (FDP) for the 228,000 SF Dublin Scioto High School with recreational playing fields in March 1993. Subsequent revisions have been made to the FDP to permit various outbuilding additions and site improvements. Tonight, the Commission is reviewing an amended Final Development Plan to permit the addition of three athletic outbuildings. The applicant is proposing to construct three athletic outbuildings behind the existing high school including: replacement of an existing building at the baseball field with a new 843 SF baseball concession and scorers' building, two new buildings including a 538 SF softball field concessions and scorers' building, and a 8,652 SF multi-use batting facility. Additionally, minor site improvements are proposed immediately around the buildings including new or replaced pavement areas, landscaping, and bleacher relocation. The proposed plan meets all setback and lot coverage requirements. The facility includes approximately 5,996 SF of batting cages for indoor hitting practice with the remainder of the space dedicated to storage for the softball and baseball fields and restroom facilities. The proposed height and materials meet the development text requirements, which require the buildings to coordinate with the school and other surrounding structures by the use of color, materials, and/or details. Proposed materials include Belden brick walls with a stone base and starter course. The applicant has experienced maintenance issues with the existing split-faced CMU stone on other outbuildings and is proposing a cast stone with a starter course of natural stone in lieu of the existing material due to product discoloration and wicking. Staff supports this material change. Additional materials include American Building's Locseam standing seam metal roof, fascia, gutters, and downspouts in a Fox Gray color, and Morin extruded aluminum panels and trim in a Fox Gray color. The building has Steelcraft hollow metal main doors on the north and east elevations, and Overhead Door insulated garage doors painted Fox Gray on the north, east, and west elevations, which will provide ventilation during use. The east elevation incorporates a large "S" for the Scioto High School using a dark brick variation identified as "brick color B." Spandrel glass is proposed for two window panels in the softball building to screen utilities. Staff is supportive of all proposed materials. The plan meets the Dublin Landscape Code, and the development text. Two existing trees will be replaced with six new trees, plus three additional trees and building foundation plantings. The proposed batting facility will drain into a proposed underground storage system located just south of the new facility and to the north of the high school. Staff has reviewed the plan against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with three conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Steven Turckes, Perkins & Will Architects, 410 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60611, stated that they were careful to be consistent with the existing building and material precedents. They took care to consider the existing outbuildings, particularly the two that sit south of the stadium,

as precedents for the new buildings. The new buildings will have a cast stone base with brick that matches the existing buildings, metal trim for the roof soffits and fascia and a standing seam metal roof. He described samples of the primary materials, including the glass windows, for the Commission's review. He is happy to answer any questions.

Commission Questions

Ms. Harter inquired about the placement of the tinted glass.

Ms. Mullinax responded that the glass referred to is a spandrel glass, which will be used only in two window panel areas to screen the utility area located beneath the scorer. The remainder of the glass glazing is clear.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the spandrel glass is necessary.

Mr. Turckes responded that if the Commission prefers clear vision glass, they could provide a shadow box behind it to provide some privacy for those sitting at the scorer tables. Adjacent to the scorer's area on one side is the concessions area; on the other side is a small locker room.

Mr. Mullinax stated that spandrel glass is a permitted material.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if there would be any changes in the parking requirements.

Mr. Turckes responded that there would not be, as there is no change in use.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the batting cage and restrooms would be open and operational only at certain times.

Jeff Stark, Chief Operating Officer, Dublin City Schools, 6371 Shier Rings Road, Dublin, OH responded that those spaces would be open during school hours or for school activities. They would not be available to rent.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the large "S" on the side the building is considered signage.

Ms. Mullinax responded that it is not. It is internal to the site and not directly visible from the right-of-way for the purpose of providing wayfinding. It is an aesthetics feature to the building, using the darker shade of brick to provide the "S" design.

Ms. Harter stated that each of the Dublin schools has an associated color. Was there consideration for incorporating the Scioto High School color in the "S"? What color is the "S"?

Mr. Stark responded the brick on the facility is a blended brick. The darkest brick in that blend will be used for the "S".

Ms. Harter inquired about the safety component of the doors.

Mr. Stark responded that the exterior doors are hollow-metal, insulated steel.

Ms. Harter inquired if the small parking area typically used by EMS during games would remain.

Mr. Stark responded that they do not anticipate eliminating any parking.

Ms. Harter inquired if any screening of the ball fields would be provided for adjacent home sites.

Mr. Stark responded they there has been no conversation regarding such screening.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the foundation plantings. On the large, southern elevation, there are low plantings. More verticality might be needed in that large space.

Mr. Stark responded that their landscape plan has been updated, which now provides more variation in height, depth and types of plant materials.

Mr. Schneier inquired about the split-face brick. He understands it does not weather well, but it provides more character. If it were treated in some manner, would it be possible to use it to achieve a more uniform appearance?

Mr. Stark responded that the split-face brick has not posed a maintenance issue, but it captures dirt, so its appearance has not weathered well. The natural cast stone is much smoother. The intent was to utilize a material that would honor the existing material but would maintain its visual appearance for years.

Public Comments

Jim and Anne Wilson, 4049 Blackthorn Lane, Dublin, OH:

"My wife and I live behind Scioto High School in the Hawthorns Commons community. Our backyard faces the athletic fields with some trees as a buffer. We moved here last year and love it. We received the City's public notice today regarding the athletic buildings construction. We have reviewed the drawings and information and feel very positive about these additions."

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier and Mr. Fishman expressed support of the application.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is supportive of the application, advocating for landscaping that would break up the view of the big walls.

Mr. Way stated that he believes the proposed foundation landscaping is appropriate, due to the fact that there is heavy traffic here.

Ms. Harter, Mr. Chinnock and Ms. Call expressed support for the application.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following three conditions:

- 1) That any required changes to building materials that are substantially similar be administratively approved by staff prior to building permitting;
- 2) That the landscape plan is revised to show existing trees to be removed prior to building permitting; and
- 3) That the applicant continues to work with Engineering at building permitting to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the City of Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

2. Indus Bridge Street at PIDs: 273-012427, 273-012430, 273-012429, 273-008244, 273-009080, 273-009101, 22-172CP, Concept Plan

A request for Concept Plan approval of the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of five buildings: a hotel, parking garage, office, and two residential buildings. The 6.29-acre site is

zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood and located north of John Shields Parkway, west of Mooney Street, south of Tuller Road, and east of Riverside Drive.

Case Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated this a Concept Plan for the Indus Bridge Street project. The 6.29-acre vacant site is located northeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway, bound to the north by Tuller Road, to the west by Riverside Drive, to the south by John Shields Parkway, and to the east by Mooney Street. The site is zoned BSD-SRN, Scioto River Neighborhood. The Grand is located to the east. There are significant grade changes from Riverside Drive east to The Grand. This is where future Mooney Street will be located. The Concept Plan is the first step in a 3-step formal process. If the Concept Plan is approved by the Commission tonight, it will be followed by the Preliminary and Final Development Plans, where details will be provided. No waivers are requested tonight. Any items not consistent with Code would be presented for approval at a future date. In October 2022, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) reviewed and provided nonbinding feedback for an Informal Review of the Indus Bridge Street project. In response to the Commission's Informal Review input, the applicant has provided the following changes with the proposed Concept Plan:

- Moved the office building to the northwest corner of the site.
- Moved the residential buildings to the west and southwest corner of the site.
- Reduced the height of the residential buildings from 11 and 10 stories to 9 and 8 stories, respectively.
- Modified the programming of the open space centrally located on the site.
- Modified the massing between the residential buildings.
- Added a multi-story connector between the residential buildings.
- Reduced parking counts on site by 26 spaces

The applicant is proposing a new extension of Longshore Street between John Shields Parkway and Tuller Road. While the extension was not contemplated in the Bridge Street District Street Network Map, this added connection is supported by staff, as it is a continuation of a pedestrian-oriented corridor and fits the character of the Bridge Street District. This extension of Longshore Street would terminate at Tuller Road to the north of the site. Longshore Street is considered a neighborhood street where constructed south of the site. Access management entering and exiting Longshore Street will need to be studied to determine what type of access is appropriate, and where the intersection of Tuller Road and Longshore Street would be best suited. The applicant is proposing the construction of a new block of development with five (5) new buildings on a ±6.29-acre site, including two residential buildings, an office building, a hotel, and a parking garage. In addition to the extension of Longshore Street, the proposed development would require the construction of Mooney Street along the east property line. The applicant is proposing four (4) access points (2 for the garage and 2 for the hotel) on the west side of Mooney Street. These access points are in addition to the two (2) access points anticipated for The Grand, located east of Mooney Street. The proposed access points do not align with the anticipated Grand access points, which results in a total of six (6) different access points on a single block. Staff has concerns regarding the sequencing of access points on this section of Mooney Street. Staff recommends that the applicant consolidate the number of hotel and garage access points and align with the existing access points on the east side of Mooney Street.

The parking garage is proposed to be accessed solely from Mooney Street. This is a condition that is seen in Block D of Bridge Park (garage accessed solely from Tuller Ridge Drive). However, given the access limitations and concerns raised by the Planning and Zoning Commission, the applicant should explore additional opportunities to provide access to the garage from Longshore Street. The applicant has identified four open space locations on the site, including a ±0.67-acre open space located centrally on the site. The central open space is provided to meet the open space node requirement for the Scioto River Neighborhood Standards. This open space is described as a hillside landscape that provides accessible terraces of varying elevations for visitors to have a unique view and experience. The applicant has modified the programming of the open space in consideration of the Commission's previous comments. The open space features an open green area with a plaza flanking the north and south sides of the green adjacent to Longshore Street. The eastern half of the site proposes a more condensed terracing approach, which is provided to meet ADA requirements and take up the grade as the open space approaches Mooney Street.

The proposed buildings include:

1. Office Building – NW Corner

A 6-story, ±91-foot tall office building at the intersection of Riverside Drive and Tuller Road. Aside from the parking garage, this is the shortest building in the development, and is the terminus building on the north end of Riverside Drive. This building includes first floor commercial, with the remainder of the stories occupied by office. This building was originally located at the southwest corner of the site, but has been moved following recommendations by the Commission.

2. Hotel Building – SE Corner

An 8-story, ±111-foot / 94-foot (Longshore Street/Mooney Street) hotel building at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Mooney Street. The hotel has first floor commercial along Longshore Street, with a lobby area along Mooney Street. The current configuration provides a drop-off area along Mooney Street, with parking located within the garage. Minimal changes have been made to this building following the previous Informal Review.

3. Residential Building – W Central

A 9-story, ±108-foot tall residential structure located centrally on the west side of Longshore Street. The building would be the tallest along Riverside Drive between I-270 and W. Dublin-Granville Road, slightly taller than the AC Hotel (103' 8"). The building is conceptually depicted as a podium-style building, with the first floor as commercial, and the remainder of the stories providing residential units. The roof of the first floor along Riverside Drive provides an amenity deck including a pool overlooking the Scioto River to the west. This building was originally located in the northwest corner of the site, but was relocated away from the gateway location to move the residential further from I-270 and allow the office building to capture the corner.

4. Residential Building – SW Corner

The applicant is proposing an 8-story, ±99-foot tall residential structure located at the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway. At a basic massing scale, the building has some qualities that are consistent with the taller residential building, including balconies, an amenity deck along Riverside Drive, and a narrower mass above the first floor commercial. The applicant is proposing a building connector corridor between both residential buildings to provide garage access to both residential buildings. The connector does not extend to the ground. It is elevated

3-4 stories above grade and is the width of the upper stories of each building. Below the connector is open space.

5. Parking Garage – NE Corner

The applicant is proposing a 5-story, ±74-foot / 54-foot parking garage along Longshore Street. The garage is designed to provide 801 parking spaces, and would be accessed solely from Mooney Street. There will be first and second-floor commercial; the second-floor commercial is only on Tuller Street.

At the Informal Review, the Commission expressed concern regarding the overall mass and scale of the development, pointing specifically to the height of the residential buildings. The updated plans include reductions in height to both the west residential (±18 ft.) and southwest residential (±20 ft.) buildings, which brings the scale of the development closer to the existing scale of Bridge Park to the south of the development. However, the two residential buildings and the hotel would be the tallest buildings in the district and in this sector along Riverside Drive. Staff recommends that the applicant explore opportunities to reduce the massing and height of these buildings to correlate with what is expected in the Bridge Street District (BSD) and what exists to the south in Bridge Park, and identify opportunities to activate the north elevation of the garage along Tuller Road, which is a Principal Frontage Street.

Mr. Hounshell shared a massing comparison of the proposed stories and total height with other approved buildings in Bridge Park. He noted that the AC Hotel was granted a height waiver, and some buildings also received waivers for story heights. Staff has reviewed the Concept Plan against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with the nine (9) conditions listed in the staff report.

Commission Questions for Staff

Mr. Way stated that parking garages in the other blocks in Bridge Park have at least two sides with liner buildings, although there is no consistency in which streets they are on. Is there any rationale for the evolution of liner buildings with the garage and concerning which streets are prioritized for liner buildings?

Mr. Hounshell responded that is dictated primarily by the category of the street on which the parking garage access exists. Residential liner buildings were provided to screen the garages.

Mr. Way responded that the two newer buildings have a liner building on Mooney Street, so the trend was to line that street with development. Additionally, all of the garages in Bridge Park, except the one by the hotel, are 275 feet long, a standard garage dimension. The garage proposed in this plan is much larger.

Ms. Call inquired if the existing approved buildings shown reflect like uses to the Indus buildings, and if any were parking garages.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the majority are corridor buildings, the tallest type of building with the highest density. None are parking structures. They are mixed-use or office buildings.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) would be conducted, regardless of whether the Longshore Street extension to Tuller Road occurs.

Mr. Hounshell responded that a comprehensive traffic study was completed when the District was created. If the proposed density exceeds what was anticipated or a street connection is proposed that was not contemplated, a traffic study would be required.

Ms. Harter inquired if, looking at the proposed width of the sidewalks, businesses could come back and inquire about outdoor dining opportunities on sidewalks.

Mr. Hounshell responded that to the south of this site, the City has entered into some agreements for right-of-way encroachments. Not all of the buildings to the south were built out to the property line. A similar process would be followed with this development.

Mr. Way stated that at the previous meeting, there was discussion that this is a larger, longer block than the rest of the Bridge Park blocks. Would there be any value in having a mid-block vehicular connection from Longshore Street to Riverside Drive? It would need to be a right-in/right-out, due to the median.

Mr. Hounshell responded that in staff's discussion with the applicant, a connection from Longshore Street to Mooney Street where the park is currently proposed was considered; however, that was not pursued due to the significant grade to Mooney Street. The layout currently proposed is more suited to the intents of the District. They are trying to minimize the number of contact points on Riverside Drive, so additional connections to Riverside Drive are discouraged.

Ms. Wawskiewicz responded that Riverside Drive is a Principal Frontage Street, so Engineering would not allow a driveway to intersect, but a public street could be developed. What the applicant has proposed is consistent with the Bridge Street District (BSD) Street Network but would add a north-south connection not currently shown in the Code.

Mr. Way responded that he wanted to make sure everyone understood that would not be moved forward.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the Longshore Street extension could be a pedestrian-oriented street, closed to vehicular traffic.

Mr. Hounshell responded that, currently, full access for vehicular traffic is shown. That would require additional study. There are specific requirements for public streets; private streets would be the developer's responsibility to maintain.

Ms. Harter inquired if there is a limit to the number of parking places permitted along Riverside Drive. Could a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) reduce the number permitted?

Mr. Hounshell stated that the maximum amount of parking permitted along Riverside Drive is dictated by the minimum required size of parking bays for parallel parking, and additionally, the required distance from an intersection.

Mr. Fishman inquired if there was a request to reduce the number of parking spaces.

Ms. Call responded negatively.

Mr. Fishman stated that his concern is that there are current issues with deliveries. Delivery trucks are double-parked on the street, often blocking automobiles. He would not be supportive of reducing the parking. He would prefer to see fewer parking spaces on the street and more delivery zones provided.

Mr. Hounshell responded that at the previous discussion in October 2022, there was no Commission consensus on reduction of parking. What the applicant is currently providing for the proposed development meets the minimum required parking, so no parking plan would be required. Because

the footprint of this building is larger than other buildings within the area, however, staff is recommending that the capacity of the existing parking garages be studied to determine if there are opportunities for a shared parking agreement. That might create an opportunity to reduce the footprint of the building and allow for more open space and better streetscape engagement. Whether that occurs or not would depend on the study and whether it is a condition that is approved.

Ms. Rauch stated that Transportation & Mobility and Planning staff are engaged in discussions concerning curbside management, including how loading/unloading can be managed more efficiently. In regard to this site, it will be addressed in subsequent stages.

Mr. Fishman responded that if loading/unloading parking spaces are not provided, delivery vehicles will double-park, if necessary. He inquired if Washington Township Fire Department has been involved in the discussions and has indicated their ability to handle emergency services for 9-story buildings.

Mr. Hounshell responded that they have been involved in the discussions. For the office and residential buildings, access must be available for their operations. They will continue to be involved in the discussions.

Mr. Fishman stated that since the inception of the Bridge Street District, the intent is to build a walkable community. The proposed buildings are huge and are not encouraging to pedestrian traffic. It would be essential to walk a great distance to get around one of the buildings. His concerns are the size of the buildings and counting the onstreet parking to meet the Code requirements for this development.

Ms. Call requested staff to provide their perspective on the walkability of the area, specifically in regard to the parking garage.

Ms. Hounshell responded that large-scale buildings limit the amount of pedestrian accessibility available throughout the site. Staff looks at the building footprint, accessible open spaces, and the flow and connection to the existing network throughout the District.

Ms. Call referred to the building tables included in the meeting materials, and inquired the building types of the proposed buildings and the permitted height for each building type.

Mr. Hounshell responded that corridor buildings have a maximum of six stories; a first-story minimum height of 12 feet and maximum height of 16 feet; upper floors maximum height of 14 feet; and a total building height maximum of 86 feet.

Ms. Call stated that the parking structure is permitted to be a total of five stories; ground-story minimum height of 8-12 feet and maximum height of 18 feet; upper story minimum height of 8.5 feet and maximum height of 12 feet. The Code reference is Section 153.065B(5).

Mr. Hounshell responded that the maximum parking structure height would be 66 feet.

Applicant Presentation

David Kosar, Indus Companies and Hotels, 1555 Lenox Town Lane, Columbus, OH 43212 stated that the site has some constraints; it is narrower and steeper than other Bridge Park sites that have been developed. In continuing the development in the area to the north, the need is to create an anchor building that provides something unexpected/different. The building with a pass-through provides a gateway feature, even though it is not located on the corner. The open area is the heart of their proposed development. He reviewed the other changes made since the Informal Review. The retail/commercial provided at the first-floor level and the connectivity of the neighborhood is very important. Due to the median, there is a vehicle disconnection, but they have ensured a

pedestrian connection at Longshore Street. The intent is to step back some of the buildings to allow for outdoor seating, in particular at the key entryway into their development. They considered providing access to the parking garage at Longshore Street, but it negatively impacts the layout, parking spaces and commercial space.

Miguel Gonzales, 300 Spruce Street, Columbus, OH 43215 reviewed the site plan revisions. They have attempted to increase the retail presence along the central open space, the heart of the development, to activate the space. They have added a residential connector between the two residential buildings. This provides opportunity for amenities on the roof of the connector. They addressed the gateway locations along John Shields, treating it with open-space architecture. They have added activation on the Tuller Road façade of the parking garage, essentially providing a two-story retail/commercial space at the Longshore Street/Tuller Road intersection. They understand the proposed height of the buildings would require height waivers.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the proposed connector.

Mr. Gonzales responded that adding the connector enables them to reduce the height on the north and south residential buildings and still meet their client's pro forma. Open space is provided at the ground level beneath the connector. The connector does not extend to the rooflines of the adjoining buildings, and an element of transparency is provided by the use of glazed glass. The connector will provide connectivity between the residential buildings and the parking garage.

Ms. Call noted the connector appears to be multiple stories and requested clarification of its contents.

Mr. Gonzales responded that the connector would be comprised of residential units.

Mr. Schneier stated that a resident in the south building would be unable to use the connector to get to the north building.

Mr. Gonzales responded that they would be able to use it for that purpose, as there will be a corridor running through the connector from the south building to the north building. There will be residential units on both sides of the corridor, facing east and west. The connector will begin at the third floor of the adjoining buildings and extend to the seventh floor. Residents would be able to cross through the connector on any of those floors to reach the elevator.

Mr. Way inquired about the trash compactor service behind the south building, but not the north building. Is the intent that both buildings would use the same trash collection point?

Mr. Gonzales responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way inquired if they had considered using liner buildings around the garage to offset the building heights.

Mr. Gonzales responded that they worked with staff on several alternatives. However, it was necessary to achieve a balance with the open space.

Mr. Chinnock requested that they provide their vision for this important site, and how it will differ from what exists.

John Woods, Landscape Architect, MKSK, 462 South Ludlow Street, Columbus, OH 43215 explained their vision for the larger open space, which is split east to west. The east half has pathways with

ADA access and has terraced seating areas. The lower west side on the Longshore Street elevation takes advantage of the commercial space in the hotel to the south and the parking garage to the north to activate that open space. Adjacent to those spaces is a paved area with plant beds, which will provide seating. The central open space can be programmed with activities such as live music and lawn sports. The revised open space between buildings is larger, so there are more opportunities for interesting plant materials. The other two open spaces will be different, providing variety. In some areas, they anticipate activating the space at the sidewalk area with café seating.

Mr. Way stated at the previous meeting, there was discussion that Longshore Street might be different from the rest of Bridge Park and not have curbs. Was that idea pursued?

Mr. Gonzales responded that they discussed it, but the idea would need further study.

Mr. Kosar noted that the intent is that the predominant location for pedestrian traffic, retail and restaurants would be along the Longshore Street frontage.

Mr. Supelak stated that the commercial space appears to be split up into separate shells. Will the uses be comparable to what exists down the street? Two spaces in the hotel appear to be designated as restaurants.

Mr. Kosar responded that currently, it should be designated only as commercial, as they do not yet know specifics regarding the commercial. The intent is to have a healthy mix of retail and service. This is an entertainment district.

Mr. Supelak stated that the footprints of a couple of the buildings appear to have an internal layout of units or hotel rooms driving the external appearance of the massing. Is that the likely evolution of those floorplans?

Mr. Gonzales stated that the hotel is more specific, due to the hotel brand. There is a unit mix, but much more design will need to occur with the units.

Mr. Fishman stated that the applicant refers to the intent to request a height waiver to permit the proposed height. By how much is the applicant exceeding the greenspace requirement in Bridge Park?

Mr. Hounshell responded that the applicant is required to provide 0.92 acres; they are providing 1.06 acres.

Ms. Call inquired if a building connector that is itself a building contemplated anywhere in the Bridge Street District area plan or Code.

Mr. Hounshell responded that he does not believe it has been contemplated previously, but he would look into that further.

Ms. Harter stated that ample space is necessary for outdoor dining, so that it does not inhibit pedestrian traffic. Have they planned for that, and if so, where?

Mr. Wood responded that the landscape plan reflects seating in several areas, around the corners of buildings. The hotel has been set back along Longshore Street, anticipating patio space to be located behind the sidewalk and off the right-of-way. The open space will accommodate dining from the commercial spaces to the north and south.

Ms. Harter inquired if there would be sufficient space for restaurants to have outside dining.

Mr. Wood responded that in most cases, there is sufficient space for pedestrian traffic along the sidewalks plus outdoor dining opportunities.

Ms. Call requested staff to comment on the encroachment process if a tenant wished to have outdoor dining within this specific area.

Mr. Hounshell responded that if a tenant wished to extend past the building lines, they would need to contact Engineering staff and negotiate a right-of-way encroachment. The Administrative Review Team (ART) reviews those requests administratively.

Ms. Call inquired what the ART considers in regard to minimum connectivity and walkability.

Mr. Hounshell responded that there is a minimum width required for sidewalks. As the Commission recalls, there have been cases where modification of existing landscape beds was necessary to meet the minimum width requirement. That can vary, depending on the location.

Mr. Hendershot stated that for the development to the south in Bridge Park, there was a separate development agreement that allowed for encroachments up to six feet. He would recommend that this applicant show where they are proposing encroachments as part of the process, so those spaces can be understood at the outset. When the project goes before City Council, they will have the opportunity to consider those encroachments. This would avoid the need to determine later if a patio encroachment could be fit into the right-of-way and the pedestrian access route.

Mr. Wood clarified that most of the patios currently shown on the plan do not encroach into the right-of-way.

Public Comments

Ms. Rauch read the following public comments received into the record:

Joanne Blum, 180 Indian Run Drive, Dublin, OH 43017:

"This development project is overly dense in an already tightly developed space. In addition, the buildings as planned exceed height restrictions for new construction. Please do not approve any variance on established standards, as those variants will become increasingly the norm. As a long-term Dublin resident, I am very concerned about the rapidly increasing development in dense, urban development for my community. There are now at least half a dozen major developments in the works, all within a mile of my home. Too much!"

Tammy and Brian Dutro, 3220 Lilly Mar Ct., Dublin, OH 43017:

"We have two concerns with this project: building height and increased traffic. Our understanding when Bridge Park was built was that the buildings would be only six stories high. This proposal exceeds that limit. Most of the existing buildings are five stories and this proposal feels out of scale. The current traffic situation at 161 and 33 during morning and evening rush hours is very congested and usually the north direction gets backed up to Martin Road. We usually try to find another way out of the neighborhood in order to avoid the roundabout during rush hour. Adding additional offices hotel, and residences will make the roundabout even busier. What considerations are being made for this additional traffic?"

Robin Galieti, 6449 Martin Place, Dublin, OH 43017:

"My husband and I have lived in our home for 2 1/2 years and in that short time, have really come to love what Dublin has to offer. I believe that if the building height zoning is changed for the Indus Bridge Street Project, there is a greater chance that future additions to the Bridge Park area will waive the building heights as well. If Code limits building height to 6 stories, all developers should build according to Code. If the Indus Bridge Project is passed, I ask that it be kept to the number

of stories in current zoning regulations. I am concerned about a granted number of stories because I live behind future proposed buildings, and constructing too high may interrupt the integrity of our neighborhood. I cannot be convinced that it is necessary for these developers to ask for a waiver or variance for additional stories. Our cul de sac backs up to an upcoming proposal for building additions to the Bridge Park area going south from the Route 161 roundabout. I realize this is in the beginning stages, but our neighborhood may be greatly impacted by these proposed additions. We are concerned with parking, density, safe pedestrian traffic, added traffic congestion to this area, and noise, to name just a few. In addition, our street is off Martin Road, a street that gets a large amount of traffic. There are existing vehicle-turning issues at Martin Road and Riverside Drive. More people means more traffic. I would ask that there be extensive traffic studies done to curtail future problems at this intersection before any additional building moves forward. We appreciate the care you put into the planning of these developments and that resident input is very important to you."

Gayle Griffith, 6465 Martin Place, Dublin, OH 43017:

"Since May of 1985, I have lived at 6465 Martin Place, not far from the roundabout at 161 and Riverside Drive. My primary concerns are the speed and amount of traffic on Martin Road, the traffic congestion around the 161/Riverside Drive roundabout, and the proposed extra-tall buildings. I understand that there is currently a six-story limit, but I hear talk about possible variances. I believe there were good reasons that the six-story limit was put in place, and I believe that those reasons are still valid. I would like the City of Dublin to adhere to the six-story limit as a firm maximum. I have navigated the roundabout at 161 and Riverside Drive on foot a few times. I felt the need to wait until there was no traffic in any direction before it was safe to cross. We cannot count on having pedestrians wait for a lack of traffic to cross at the roundabout. That hardly ever happens anymore. I hope there will be measures put in place to make pedestrian crossing at the roundabout safe."

Barbara Hart, 4409 Zachary Ct., Dublin, OH 43017:

"I'd like to ask the commissioners to consider this project with discretion. I am not a city planner, engineer or a developer - I am a resident that is being strongly impacted by the traffic that has been created on Martin Road from the existing roundabout and Bridge Street Development. I doubt when Bridge Street was first discussed in the early 2000's much thought was given to vehicles driving to Bridge Park. Everyone's concern was accommodating arriving cars with garages, on street parking and ultimately the overall success of the development. We live with the reality. Since the installation of the roundabout and Bridge Park there is an unending stream of cars northbound on Riverside Drive and Martin Road during peak commute and weekend hours. Martin Road is now a primary shortcut used to avoid the roundabout "traffic jam." Our quiet "unassuming" neighborhood is not the same as it was when we moved in - traffic never stops and what used to be an "out of the way" neighborhood and roadway mostly used by residents and guests (similar to most residential developments in Dublin) is now a busy thoroughfare. I realize development is inevitable, but why are these ultra-high-density developments consistently earmarked for this small corner of southeast Dublin with such limited roadway access? Try not to think only about the economic development is predicted to benefit the City and residents, but consider how this ongoing development is changing the basic fabric of our Dublin neighborhood that has been our home for more than 2 decades. Your decisions will make a difference."

Grant Noppenberger, 3173 Martin Road, Dublin, OH 43017:

"I wanted to express my concern for the over development of this project. The building codes and laws clearly state a 6-story maximum building height, and this project clearly exceeds that limit. This is going to have a negative impact on the neighbors in the direct area and neighborhood of the development. The traffic going down Martin Road has increased so much and there is a blatant disregard for the speed limit of 25 MPH or the speed bumps. The roundabout is unsafe enough to walk through, even with the crosswalk. This extra project will only increase traffic down Martin Road, from people using Riverside Dr. to avoid the roundabout. With the proposed apartments, there is sure to be an increase in crime. Crime often accompanies increased density, especially with so many apartments, which tend to attract a more transient population than people who are invested in the community. Currently, there is no greenspace at Bridge Park or a nearby park that our community can enjoy. A park or greenspace would be a huge addition to Bridge Park and the Dublin community as a whole."

Cindy Soler, 3200 Lilly Mar Ct., Dublin, OH 43017:

"I feel that the proposed addition to Bridge Park is too dense for the roads that already exist at Riverside Drive and the roundabout at 161. Has a traffic study been done for this intersection? The northbound Riverside traffic backs way south while waiting to proceed through the roundabout. This situation also causes problems for residents on and around Martin Road -- cut through traffic, and Martin Road residents and neighbors unable to exit Martin Road either north or south to Riverside Drive during busy traffic times. It would be nice if Martin Road at Riverside Drive heading westbound could have a left turn lane installed. One left turn car waiting to turn left onto Riverside Drive southbound backs traffic way back up Martin Road! Yes, we could drive around to SR 161 to get to Dublin proper, but is that really a solution? I am not sure larger speed bumps on Martin Road is a final solution, either. It would just be a band-aid for the problem that would punish the Martin Road residents with having to bounce over taller bumps every time we leave our neighborhood!"

Ms. Call noted that several Next Door comments were received and reviewed by the Commissioners, as well.

Scott Haring, 3280 Lilly Mar Ct., Dublin, OH 43017 stated that he is present to represent the East Dublin Civic Association (EDCA). He will build on the comments already offered. The EDCA residents have been active in the process of governing this City, including the Community Plan and how that ultimately leads into the City Code. The building standards are the residents' protection. Tonight, a list was shown of the criteria, which were/were not met; that can be a very good guide in considering a project. The common theme of concern with this project is its proposed height, which does not meet the Code limitation of six stories. A project should be able to meet both the open space and maximum height requirements. The only way a project greater than six stories should be possible is if Council rezones the area differently, creating a specific place in Dublin where a height greater than six stories was permitted to occur.

Jerry Behling, 3289 Martin Road, Dublin, OH 43017 stated that he has lived here since 1970. He loves Dublin but does not like the current level of traffic. Although his house is buffered with large trees, there is significant noise intrusion from the traffic. He is opposed to further development in the area of the roundabout at SR161/Riverside Drive. This area has already created a high level of aggravating traffic. We do not need any more; the area is saturated. At a recent EDCA meeting, residents posed several questions regarding the surge of traffic in this neighborhood. Dublin's Director of Transportation gave lengthy responses, refuting the residents' claims, listing the reasons

improvements could not be made, and writing Martin Road off as a collector road. The biggest insult in her response was, "Traffic is a good problem to have." Perhaps that could be true if the residents were not affected by the commercial developments and associated traffic. As a resident of Dublin for 53 years, he likes parks, trees, unpolluted air and clean air. He wants a local government who wants that, too, rather than more vehicles resulting in many problems, including pollution, accidents, rage and threats to pedestrians. The developers who own property want to build something that will make a vast amount of money. They do not care that time after time, these developments evolve into decay, a blight on the land and the ruin of its natural beauty. In his 78 years, he has seen that occur all around Columbus and its surrounding suburbs. Many shopping areas have been developed, and then decayed, leaving eyesore scars in their wake.

Joanne Blum, 180 Indian Run Drive, Dublin, OH 43017 stated that she has been a Dublin resident more than 23 years, and for most of that time, it has been a beautiful, peaceful and lovely place to live and has felt safe. It is changing rapidly now with the tremendous amount of development occurring the last few years. Half a dozen large projects now, like the Indus project, are in the planning stages. Each one causes a degradation of the residents' quality of life in Dublin, resulting in more population, more noise and more traffic. She hears I-270 traffic 24 hours/day now from her home; that did not used to be the case. She does not think Dublin needs more development, and is questioning the reason so much is occurring and the reason it is being approved so readily. She understands the reason developers want to come in is that there is a large amount of money to be made, but at what point are we going to say that it is too much for Dublin? There is a very dangerous idea that she hears often, which is that development is inevitable; you can't do anything about it. Residents are made to feel that way and don't speak up for that reason. That is a dangerous idea and should not be believed; there is much we can do about it. Development is not inevitable. There are communities across the country who are saying no to development. They are embracing new building standards. There are beautiful places who want to preserve their beauty, such as Sedona. They have very strict requirements, because they do not want the beautiful red rock mountainside area to be destroyed by excessive development. On Sanibel Island, property owners are prohibited from building higher than two stories, because they want to preserve the beauty and comfort of their community. We can do that here, too. It is very important to draw limits. Another dangerous idea is that the community should always take a back seat to economy, that economy must lead. The thinking is that growth is about making money, and the community just has to adjust to the economic decisions being made by its local government. That is occurring right now. Economic decisions are being made; corporate offers are being accepted; development projects undertaken over our heads, to which we are expected to accept and adjust. The kind of community she wants to live in is where community is first. It is safe, friendly, walkable, and peaceful. If we determine we want that, then economic choices are made in support of it. The community should not have to fall in line behind money-making. Another dangerous idea is that community is dying. That also seems to suggest that growth is related only to economics, jobs, money-making, retail, business and new construction, running roughshod over the residents' need for a green, healthy and clean environment. There are various kinds of growth, and the growth we need more than anything right now is growth in our consciousness, our awareness of what makes for a good, thriving community, and to look carefully at what will not support the kind of community we want. We need growth in protecting our land and preserving biodiversity, healthy flora and fauna. That is the kind of community she wants to live in and she would love it if Dublin would embrace a vision like that. Preserving 30% by 2030 – 30% of our beautiful area with the Scioto River, Indian Run Ravine and its other natural wonders, not selling it all for money-making purposes

and things we do not need more of – retail, restaurants, hotels and apartments. Dublin has much of that already. She would like Dublin to pause and take a look at what its residents want.

Katie Mcquade, 3260 Lilly Mar Ct., Dublin, OH 43017 stated she appreciates those with the EDCA who have shared with the residents many sets of proposed development plans – all within a very short period of time. She reiterates the same concerns that have been expressed by others regarding building height, traffic and noise. An additional concern is that the location for this proposed project is in front of the existing Bridge Park development, which is developed all the way back. Immediately behind this site is The Grand, a luxury senior community. One of the primary goals of Bridge Park was to take advantage of the natural beauty of the Scioto River. The City realigned Riverside Drive in this area, so there was more available space to develop a park, and provide the community accessibility to the river. Yet now before us is a proposal to build the tallest building in front of the rest of Bridge Park. Why put an 11-story building in front of The Grand? Nobody behind it would be able to see the beauty of the sunset over the Scioto River. This development will take that enjoyment away from the residents at The Grand. Please consider the community that already exists in this area and what this would be taking away from them.

Diane Cartolano, 3390 Martin Road, Dublin, OH 43017 stated that she and her husband have been in Dublin for 25 years and are not against development, per se. There has been too much development too soon. They are very uneasy about what will become of their home and property. Due to the level of cut-through traffic, it is no longer enjoyable to sit on their front porch. City leadership has said that public involvement is important, a cornerstone of the city. She believes they are sincere and hopes that translates into actions that are consistent with that. The density of the proposed Indus project is “over the top.” The proposed height far exceeds what Code permits. The applicant’s pro forma cannot trump the City’s laws. The residents implore the Commission to require the applicant to abide by the Code limitation of six stories. She also is opposed to a variance, as it will set a precedent. Code is important. The Commission has spent time reviewing Neighborhood Design Guidelines for residents. They ask the Commission to also require commercial projects to adhere to the standards. The proposed 147 hotel rooms, 169 apartments, an 800-car parking garage, plus office space will produce a large number of people and vehicles to be absorbed by the City’s roads, City services and schools, along with the many other projects under consideration. There were five (5) vision principles of the 2010 Bridge Street Vision Statement. Much of what is happening here now is very contradictory to those stated Vision Principles. #1 – Walkable and Pedestrian Friendly. This area is now the opposite of pedestrian friendly; in some places, it is the “walk of death.” #2 – Greenspace. It is unfortunate that what has long been the hallmark of Dublin, as enshrined in its motto, “It’s Greener in Dublin,” now is valued only from its potential to generate money. When money is the only motivation, it can cloud one’s ability to see the long-term consequences of one’s actions. Dublin is quickly losing its charm and character. This violates Vision Principle #3 - Embrace Dublin’s natural setting and celebrate a commitment to environmental sustainability and preservation. Driving through the roundabout and through Bridge Park does not give an impression of Dublin being green. One comment is that Dublin is starting to look more like the concrete jungle of Manhattan than the Dublin we have all known and loved. They acknowledge the right of developers to develop their property, but they do not have the right to negatively impact other people’s properties in that process. She understands there is a fine balance, but developers usually get the deference when prioritizing interests. While initially, Bridge Park increased property values, there is a point at which proximity becomes a detriment to property values. However, she would exchange any increase in their property value for the restoration of the peaceful conditions they once had. She invites the Commissioners to visit

their neighborhood and consider their decisions as though their family lived in the area. Crime has increased in this area, and a continuing increase in population will put additional demands on the City's Police, Fire and School. The Martin Road area has had a disproportionate impact from the Bridge Park development due to the traffic. This violates Vision Principle #4 – to complement and strengthen Dublin's existing community fabric, and #5 – Dublin puts its residents first. The Planning and Zoning Commission and Code are the only firewalls the residents have for protecting and preserving their neighborhoods, homes and quality of life from the ill effects of over development. She urges the Commission to vote "No" on the project as it is currently proposed, which would be a vote in support of its residents. The City is set to refresh its Community Plan. Please consider the wisdom of slowing down the pace and volume of development. Doing so would provide some time to give this important undertaking the attention it merits. We are very concerned about the City's current direction.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call focused the discussion on Lots, Blocks, Street Types and Land Use.

Mr. Chinnock thanked the residents for sharing their concerns with the Commission, which we do take into consideration. The sentiment is that we can do better. Although there has been some progress, the proposed development still has a long way to go. He feels strongly that Longshore Street needs to do something different, should that extension be pursued. This is an opportunity to do something great, something better than what is currently proposed.

Ms. Harter stated that she is happy to see the residents share their concerns with the Commission. She believes that the people before her spent a lot of time coming up with the 6-story height limitation and careful consideration of the height limitation is warranted. In considering the spacing of the massing, she is concerned about the adjacent traffic movements. She appreciates the attention to connected open spaces, and the applicant's interest in involving the Dublin Arts Center for potential artwork. Perhaps the Dublin Schools arts program could be considered, as well. In addition to the road movements, the ease of pedestrian movements within the site and between the buildings will be important considerations of this project

Mr. Way stated that he appreciates the public's input tonight. He also appreciates the applicant's attention to the Commission's comments at the last meeting and the changes subsequently made, including moving the residential component away from I-270. He remains challenged about the prospective height. He has not heard a compelling reason for the proposed height. Although the height has been lowered some since the last meeting, that massing has been placed in a connector building, which he finds challenging. They are placing a 60-foot connection between two 220-foot buildings resulting in a building 500 feet in length. That massing is now out of scale. He realizes the applicant is working with a narrow site, and in terms of massing, not height, the buildings along Riverside Drive fit well, except for the connector piece. To the east of Longshore Street, more space is available, although there is a grade involved. The hotel is occupying a very large footprint, which could be made more compact. He continues to struggle with the garage. He believes it would be possible to integrate residential liner along the north and south elevations of the 180-foot wide garage. Some good moves have been made, but the massing and height still need significant work.

Mr. Supelak stated that he appreciates the adjustments that have been made to the open space, and the center park area is becoming compelling. He likes the placement of retail/commercial space adjacent to that space. The office building does not suffer from the fact that the floorplates drive

the facades and massing. There is flexibility to address that corner appropriately. This proposal is for five buildings, more than has been attempted with other developments within Bridge Park. That results in the potential for all five looking similar. He would encourage an integrated fabric appearance rather than the appearance of a single development. Similar to the public, his concern is that this is overbuilt in general. The height, in particular, is problematic, which in turn drives the scale of the parking garage, creating a secondary problem. He agrees with Mr. Way's concern with the connector and the resulting super block. The pass-through is compelling, but the scale does not work well. He is concerned about access in a few ways. One is the parking garage; if the parking places are hidden, they might as well not be there. That could be solved by providing more vehicular access points. He believes two additional pedestrian access points could be added further up Longshore Street, closer to Tuller Drive, and one down to the park. He provided other suggestions for activating the public spaces and providing access. The garage mass is a concern. Wrapping it with liner buildings should continue to be studied, but scaling it down would be critical in addressing the issue. With three of the five buildings, the floorplate is driving the exterior; that relationship is overdone. He encourages them not to view this project only as buildings, but from the aspect of how the development interacts in and with the public realm.

Mr. Fishman stated that he appreciates the residents' comments. He wants the residents to understand that this is early in the project's development process. He appreciates the developer's efforts, which he recognizes can be arduous. However, he can sum the project up with a brief sentence: it is too much development on too small of a site. He participated in at least 20 meetings when the Bridge Street Code was developed. All the consultants working with them on that effort emphasized the need for a 6-story height limitation, and that waivers should be granted only in urgent situations, where a compromise would provide the City significant benefit. As he has expressed before, setting a precedent concerns him. Permitting nine (9) stories for this development will result in a request by another development in Bridge Park for nine (9) stories. Waivers should be only for emergencies. The residents deserve to know that the Code is the Code, and trust that the City does not permit three additional stories to be added in order to achieve more density on a site.

Mr. Schneier stated that the Commission's authority is limited to the Code, which does provide for certain development on this land. The issue is the massing. The parking garage is massive due to the amount of parking necessary for the proposed development. In Bridge Park, the distances between parking garages is already difficult, even though they may not be full. Building a smaller parking garage with the understanding that its overflow parking would use another parking garage will only cause a problem elsewhere. To shrink this garage, the building also must be shrunk. The connector is an interesting idea, but it essentially creates a super block, or one long building. He believes that the Code allows waivers in appropriate circumstances, and he is open to waivers in such cases. He does not favor a building height waiver for this proposal, due to the associated massing issues. This is the one area in Dublin where density, excitement and activation go hand-in-hand. The Marriott AC established a certain "look" on the south side, so he is less concerned with the building height, per se; but the proposed height in conjunction with the overall massing is too much.

Mr. Fishman agreed that the Code permits waivers when necessary, but using them for the purpose of achieving more density on a site is not appropriate.

Mr. Boggs stated that waivers are part of the Code, and a waiver would be required to permit greater than six stories for these buildings. There are specific criteria and submittal requirements

if the applicant desires to request a waiver, should this application proceed. However, a waiver request is not on tonight's agenda. He encouraged Commissioners to focus on the Concept Plan review.

Mr. Way stated that Longshore Street is at the northern end of Bridge Park, and it needs to be something unique that will draw people from the south to the north. He would encourage greater emphasis to be placed on the character of the Longshore Street extension, making it different from the rest of Longshore Street. From the open space standpoint, the applicant has achieved the right connections, but he does not see that yet on Longshore Street, which should be part of the open space network.

Ms. Call stated that the Concept Plan corridor buildings reflect a 19% increase over the allowable building height. That results in a very significant increase in parking – 15% more than Code permits. Looking at comparable corridor buildings (not including the AC Hotel), there is a 30% increase. With this plan, we are looking at a block with five (5) buildings that exceed the permitted height in this area. The Commission is not comfortable with that. It is overbuilt and is not supported by the Commission.

The Commission reviewed the language of the conditions.

Mr. Boggs stated that the purpose of a Concept Plan review is to signal the Commission's expectations to the developer and the community in the early stage of the development process. Those expectations are reflected in these conditions. That should not create the expectation, however, that the developer would not submit a waiver with the Preliminary Development Plan, a more mature part of the process. There may still be waivers requested, but this is a signal to the applicant and the public the Commission's position at this point, based on the Concept Plan it has seen.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant wished the Commission to proceed with the vote or if they requested their application to be tabled.

The applicant indicated they wished the Commission to proceed with the vote.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Concept Plan with the following nine (9) conditions:

- 1) The applicant consolidate the number of hotel and garage access points and align with the existing access points on the east side of Mooney Street, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 2) The applicant provide access to the garage from Longshore Street, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 3) The applicant reduce the massing of the buildings to meet the Code and to complement the existing character of the Scioto River Neighborhood;
- 4) The applicant identify opportunities to reduce the amount of parking spaces and size of the parking structure to meet the Code, which could include investigating shared parking opportunities throughout the Scioto River Neighborhood District;
- 5) The applicant work with staff to provide additional design details with subsequent applications to provide unique gateway designs at the key intersections that align with the requirements of the Scioto River Neighborhood;

- 6) The applicant submit a Traffic Impact Study at a future time determined by staff;
- 7) The applicant continue to work with staff to ensure the heights of the buildings meet the Code and are compatible with the intent and existing buildings of the Scioto River Neighborhood, subject to staff approval;
- 8) The applicant work with staff to ensure unique, high quality architectural design and details are incorporated within the proposed development that complements the district; and,
- 9) The applicant identify additional opportunities to activate the north elevation of the garage along Tuller Road.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Chinnock, no; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion carried 6-1]


COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch reported the following:

- The State of the Community will be held at The Exchange on March 9, 2023.
- Due to date conflicts in March, the Community Plan update will be rescheduled in April 2023.
- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, February 9, 2023.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:39 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council