



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 1, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

2. **Valentina’s at 4595 Bridge Park Avenue** **22-095MSP**

Master Sign Plan

Proposal: An awning edge sign, projecting sign, and wall signs for an existing tenant space on a 1.30-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with Bridge Park Avenue.

Request: Review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.065(H) and §153.066, and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines.

Applicant: Carter Bean, Bean Architects

Planning Contact: Zachary Hounshell, Planner II

Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-095

MOTION: Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the awning edge sign is permitted only for this tenant and will not apply to other tenant spaces within Block B.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: The Master Sign Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|----------------|--------|
| Lance Schneier | Yes |
| Rebecca Call | Yes |
| Mark Supelak | Yes |
| Kim Way | Yes |
| Warren Fishman | Absent |
| Jamey Chinnock | Absent |
| Kathy Harter | Yes |

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

 B1050D11513A490...
 Zachary Hounshell, Planner II



~~Ms. Call responded that perhaps the Commission could direct staff to work with the applicant and the adjacent parcel owner.~~

~~Mr. Hendershot stated that staff understands the challenges with the site layout and access points and access management, but they are also looking out for the public roadway network and health and safety of the public. In their professional opinion, staff would not be supportive of moving the access point.~~

Public Comment

~~Ms. Call stated that the Commission received an earlier public comment on this case. No additional public comments were made.~~

~~Ms. Call summarized that the Commission appreciates the proposal and believes the use would be complementary to the surrounding area. The Commission believes it can be designed to be an acceptable project on the parcel and looks forward to seeing the applicant at future steps in the development process.~~

2. Valentina’s Sign at 4595 Bridge Park Avenue, 22-095MSP, Master Sign Plan

A proposed amendment to a Master Sign Plan for an awning edge sign, projecting sign, and wall signs for an existing tenant space on a 1.30-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood, located southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with Bridge Park Avenue.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that in October 2021, the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and approved a Minor Project for façade and site modifications to accommodate the Valentina’s restaurant. The approval included storefront alterations, enclosed and covered patio spaces, and streetscape improvements. The Master Sign Plan (MSP) for Block B allows for a variety of building-mounted sign types permitted throughout the Bridge Park development, including wall signs, projecting signs, placemaking art signs, awning signs, and canopy edge signs. Signs that meet the requirements of the approved MSP are permitted to submit directly for sign permits. Amendments to the MSP for specific tenants may come back to the Commission for review. The proposed sign is a combination of two sign types – an awning sign and a canopy edge sign. Canopy edge signs are channel letter signs that are mounted on top, underneath, or to the face of a horizontal canopy structure. Awning signs are generally described as sign graphics printed on the canvas of a solid awning. The proposed amended Master Sign Plan is for an awning edge sign, a canopy edge sign and a projecting sign.

Awning Edge Sign

Proposed is a 42-square-foot (SF) awning edge sign on the west elevation of the tenant space. The sign will be mounted on the northernmost awning of the tenant space, adjacent to the northwest corner of the restaurant. The sign will be mounted at a maximum height of 12 feet – 10 inches from established grade. The inside surface of the 2.5-inch deep reverse channel letters is painted a dark yellow-green color (PMS 417 C), with the exterior of the letters painted white. The sign will be internally illuminated with exposed LED neon lights within the channel letters.

Staff is supportive of the proposed awning edge sign and amendment to the Master Sign Plan. This is a sign type that is not seen elsewhere within the District. It will contribute to the vibrancy of the District.

The next two signs would be permitted to advance to Building Permitting, as they do meet the MSP requirements.

Canopy Edge Sign

Also proposed is a 42-SF canopy edge sign, which would be located on a 2-inch tall raceway. The canopy sign design matches the proposed awning edge sign. Below the canopy edge sign is a 2.3 SF secondary canopy edge sign that will be stud mounted to the face of the canopy and painted white. The two signs would be considered a single canopy edge sign and meet the maximum 50 SF for canopy edge signs. The secondary sign will not be illuminated.

Projecting Sign

Also proposed is a 5-SF projecting sign on the east end of the approved canopy. The projecting sign will hang below the canopy and will be oriented east-west along the sidewalk on the north side of the tenant space. The sign will project approximately 1.5 feet below the canopy, providing a clearance of 8 feet–7 inches, meeting the minimum 8-foot requirement per the MSP. The projecting sign will be painted Metallic Grey (PMS 446 C) to match the metal canopy and will be internally illuminated through the .5-inch white acrylic push-through letters.

Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition, that the awning edge sign be permitted only for this tenant.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant had no presentation.

Commission Questions

Ms. Harter inquired if the awning on the front facade would obscure the street number on the Bridge Park Avenue facade.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the street number is located close to the building entrance. It would not be located on the metal canopy.

Ms. Harter inquired if the street numbers are required to be visible to both pedestrians and passing traffic.

Randy Roberty, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants, 390 West Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, OH 43215, stated that the renderings provided in the packet were earlier views. The updated rendering with signs is shown on the presentation screen. The street number is located on the building.

Mr. Supelak inquired if consideration was given to vertical signage on one of the brick piers on the Riverside Drive elevation.

Mr. Roberty responded that based on the scale of the space and the height of the building above, signage on the piers would appear to be for the space above. It would not relate well to the tenant space or the façade. It is technically not an awning. It is part of the actual building footprint space below with walls, foundations and windows. It is a roof disguised to look like an awning. As reflected from earlier discussions, the goal was to make this addition feel less like a permanent addition. The roof used, although permanent, has an awning aesthetic. It is a membrane roof with fabric draped over it.

Mr. Way stated that there is a bar that runs along the canopy, to which the letters are attached. The bar appears to be painted to match the awning.

Mr. Roberty responded that it is a support structure. The intent is to disguise it to the extent possible. It blends into the canopy and the letters appear to float.

Ms. Harter inquired if an attempt is being made to align the letters with the lines of the awning.

Mr. Roberty responded that the letters are disconnected from the lines; the letters are a different width than the repetitive stripes. The graphic used by the sign company is misleading, but the renderings provided in the packet are an actual reflection of the aesthetic.

Mr. Supelak inquired if, in the event the bar painted to match the canopy stripe rhythm does not turn out as anticipated, the applicant would replace the paint with only one of the associated colors.

Mr. Roberty responded that if the results should turn out to be awkward, it would be modified.

Mr. Supelak inquired the reason for the sign box below the canopy.

Mr. Roberty responded that the lower sign relates to the pedestrian scale. The two larger signs provide vehicular view.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the striped canopy material.

Mr. Roberty responded that the canopy is a conventionally framed roof and wall, metal stud bearing, with a membrane roof, plywood roof deck. The striped material is a Sunbrella canvas awning fabric draped over the roof system.

Mr. Way inquired how difficult it would be to replace the canvas material when needed.

Mr. Roberty responded that it would be a straightforward, one-for-one replacement – a simple awning swap.

Ms. Harter inquired if, due to its slope, snow lingering on the awning might pose a hazard to guests.

Mr. Roberty responded that he does not believe it will be an issue. Most other canopy signs are sloped, as well; although typically concealed by a flat edge, snowdrift occurs behind the signs.

Ms. Call noted that most canopies do not have letters blocking the edge of the slope.

Mr. Roberty responded that the angle the sign rests upon is not flush; it is elevated. There is a gap below it, and water can run free below it.

Ms. Harter inquired if repair is needed, who would be called for service.

Mr. Roberty responded that their awning vendor, Capital City Awning, would be contacted.

Ms. Call stated that some of the renderings have additional text on four of the signs. She assumes that text would not be present on the awnings.

Mr. Roberty responded that is correct.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Supelak stated that the signs are attractive, and he likes the proposed construction. However, he is not convinced the better solution would not be a vertical sign on the brick pier further down; it would extend the space. Currently, all the signage is right at the corner.

Mr. Way stated that it initially seemed strange to put the signage on the awning, but he now better understands the proposal, and it will be a one-time type of approval. Because there is a consistency for edge signs along the street, although not on awnings, the proposed sign could be considered consistent. As staff noted, this is a unique sign, designed to make this corner special. There has been a significant amount of discussion about making the corner unique. He is supportive of the sign, which is consistent, yet interesting and will make this corner special.

Mr. Schneier stated he also is supportive of the sign. It is the right look for this corner, where the pedestrian bridge lands. The sign blends with the street, yet is unique and inviting. It provides the kind of energy that the City is attempting to achieve here. He has no issues with the sign.

Mr. Harter stated that, initially, she had concerns about the stripes and use of color. However, per the discussion, she likes the color tones, the art, the surprise it provides, and the consistency with other street signage.

Ms. Call stated that she agrees with fellow Commissioners. She appreciates that the approval would only be for this tenant. The Commission likes master sign plans, which permit members to look at the signage in totality. One of the challenges with this proposal is that the awning is asked to be an awning, structural architecture and also a sign base. If we had looked at it earlier, the awning would have been considered a marquis sign for this corner, and it probably would not have met sign requirements, such as square footage. She likes the vertical suggestion. However, the proposed sign is cohesive, and for that reason, she is supportive.

Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with one (1) condition:
(1) That the awning edge sign is permitted only for this tenant and will not apply to other tenant spaces within Block B.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion approved 5-0]

3. ~~The Corners, Phase 2 at PID: 273-013223, 22-098FDP, Final Development Plan~~

~~A proposal for construction of a ±7,100-square-foot commercial building to accommodate a medical office tenant and a future commercial tenant. The 13.5-acre site, a Planned Unit Development (PUD) – The Corners, is located northwest of the intersection of Rings Road with Frantz Road.~~

Staff Presentation:

~~Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for The Corners development. The 1.48-acre site is located northwest of the intersection of Rings Road and Frantz Road within The Corners Planned Unit Development (PUD), Phase 2, Subarea B2. The total area of the PUD is approximately 13.5 acres. The site is located directly north of The Field of Corn (Sam and Eulalia Frantz Park) Public Park and art installation. The City of Dublin Department of Development initiated a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in May 2018 to identify a suitable developer for collaboration on the 10-acre site retained by the City. The Daimler Group was the selected developer and partnered with the City on The Corners development. The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) recommended approval of the Zoning/Preliminary Development Plan~~



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 7, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Baltimore Corner Restaurant (Valentina’s) at 4595 Bridge Park Avenue
21-017MPR Minor Project Review**

Proposal: Exterior and site modifications to accommodate a restaurant tenant including storefront alterations, an enclosed and covered patio, and associated design details.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Riverside Drive and zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Applicant: Randy Roberty, Design Collective; and Wayne Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-017

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to approve two Waivers:

1. §153.063(E)(5)(c) — Neighborhood Standards, Pedestrian-Oriented Streetscape – Requirement: A minimum of 12 feet of clear sidewalk width shall be provided along designated shopping corridors through the combination of public right-of-way and required building zone area with public access easements. Outdoor dining and seating areas shall not be permitted within this clear area. Request: To reduce the clear sidewalk width along Riverside Drive to a minimum of 8 feet-2inches permitting outdoor seating and dining within a required Shopping Corridor.
2. §153.064(C) – Open Space Types, Provision of Open Space - Requirement: To provide 200 square feet of open space per residential unit and 1 square feet per 50 square feet of commercial space. Bridge Park, Block B was required to provide a total of 1.08 acres of publically accessible open space of which 0.33 acre was provided on-site and 0.75 acre was provided off-site. Request: To reduce the total amount of publically accessible open space within Block B by ±150 square feet.

VOTE: 4 – 2.

RESULT: Both Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|----------------|--------|
| Jane Fox | Yes |
| Warren Fishman | No |
| Mark Supelak | Yes |
| Rebecca Call | Absent |
| Leo Grimes | Yes |
| Lance Schneier | Yes |
| Kim Way | No |



**1. Baltimore Corner Restaurant (Valentina’s) at 4595 Bridge Park Avenue
21-017MPR** **Minor Project Review**

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded, to approve the Minor Project with eight revised conditions:

- 1) That all pocket plaza elements including a seat wall, dining tables, and ancillary furniture and amenities be withdrawn from this proposal and the pocket plaza design be separated from this application;
- 2) That the property owner work with the Dublin Arts Council to identify a final design for the pocket plaza, no later than March 31, 2022, and implement the final design no later than October 1, 2022, subject to Staff approval;
- 3) For all alterations and additions located within the right-of-way, full civil engineering drawings are to be submitted as part of the building permit;
- 4) That the applicant provide a full landscape plan detailing the use of artificial and live vegetation, prior to permitting and subject to staff approval;
- 5) That the applicant provide a photometric plan demonstrating compliance with the Code, prior to permitting and subject to Staff approval;
- 6) That all artificial plant material shall be maintained in good condition as assessed from the public right-of-way. Should the City determine at any time the condition of the artificial material to be deteriorated, the applicant shall repair and replace immediately, remove, or come before the Commission with a suitable alternative;
- 7) That the applicant provide the window film color and calculations at permitting, to confirm transparency requirements are met along the east façade; and
- 8) That the applicant submit for sign permits, with a landlord approval letter, for review of the proposed signs relative to the adopted regulations.

VOTE: 5 – 1.

RESULT: The Minor Project was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|----------------|--------|
| Jane Fox | Yes |
| Warren Fishman | Yes |
| Mark Supelak | Yes |
| Rebecca Call | Absent |
| Leo Grimes | Yes |
| Lance Schneier | Yes |
| Kim Way | No |

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

 294AB0C8363F490...
 Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner





MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 7, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

~~Mr. Supelak, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the October 7, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Tonight's meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City desires to accommodate public participation to the greatest extent possible.~~

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

~~Mr. Supelak led the Pledge of Allegiance.~~

ROLL CALL

~~Commission members present: Warren Fishman, Mark Supelak, Kim Way, Jane Fox, Leo Grimes, Lance Schneier
Commissioners absent: Rebecca Call
Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Chase Ridge, Zak Hounshell, Sarah Holt, Michael Hendershot, Colleen Gilger~~

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

~~Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Grimes seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the September 16 meeting minutes.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.~~

~~[Motion approved 6-0.]~~

~~Mr. Supelak 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. Mr. Supelak swore in those individuals intending to give testimony at the meeting.~~

TABLED CASE

- 1. Baltimore Corner Restaurant (Valentina's), 4595 Bridge Park Avenue, 21-017MPR, Minor Project Review**

A request for exterior and site modifications to accommodate a restaurant tenant including storefront alterations, an enclosed and covered patio, and associated design details located within Bridge Park, Block

B zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood District. The site is southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Riverside Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review for Valentino's Restaurant, which is located within the Bridge Park development on the east side of Riverside Drive. This site is located at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive within Building B2, also referred to as the Baltimore Building. The existing tenant space is located on the first floor of the building, facing the intersection. Block B was originally approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission in 2015. At that time, a shopping corridor was required to be designated. Shopping corridors are intended to provide for continuous pedestrian activity and have a minimum required width of 12 feet. The shopping corridor extends along the Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue frontages. A waiver to the shopping corridor requirement is requested along Riverside Drive. With the 2015 development approval, the applicant was required to provide open space, which was provided both on the block of development, as well as within Riverside Crossing Park. There was a condition that the applicant continue to work with the City and Dublin Arts Council to develop the final elements for the pocket plaza, which is located at the terminal vista of the pedestrian bridge. This condition has not yet been implemented. The 2015 conceptual design of the pocket plaza in this location contained a variety of paving materials, the building column, as well as an area for artwork opportunity. With this current proposal, staff recommends that the pocket plaza design and tenant space designs be separated. This is a result of the cooperation between the City, the Dublin Arts Council and Crawford Hoying that has occurred since the September 30 Commission meeting. David Guion, the executive director of Dublin Arts Council, recommends that these two projects be uncoupled in order to facilitate a design process between the property owner, Crawford Hoying and Dublin Arts Council, with the City's consideration, to transform the pocket plaza into a place. There are opportunities for placemaking as well as artistic elements. Staff has included a condition that the design for this pocket plaza be finalized by March 31, 2022, and that the final design be implemented no later than October 1, 2022. Based on this timeframe, the 2015 condition would be required to be implemented within one calendar year. This application has been before the Commission on several previous occasions, between April and September of this year. Since the September review, the pocket plaza design has been updated, withdrawing those elements from the application. Ms. Martin reviewed the updated site plan, noting that the enclosed patio space encroaches approximately six feet within the Riverside Drive right-of-way and approximately five feet within the pocket plaza, reducing the pocket plaza area by a total of 150 square feet. This minimal reduction will provide a clear area of three feet for circulation around the building pier, provided that the proposed seat wall is removed. The covered patio portion also will encroach six feet within the right-of-way. In order to accommodate the consistent six-foot encroachment and maintain eight feet of clear distance along Riverside Drive, the applicant is proposing to modify the streetscape planters by a variable width of two feet-four inches to 0 feet at the southernmost end, in order to accommodate additional pedestrian circulation. The tenant modifications are consistent with the September review, as are the furniture and lighting selections. Staff recommends approval of the two requested Waivers, as they are considered vital to activate the streetscape in a quality manner and facilitate intentional placemaking that blurs the line between public and private spaces, consistent with the goals and objectives of the Bridge Street District. Staff also recommends approval of the Minor Project Review with eight conditions.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the decision to decouple the plaza from the tenant application. Will the applicant be able to proceed with their project, and what occurs when the plaza design has been completed? Do the two components diverge or converge?

Ms. Martin responded that with approval of their application, the applicant would be able to proceed with their tenant modifications, including the storefront modifications, the encroachment into the Riverside Drive right-of-way, and the 150-foot encroachment into the pocket plaza. The pocket plaza will not be

changed by the tenant application. Crawford Hoying, the City and Dublin Arts Council will undertake a public design process to create a vision for the space. Staff will have the ability to approve that design, after which the design would be implemented. The Commission has also requested that the design be brought before the Commission for informational purposes.

Mr. Schneier stated that a dual track process would proceed, and regardless of the public plaza discussions, the applicant is permitted to proceed with their project.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. That is consistent with how tenant modifications work within the rest of Bridge Park.

Applicant Presentation

Randy Roberty, Design Collective Architecture, 151 East Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, OH, stated that the owner agrees with the eight conditions presented by staff. Based on the thorough discussion of the project that has occurred previously, they have no additional presentation.

Public Comment

No public comments on the case were received.

Commission Questions

Mr. Fishman stated that two waivers are requested. If this restaurant should cease to exist in this location in the future, would the two waivers remain in place for the next tenant in the space?

Ms. Martin responded that from the Waiver conditions would be retained unless the tenant space was altered in any way. If a new tenant wanted to make alterations, the waivers would need to be reconsidered in conjunction with their proposal. In the unlikely scenario that a new tenant wished to make no alternations, the waivers would remain in place.

Mr. Fishman inquired if they were ever to make alterations in the elevation of the restaurant, the waivers would need to be reconsidered.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak stated that the two waivers are specific to this design. Is the concern that the waivers would allow future design changes?

Mr. Fishman responded that, in the past, a second tenant in a space has made changes based on the waivers that had been previously granted. Is it staff's assurance that, without exception, any future alterations proposed would require reconsideration of the waivers?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Way commended staff for uncoupling the pocket plaza from everything else. He believes that was the correct step to allow the application to proceed on its own. He has been very consistent throughout all of the previous reviews that he does not support reduction of the width of the key shopping corridor. He remains consistent in his view that the width should be 12 feet. He does not believe any alteration of the width is acceptable.

Mr. Supelak inquired if it was the City's request to reduce the width to eight feet or is the applicant requesting the adjustment?

Mr. Way responded that the proposal is to expand the restaurant into the public right-of-way and to move the planter over two feet to accommodate a minimum of 8 feet, which is far less than 12 feet. He believes

that 12 feet is necessary in this particular area of Bridge Park due to the circulation that occurs along the street and the connections to the hotel and other uses. He has observed the difficulty for people to pass on six and 8-foot wide sidewalks. With the addition of strollers and children, he believes the 12-foot width is appropriate and necessary -- a dimension that was established with all the development guidelines. It is an appropriate standard; he supports it and does not want to see it reduced in this particular area.

Mr. Supelak stated that the landscape beds in this particular area are generous. Are there other areas where they are far less generous?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. Immediately north of the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, the street section changes. There is actually on-street parking, which provides a buffer from Riverside Drive, along with significantly narrower planter beds. Due to the volume of traffic and speeds existing from the roundabout, the area south of Bridge Park Avenue includes no on-street parking and a more generous, 12-foot wide planter has been provided.

Mr. Supelak inquired what would be the significance of narrowing that planter more.

Mr. Way responded that in his professional opinion, the width of the planters was designated to encourage the landscape within it to thrive. If the available area for air and water were to be reduced, it would impact the plants. That planter bed dimension is necessary for the health of the landscape materials.

Mr. Grimes stated that with the nearby hotels, perhaps there is less shopping traffic here. If that is the case, the pedestrian traffic flow would not be negatively impacted by reducing the planter widths slightly. While this is a very important corner adjacent to the pedestrian bridge landing, given the factors involved, he would not be opposed to granting that waiver.

Ms. Fox stated that she agrees this sidewalk does not carry a high level of pedestrian activity from the south. The Code permits a 6-foot encroachment into a sidewalk for patio use. Is it correct that this encroachment is permitted in Bridge Park?

Ms. Martin responded that it is permitted based on the development agreement between the developer and City Council.

Ms. Fox stated that the difference here, however, is that the encroachment is from the building footprint. However, it will be an indoor-outdoor tenant space with a consistent six-foot encroachment. She agrees that the applicant's proposal should be separated from the pocket plaza, as was the original intention. The proposed coordination of the parties on the design will be a good process for identifying interesting placemaking elements. She would recommend that when that design is completed, it returns to the Commission, not as a condition, but for the Commission to learn more unique ways in which to create placemaking in conjunction with Dublin Arts Council and the developer. As a result of the previous discussions, we have achieved a really elevated design and the opportunity to work with the Dublin Arts Council to create a more interesting pocket plaza. She has no objection to permitting the encroachment, because it is a gateway area and there is an elevated design. The pocket plaza also will receive a more extensive and professional development. She believes the innovative design will activate the space. However, she is concerned about setting a precedent. If needed, perhaps the planter could be shortened to accommodate the tables at the corner. She believes the elevated design, in return for the reduction of width, is an equitable compromise. Additionally, she believes the artificial greenery would enhance the appearance. Architects use artificial greenery in rooftop gardens, due to their associated ease of care. She believes it would add to the Italian character the architect is attempting to create on this corner. She requested clarification of the proposed window film.

Ms. Martin responded that a condition has been added that additional details be provided on the window film, which will be along the east, Longshore Street elevation, where the service entrance to the tenant space is located. If a reduction in transparency to an elevation is proposed, the applicant is required to provide calculations demonstrating that the minimum Code requirement is met.

Ms. Fox stated that she understands the need to screen the view into service areas. However, there are opportunities to use a more decorative screening element, perhaps with an image, that would be more interesting than just a covering of the glass.

Mr. Fishman stated typically, he is not in favor of reducing sidewalk widths, but if part of a trade-off, it can be acceptable. Previously, he was opposed to the use of artificial plants, but within the last week, he has visited some areas and observed that if well maintained and replaced when needed, its use can be acceptable. He assumes there is a set budget for the anticipated artwork in the plaza. Will this item be returning to the Commission for approval?

Ms. Martin responded that it is not anticipated to return to the Commission. The intent is to facilitate the design process to expedite the design and implementation. It is essential that the plaza be completed when the restaurant opens.

Ms. Fox stated that Mr. Fishman has raised a valid point regarding the expectations and the budget.

Mr. Fishman stated that the budget often can restrict creativity. In the past, an assurance for a beautiful piece of artwork provided very disappointing results -- essentially, a sign. Can the City provide some oversight on the design?

Ms. Martin responded that the three entities coordinating on the effort will provide the oversight. The 2015 condition did not require the final pocket plaza design to come back to the Planning Commission, and that condition is now being extended into 2021. She is confident the design process will not result in a sign in the plaza.

Mr. Fishman stated that he understands the restrictions of a budget. However, the City's expectations for this plaza are quite high and the point of considering the waivers.

Mr. Supelak stated that the applicant is the tenant, Valentina's. The plaza project discussion, however, will be with the developer, Crawford Hoying.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. If the proposal had not involved the open space, the pocket plaza conversation would not have occurred. The initial proposal for a building addition to occupy part of the pocket plaza has been replaced with the original intent to preserve the pocket plaza.

Mr. Supelak noted that any budget stipulations would not be associated with this applicant.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the applicant/tenant would provide any funds for the construction of the plaza.

Ms. Martin responded that she is not familiar with the terms of the lease agreement between the applicant and the property owner; however, no funds are being provided to the City. This is a private open space.

Mr. Schneier observed that with the previous application, there was an incentive for the applicant to cooperate with the plans for the pocket plaza. The proposed decoupling of the application with the pocket plaza will eliminate that incentive. The direction now suggested would not impact the applicant's ability to construct, occupy and conduct business in the tenant space. Are input, approval or funds expected from the applicant?

Ms. Martin deferred questions regarding the lease conditions and financial contributions to Crawford Hoying, noting any failure to meet the conditions of the required timeframe would become a violation that can be enforced.

Mr. Schneier stated that the defined responsibility and enforcement ability were reassuring.

Mr. Fishman stated that it has not yet been defined who would be responsible for the financing of the plaza and what motivation they would have to make this the spectacular place that the City has envisioned. He is concerned that the developer could lose interest in the anticipated result, and set a firm budget that could not be exceeded. When the application and plaza design were coupled together, there was more motivation to achieve what was desired. He requested clarification of the responsible financial party and the existing motivation to make the space spectacular.

Ms. Martin agreed that in the initial proposal, there was a nexus between the two components; with the revision of the application, that no longer exists. Instead, the City is enacting the 2015 condition. She will defer to Crawford Hoying to address the financing question.

Mr. Boggs noted that the 2015 Conditions contained no particular financial criteria.

Nelson Yoder, Principal, Development Partners, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Dr, Ste 500, Dublin, Ohio, 43017, stated that he would comment on the issues that have been raised. He participated in the development process in 2012 through 2015. In regard to the encroachment of the sidewalk into the planter, initially, the plans provided for on-street parking on Riverside Drive heading north out of the roundabout. At that time, all the planters were much narrower. However, Engineering indicated that it was not safe for vehicles exiting the roundabout to contend with parallel parking. It was eliminated within this area, and the sidewalk gained 8-9 feet, which was then absorbed into the planters. That is the reason the planters to the north are narrower than the wider planters to the south. He agrees with Mr. Way that the wider planters are better for the health of the plants, and he also would have assumed that the wider planters were for that purpose, if he had not been part of the earlier discussions. If some encroachment into the planters would facilitate the wider sidewalks that Mr. Way is requesting, that would be possible, at least with the planters to the north of Bridge Park Avenue. In regard to the pocket plaza financing, they had anticipated working with Cameron Mitchell on financing the improvements to that open space. With the removal of that item from the CMR application, a \$25,000 allowance for the public art in the plaza has been set aside. This is a very small space, so he anticipates that \$25,000 will be sufficient. He is willing to go on the record to state that is the amount set aside for this purpose. If the City wants to put something above and beyond that, they would be willing to contribute toward that, as well, in order to create something even more spectacular. They will be investing just as much into the public space as they would have to the private space for the CMR project. Hopefully, the Commission agrees that is adequate.

Mr. Schneier stated that the coupling of the public plaza with the tenant application probably should never have occurred. In his opinion, the applicant should be able to proceed without reference to the pocket plaza. The pocket plaza design can happen separately.

Mr. Fishman inquired who is responsible for the piece of artwork. It will not be the Dublin Arts Council, although they may participate in the design. Is it Cameron Mitchell or the City?

Ms. Martin responded that she believes it is the artist or placemaker that is engaged in creating the space. The intent is to allow sufficient latitude for creativity and not regulate that aspect. The hope is that will result in the type of place the public wants to visit and will highlight this corner, as well as the tenant space. The conditions, timetable and participating parties are anticipated to execute a project that will meet the City's expectations.

Mr. Fishman inquired if Dublin Arts Council would be the responsible entity.

Ms. Martin responded that the property owner, Crawford Hoying, will be responsible for implementing the condition; the City will be responsible for enforcing the condition; and the Dublin Arts Council will be responsible for facilitating a creative conversation about the placemaking design.

Mr. Supelak stated that when this building was developed, the City and Crawford Hoying agreed on the open spaces within the block with the understanding that this particular space would be designed and occur when there was a tenant in the corner space. That responsibility has always been Crawford Hoying's.

Mr. Boggs agreed that it has always been Crawford Hoying's responsibility, and had the initial proposal for this tenant space not included the partial elimination of the pocket plaza, the pocket plaza would never have been under the Commission's purview. It would have been developed as it will now with the

decoupling. The revised application is now limited to the scope of tenant improvements in the building and does not include the open space. Development of the open space will proceed as originally intended.

Mr. Fishman stated that when the Bridge Street Code was being developed, the consultant cautioned the importance of not letting development eliminate any of the open spaces, as the proposed Code was defining the minimum open space needed. Yet, we are now considering eliminating some of it to achieve this project. Would it be possible to require the design, when completed, to come back to the Commission to review before they proceed with implementation? He does not want the Commission to be in the position of finding fully implemented artwork that is very disappointing. He can support the waivers, if overall, he has the confidence the result will be spectacular. This corner, which is immediately across from the pedestrian bridge, is a real focal point in Bridge Street.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the plaza had never been part of a development application but been handled as an independent project, what would have been the review process. Would it have come before the Planning Commission?

Ms. Martin responded that it would not have. The Planning Commission approved this pocket plaza in 2015.

Mr. Schneier stated that it would seem that only the application is within the Planning Commission's authority to review. The pocket plaza review is not within our authority.

Mr. Fishman stated the plaza became connected with this application, when the Commission was requested to make a concession to reduce the plaza space to permit the building to be extended further.

Mr. Schneier stated that the Commission could decide not to approve that.

Mr. Fishman stated that is true, but it would be difficult at this point of the project. The plaza has become a significant part of the application based upon the promise of a spectacular entrance. In these circumstances, we would be granting a waiver to create a dominant place including the entrance of the restaurant. The remaining piece of land has become the issue of debate

Mr. Supelak inquired if, at this point, the restaurant as designed would be encroaching into the pocket plaza space.

Ms. Martin responded that it is encroaching by 150 feet square feet.

Ms. Fox stated that the decision regarding the plaza occurred in 2015. The concern is that it did not get finished at that point. There must be an element of trust and cooperation that it will happen. She also would like the plaza design to come back to the Commission, but not as a condition. It would provide an opportunity for the Commission to learn how to create placemaking spaces in collaboration with the Dublin Arts Council. She agrees with decoupling the plaza from the application, with the Commission now trusting the process in place to complete the plaza.

Mr. Fishman stated that he could agree with that compromise.

Mr. Schneier stated that he also would have no objection, if it is clearly stated that the plaza design will return to the Planning Commission as education.

Mr. Supelak stated that there would no need to add a condition for that. The City and Crawford Hoying have a good working relationship, and we can simply request Crawford Hoying to do so. This process, however, has exposed a gap related to review of the designing of pocket parks.

Mr. Yoder stated that the plaza art component would be a public process involving Mr. Guion. Commissioners are familiar with Mr. Guion and the Dublin Arts Council. They can contact Mr. Guion directly and meet with him individually to share their thoughts regarding the plaza. There will be full transparency, although sometimes items can be overlooked during major developments; that is what occurred here. This plaza presents a great opportunity to improve the front door of Bridge Park, and nobody cares more about than Cameron Mitchell and the private developers of the adjacent project. All interests are in total alignment.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the statement that the Code permits the proposed 6-foot encroachment into the right-of-way.

Ms. Martin responded that the provision is not in the Zoning Code. It is part of the development agreement that the City executed for the Bridge Park development. That agreement accommodates certain things that are not permitted elsewhere, such as encroachment into the right-of-way for specific purposes, including outdoor dining. However, in areas of conflict between a Code requirement and a development agreement allowance, the Code prevails. For that reason, a Code waiver has been requested.

Mr. Way stated that the clarification indicates that a waiver could be made for patio space; however, part of the proposed encroachment area would not be for patio space but for enclosed building space. Would it still meet the criteria?

Ms. Martin responded that there was significant discussion on that concern, but the Law Director determined that the enclosed portion would be an enclosed patio, due to its indoor-outdoor element.

Mr. Way inquired if that space would not be considered a permanent structure.

Ms. Martin responded that it would not, per the Law Director's determination.

Mr. Way stated that another tenant to the south, Z Cucina, has an outdoor space that is within the building line. Will this set a precedent for that tenant also to request an encroachment into the right-of-way?

Mr. Boggs responded that nothing would prevent them from submitting a Minor Project Review request, which could include such a waiver. He does not believe that granting this waiver would set a binding precedent, because the geographic and traffic conditions are different. What is decided here should not be a determinant for future tenant requests.

Mr. Way stated that he appreciates Mr. Yoder's comment about the width of the planter. However, his observation of the area indicates that the planters here needed to be wider because this area has no on-street parking buffer, and it is located near the roundabout where vehicle speeds are increasing. Where there is on-street parking, that element will slow the traffic. He believes the planters were made wider to provide the needed buffer at the gateway into this area.

Mr. Supelak stated that he has no objection to either reduction of the sidewalk width or to reduction of the planter width in order to make the sidewalk wider. There is a value judgment at play. He is in agreement with the proposed decoupling and is excited about the inclusion of the Dublin Arts Council in the design process. The three parties can work together on a mutually vested interest. Staff has indicated that they have concerns about potential future issues with the proposed artificial plants; however, he is confident neither Cameron Mitchell nor Crawford Hoying would permit any deterioration to occur. Perhaps a condition concerning the maintenance thereof could be added. He inquired if Commissioners were in agreement regarding the requested sidewalk width waiver. There might be an opportunity to gain a foot of width for the sidewalk through reduction of the planter width.

Mr. Way pointed out that the rendering of the proposed sidewalk could be misleading, as the image depicts a 12-foot width.

Ms. Fox requested that the condition regarding the artificial plants be eliminated or revised.

Ms. Martin responded that the condition could be eliminated or altered to require that if the City determined at any point the maintenance of the artificial plants was an issue, the applicant would be required to either remove/replace or request Commission review to identify an alternative.

Mr. Way stated that he would not be supportive of any artificial greenery. It was his understanding that a future landscape plan would be submitted, where the Commission would have further input.

Ms. Martin responded that landscape plan is a required condition of this application and is an item that staff would review. Staff would accept artificial plant materials in a very limited capacity, particularly on the main entrance to the building. All other plant materials would be required to be real. Staff also

objected to artificial greening along the awning, given its high visibility from Riverside Drive and Riverside Crossing Park.

Mr. Supelak stated that he believes the Commission is not objecting to the use of artificial plants along the awning.

Mr. Roberty clarified that all vegetation that is not above the awning is real. The only artificial vegetation is on the awning, including the canopy of the entrance.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on this application.

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Fox seconded approval of the following waivers:

- 1) Section 153.063(E)(5)(c) — Neighborhood Standards, Pedestrian-Oriented Streetscape:
Requirement: A minimum of 12 feet of clear sidewalk width shall be provided along designated shopping corridors through the combination of public right-of-way and required building zone area with public access easements. Outdoor dining and seating areas shall not be permitted within this clear area.
Request: To reduce the clear sidewalk width along Riverside Drive to a minimum of 8 feet-2 inches permitting outdoor seating and dining within a required Shopping Corridor.
- 2) Section 153.064(C) – Open Space Types, Provision of Open Space:
Requirement: To provide 200 square feet of open space per residential unit and 1 square foot per 50 square feet of commercial space. Bridge Park, Block B was required to provide a total of 1.08 acres of publically accessible open space of which 0.33 acre was provided onsite and 0.75 acre was provided off-site.
Request: To reduce the total required open space for Bridge Park, Block B by approximately 150 square feet.

Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, no; Mr. Fishman, no; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion carried 4-2]

The Commission reviewed the revised conditions.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with following conditions:

- 1) All pocket plaza elements including seat wall, dining tables, and ancillary furniture and amenities be withdrawn from this proposal and the pocket plaza design be separated from this application.
- 2) The property owner work with the Dublin Arts Council to identify a final design for the pocket plaza no later than March 31, 2022 and implement the final design no later than October 1, 2022, subject to staff approval.
- 3) For all alterations and additions located within the right-of-way, full civil engineering drawings be submitted as part of the building permit.
- 4) The applicant provide a full landscape plan detailing the use of artificial and live vegetation, prior to permitting, subject to staff approval.
- 5) The applicant provide a photometric plan demonstrating compliance with the Code, prior to permitting, subject to staff approval.
- 6) All artificial plant material shall be maintained in good condition as assessed from the public right of way. Should the City determine at any time the condition of the artificial material be deteriorated, the applicant shall repair and replace immediately, or remove, or come before the Commission with a suitable alternative.

- 7) The applicant provide the window film color and calculations, at permitting, to confirm transparency requirements are met along the east façade.
- 8) The applicant submit for sign permits, with a landlord approval letter, for review of the proposed signs relative to the adopted regulations.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, no; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes.

[Motion carried 5-1]

NEW CASES

2. 4000 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 21-128CP, Concept Plan

A request for the construction of a ±6,900-square-foot, one-story, multi-tenant commercial building with drive-thru restaurant. The 1.98-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is located ±500 feet northwest of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with Dublin Center Drive.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and determination of a Concept Plan for 4000 W. Dublin-Granville Road. The Concept Plan is the first of three review stages for new developments within the Bridge Street District. The next two steps are the Preliminary and Final Development Plans. There is an opportunity to combine those last two steps, if the Concept Plan is approved. The applicant is requesting that those reviews be combined, should the Concept Plan be approved. The 1.98-acre site is located in the Sawmill Center neighborhood within the Bridge Street District. This vacant site is located south of the Lowe's development and has a number of mature trees along the west property line. In the southeast corner of the site is a low-lying entry feature, which currently does not serve a purpose or function for this or surrounding sites. There is also a decorative wall and monument sign for the Lowe's development. With this development, that sign would remain in place for the Lowe's development. When Lowe's was developed, a number of outparcels was created. This site is one of those, similar to the former Mellow Mushroom site immediately to the east. Because these are Lowe's outparcels, there are a number of deed restrictions, which include limitations on height, size and uses within proposed buildings. Deed restrictions are private agreements between the property owners and tenants, and the City is not involved in implementation of these agreements because they are negotiated between private entities. There is a 50-foot electric easement along the west property line. This proposal also includes the future development of Village Parkway, which is considered a District connector and principal frontage street within the Bridge Street District. The construction of this future extension is not included with the development; it is only accounted for in the site layout and design. The site is zoned BSD-SCN, Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. The intent of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood, as outlined in the BSD Code, is to provide an active, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented environment through unique shopping, service and entertainment uses with supporting residential and office uses. The site is not subject to potential gateway requirements or shopping corridor requirements, and prohibits commercial center building types. Commercial center building types are not permitted on this site; they are permitted on select corridors, specifically along Bridge Park Avenue and Sawmill Road. This site is located at intersection of the potential Village Parkway extension and West Dublin-Granville Road. Both streets are designated as principal frontage streets. Banker Drives lies to the northeast and an access drive, both of which are potential neighborhood streets. Currently located on the Lowe's parcel to the north, they are designed as private access drives and are not built to public street standards. This proposal for an approximately 6,900-square-foot, multi-tenant commercial building, which will include uses such as restaurants and office. For one of the restaurants, a quick-serve drive-thru accessory use on the east is proposed. The building will be a Loft Building Type. [Site plan was reviewed.] Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and because



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 2, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

1. Baltimore Corner Restaurant (Valentina’s) at 4595 Bridge Park Avenue
21-017MPR **Minor Project Review**

Proposal: Exterior and site modifications to accommodate a restaurant tenant including storefront alterations, an enclosed patio addition, a covered patio space, and associated design details.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Riverside Drive and zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Applicants: Randy Roberty, Design Collective and Wayne Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-017

MOTION: Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of a motion to table the application.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: The Minor Project proposal was approved to be tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|----------------|--------|
| Jane Fox | Absent |
| Warren Fishman | Yes |
| Mark Supelak | Yes |
| Rebecca Call | Yes |
| Leo Grimes | Absent |
| Lance Schneier | Yes |
| Kim Way | Yes |

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Nichole M. Martin

294AB0C6363F490...

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner



~~standards. He inquired if Mr. Barton is the original owner, as the first owner can hold the builder financially responsible for any defects.~~

~~Mr. Barton responded that he is the second owner, but the builder is no longer in business.~~

~~Mr. Fishman responded that regardless, he believes repairing the issue is the correct solution, rather than removal. He is concerned about setting a different precedent.~~

~~Mr. Boggs clarified that it does not take a majority of the full membership to pass a vote; a motion of the Commission can pass with the majority of the quorum present. Therefore, three affirmative votes would be needed.~~

~~Mr. Way moved, Mr. Supelak seconded a motion to table the application.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 5-0]~~

1. Baltimore Corner Restaurant (Valentina's) at 4595 Bridge Park Avenue, 21-017MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for exterior and site modifications to accommodate a restaurant tenant, including storefront alterations, an enclosed patio addition, a covered patio space, and associated design details within Bridge Park, Block B, zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood District. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Riverside Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project. The site is located within the Bridge Park development. Building B2, the Baltimore Building, is located at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive. The tenant space on the corner is adjacent to Riverside Crossing Park, as well as the terminus of the DublinLink Pedestrian Bridge. Photos have been provided to give site context and the existing conditions.

Background

The Bridgepark development was approved in 2015. At the time, the developer was required to designate a shopping corridor. Shopping corridors are intended to be uninterrupted pedestrian ways that allow for the activation of the public realm for outdoor seating and dining. The shopping corridor is required to have a width of 12 feet. Additionally, the pocket plaza located adjacent to this tenant space was also approved as part of the open space plan. There was a condition of approval that the developer work with the City and the Dublin Arts Council to finalize elements in that pocket plaza. The tenant modifications are triggering compliance with that condition, as well as considerations of the details within the public realm and private property. This case has been reviewed twice previously by the Commission, on April 1, 2021 and June 17, 2021.

Updated Plan

In response to the Commission's feedback, the applicant has enhanced and elevated the design to create a sense of place.

The revised proposal:

- Retains the pocket plaza at Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive with soft seating opportunities;
- Reduces the total square-feet of building and number of restaurant seats;

- Reinforces the gateway by exposing the base building's vertical pier including eliminating strong horizontal lines and prioritizing soft canopies;
- Adds a tiered fountain within the right-of-way;
- Adds a mixture of faux and living vegetation; and,
- Adds café style furnishings including a gelato cart.

Ms. Martin reviewed the architectural changes per elevation; including the primary entrance along Bridgepark Avenue; the pocket plaza; the proposed fountain; the enclosed patio space; the covered patio space; right-of-way lines; and modifications to streetscape planters to reduce width allowing a total clear area of approximately 8 feet in width, where 12 feet is required. Staff recommends approval of a waiver to permit a reduced sidewalk width in this area, as it is consistent with the goals of the Bridge Street District by allowing for additional opportunities for outdoor seating and dining that engage the pedestrian realm. All of the patios have operable windows and continuous awnings. The awning is complemented with artificial plants, but staff has included a condition that element be removed.

Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of one waiver and of the Minor Project Review with nine conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Randy Roberty, Design Collective, 151 Nationwide Blvd., Columbus stated that they reviewed the Commission's input from the previous two reviews and identified the following key points: (1) the encroachment into the right-of-way might be considered if it were less intrusive and engaged the pedestrian realm; (2) the verticality of the existing tower/column was designed to identify a gateway into Bridge Park. Maintaining that feature and use was important; (3) the pocket park was critical. Their efforts focused on that gateway space and they have addressed all of the identified issues (reviewed issues addressed).

Commission Questions

Mr. Way inquired if a pocket plaza is intended to be public or private.

Ms. Martin responded that in the Zoning Code, it is intended to be on private property but accessible to the public.

Mr. Way stated that the building line along Bridge Park Avenue was set back for its entire length from the right-of-way. How did that occur? Theoretically, the building could have extended to that line.

Ms. Martin responded that each building type in the Bridge Street District has a required build zone. This is a Corridor Building Type, and the build zone is 0-20 feet, so it could have been extended.

Mr. Way stated that the pocket plaza, however, is a no build zone; it must be an open space.

Mr. Roberty responded that the pocket plaza is within the building lot. It could be comprised of the building, if desired. It was designed as a pocket plaza, but the right-of-way extends to the corner of the site.

Ms. Martin clarified that in 2015, the pocket plaza area could have been comprised of a building, but today, it could not.

Mr. Way inquired if the pocket plaza is on private property, is it part of the tenant's space or part of the Bridge Park development's space.

Ms. Martin responded that it was required to be provided with the development. It is not required to be provided with the tenant space. This tenant has elected to influence the public plaza through their design, triggering review of that area.

Mr. Way stated that the developer is leasing that space. Is the pocket plaza leasable space, and is the tenant then permitted to include it in its leased space?

Mr. Roberty responded that the developer offered the pocket park as part of the occupancy agreement with this tenant.

Mr. Way stated that the way the pocket park space is designed, it looks like a tenant space that is being used as an outdoor dining patio.

Mr. Roberty responded that is partially correct. This pocket plaza space is tucked within the "armpit" of the building; it is a very odd public space. People gathering in the plaza would be gathering against the building. The goal was to provide some of it as restaurant space, so that the restaurant can spill out and "engage the sidewalk," which was a stated goal of Bridge Park. At the same time, it should carve in niches and seating areas that could be utilized by the public. It would be a 50-50 space, so would be busy. If it were only a public space, it would be occupied to a lesser extent.

Mr. Way stated that if the restaurant is using that space to accommodate customers, how comfortable would the public feel entering that space? That would seem to defeat the purpose of a pocket park. The intent is to create an inviting space for the public to use at this key gateway corner in Bridge Park. Because of its relationship to the pedestrian bridge and the volume of people flowing back and forth, it cannot serve both purposes. It either needs to be a public space or a private space. He would argue that it needs to be a public space.

Mr. Roberty responded that their concern with making it entirely a public space is that it would create a void or dead space right on that intersection. The vast majority of the time when people are circulating past, it will be empty, particularly when the Riverside Crossing Park opens. People looking for outdoor public space will likely look within that park, as it will be less awkward and more usable. Because the desire was to create continuous energy on that intersection, using it in a more sustainable manner was their goal.

Mr. Way noted that if a space is designed to be inviting to the public, it would not be a dead space. Is the indoor-outdoor room permanent or temporary?

Mr. Roberty responded that the space south of the bar is a permanent, steel column structure with Pella sliding windows and an awning that camouflages it.

Mr. Way inquired if that area would be an elevated space.

Mr. Roberty responded that there would be a 30-inch high planter that corresponds to the height of the tabletops. The glazing is above that.

Mr. Way inquired the height of the floor of that space above the sidewalk.

Mr. Roberty responded that it would be level with the sidewalk.

Ms. Call reviewed the text from the Bridge Street District Code for placemaking elements:

"(C) BSD Sawmill Center Neighborhood District, 5) Placemaking Elements, (a) Shopping Corridor 1. The intent for designated shopping corridors in the BSD neighborhood districts is to provide continuous mixed-use street frontages with retail uses and eating and drinking facilities occupying the ground floor of buildings located on streets that have a well-defined and detailed pedestrian realm. Buildings with frontage on designated shopping corridors should be sited to accommodate a mix of outdoor activities, such as patios, seating areas, pocket plazas and spacious walkways."

That is repeated essentially in verbatim in "Shopping Corridor," and under "Pocket Plaza" it reads:

"A pocket plaza is designed as a well-defined area of refuge separate from the public sidewalk. These areas contain a greater amount of impervious coverage than other open space types. Seating areas are required, and special features, such as fountains and public art installations are encouraged."

Mr. Schneier inquired if the public would be comfortable sitting down at one of the three tables in the space, and if they did so, would the restaurant inform them that the tables were for diners? The restaurant's intent is to use that space for their diners, but it is in the public plaza. How would this be handled?

Mr. Roberty responded that the intent is that there would be some of both. Their firm handles many similar designs, including the new central block at Easton. In their work with developments, they have found that in order to achieve placemaking, or create an engaging experience, there must be a mix of dining and seating for the tenants, as well as public space. They must integrate 50-50. Otherwise the public spaces feel dead; there is no energy to drive them.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the fountain was proposed in response to the perception that it was what this Commission wanted.

Mr. Roberty responded that in previous meetings, the feedback was that the plan was not offering public art, fountain or another public plaza feature. The fountain was their attempt to address that issue. It can be eliminated, if necessary.

Ms. Call noted the Code also states that, "Outdoor seating areas are required for all pocket plazas and may be required by the reviewing body for other public and private..."

Mr. Schneier stated that if there were some seating areas outside of those tables, they might look more conducive for seating to the public. The Code does not state that all of the seating areas in the plaza must be public, so this proposal would be in compliance with Code.

Mr. Supelak inquired if an 8-foot width sidewalk is sufficient on the west side.

Ms. Martin responded that the minimum required sidewalk width in all of the Bridge Street District is 8 feet in width, and the City Engineer has indicated that they have no objection to the width. The reason it is an item for consideration by the Commission is that because it was designated as a shopping corridor, there are additional requirements; a 12-foot width is required in this area. Because the applicant is requesting an 8-foot width, approval of a waiver is necessary. Staff has recommended approval because it is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Bridge Street District at this key location.

Mr. Supelak stated that 8 feet is sufficient in most situations; however, he wonders if a pinch point could occur here, which ultimately might feel like a barrier. He is concerned, as well, about compressing the planter beds to the point that pedestrians feel too close to the roadway. This should be considered thoroughly.

Mr. Roberty responded that the planter bed along Bridge Park is only 8 feet wide, while the one at this corner will be 11 feet wide.

Mr. Supelak stated that it is also a far faster thoroughfare.

Mr. Way requested clarification of which plants will be real and which would be artificial.

Mr. Roberty responded that the hanging planters and ground-level vegetation would be real. The faux vegetation would be along the top of the awning to soften its connection to the building. Because it is not within proximity to the guests, it would not be noticeable. They would specify a vine that is an evergreen, so it would remain green in the winter months.

Mr. Way noted that all of the real plants appear to be herbaceous, seasonal plants, so would die off in the winter.

Mr. Roberty responded that Cameron Mitchell does seasonal vegetation in all of the planters. The key elements would be specified.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that he is concerned that all of the seating within the pocket plaza must be public. If that is the case, no restaurant seating could be placed there.

Ms. Call stated that, for clarification, the pertinent Bridge Street Code section reads: "Outdoor seating areas are required for all pocket plazas and may be required by the required reviewing body in other public outdoor spaces, including all other open spaces provided in section referenced Code. Where required, there shall be a minimum of one linear foot of seating for every two linear feet of public or private street frontage. The required reviewing body may modify this requirement where conditions warrant greater or lesser seating. Seating requirements may be met through the use of movable seating, fixed individual seating, fixed benches, seat walls, planter ledges, seating steps and other creatively designed seating areas that invite resting and gathering. A combination of seating is encouraged. To ensure adequate seating use by the public, a portion of the required seating must be located within 10 feet of a public sidewalk, where provided."

Mr. Schneier stated that he appreciates the interaction, the attempt to blur the lines, because it is inviting. However, when those lines become too blurred, the private and the public spaces are not identifiable. With The Avenue in Grandview, the outdoor seating for the restaurant is obvious; there is also a sidewalk area. The two areas are clearly delineated, although it feels inclusive. He is concerned how the tables shown in this plan will be accommodated. He likes the fountain, but has no strong position regarding it.

Mr. Fishman stated that he also is concerned about the public and private seating within the pocket plaza. He hates to sacrifice any public seating, as it is likely to disappear entirely. One example of that exists in Dublin, the Oscar's restaurant. Their patio is actually a public seating area, which he believes the City owns. Years ago, there was a sign indicating the public was welcome; however, the sign has disappeared, and the area appears to be restaurant space only. For that reason, he hesitates to give up public space. On a recent Saturday, he was at this corner across from the pedestrian, and the corner was crowded with pedestrian traffic. This is the situation even before the restaurant is developed. Attempting to place both public and private seating on this corner will not work. This is a landing area off the pedestrian bridge, and it should be where the public can sit and meet. The restaurant is beautiful, and he has no issues with that part of the proposal, but he does not believe the private-public area works.

Mr. Roberty requested clarification for how the public plaza is anticipated to work.

Mr. Fishman responded that as pedestrian traffic exits the bridge, they will meet and sit here. It was zoned for this purpose several years ago. As proposed by this plan, it will be confusing for the public, and the restaurant will dominate the space. Attempting to have a restaurant and the public share a space without a distinct delineation of the spaces will be a problem.

Ms. Call reminded members that the review also needs to address the lighting package, real versus faux plants, the fountain, etc.

Mr. Fishman stated that faux plants are typically very difficult to maintain. Where they have been used in other parts of the community, they are usually in disrepair. He believes it is preferable to use live plants that can be regularly maintained.

Ms. Schneier stated he assumes the applicant does not want faux plants at the pedestrian level; he would not be opposed to faux plants as proposed.

Ms. Call stated that the other issue is the requested waiver to the required sidewalk width.

Mr. Schneier stated that he has no objection to the requested width reduction. It is a good tradeoff to achieve the desired private-public energy.

Mr. Way commented:

1. that with the tape markings designating the proposed sidewalk width reveal that the proposed building extension will be very jarring in this space. Building out that façade will create a significant interruption to the face of Bridge Park along Riverside Drive and to the "experience" here. He believes there will be significant public movement here, and he is not supportive of altering the planters or of the building façade extension. The restaurant can reside within the right-of-way line. Although the canopy can remain as an architectural element, everything should be pushed back. He also objects to the proposed 8-foot width. He is presently dealing with this issue with other projects, and an 8-foot width has proven insufficient in cities, such as Bexley. In Columbus, the urban sidewalk width is greater than 10 feet. His position is that the sidewalk here needs to maintain a width of 12 feet.
2. This is the 100% corner of Bridge Park, the iconic corner adjacent to the pedestrian bridge. We are asking this corner to do many things. This corner is asked to engage the public right-of-way, be part of the architecture of Block B, and also serve the tenant space. All of those requirements are not aligned; they are conflicting. It is a design challenge to bring all three elements together in harmony and unity. Presently, the requirements are "opposing each other." The building column and architecture conflict with the design of the tenant space and the pocket plaza. This issue needs much more study. This corner is much too important. The City has made a significant investment in the pedestrian bridge and in inviting people to Bridge Park and Historic Dublin. This key corner should be incredibly powerful. Right now, the many desires for the space are in conflict.

Mr. Supelak stated that the palette is nice, and the proposal has improved since its previous iteration. He believes the proposed signage and lighting package is good. However, he is undecided about the proposed sidewalk width reduction. He believes the reduction could be two feet less without impacting the restaurant interior plans significantly. He also struggles with the pocket plaza proposal for this corner. The Commission probably did encourage a mix of uses in this corner, but the proposed mix is not effective. It must be improved. This is a very busy vehicular corner, and not easily conducive to a "hanging out" corner. However, as a public meeting space across from the bridge, as Mr. Fishman described, is a very good use. While he is generally supportive for the other parts of the proposal, he is not supportive of the pocket plaza as proposed. The design parameters for that space should be to design it so that the City wants to go there. There is merit to including art here to create an experience. There is potential for this corner, but more efforts are necessary to make it amazing and appropriately balance the private-public uses. He has no objection to the proposed faux plants, but iron roof crests potentially could be a better alternative. Any mobile seating elements incorporated on this corner will tend to expand outward.

Mr. Fishman clarified that he is not supportive of the proposed extension of the building, and eliminating that element would eliminate many of the problems being discussed. He concurs with the remainder of his fellow colleagues' comments.

Ms. Call stated that the design has improved significantly; it looks phenomenal. She really likes the canopies, color palette, branding and lighting packages. She agrees with Mr. Way, however, that we are asking a lot of this space, and proposing to shrink some elements to make it work. She believes it may be possible to overcome the seating issue in the public plaza. Perhaps if the seating was pointed in the opposite direction from the restaurant, it would identify the benches as public seating. She agrees that the reduction in sidewalk width is an issue; 8 feet is not very wide elsewhere. It would be more of an issue here on a very populated corner. The restaurant will draw even more traffic there. Therefore, shrinking the width of the sidewalk is a concern. The intent is to attract a lot of people to this area, which is the reason the restaurant wants to locate here. Shrinking the available space for those people to occupy could have the opposite effect and discourage pedestrian traffic. The only concern she has with the lighting package is the string lights, which are secured by posts; that arrangement is not particularly attractive. Placing art in the greenspace is an opportunity. If the planters were to be shrunk and some vegetation removed, re-centering the vegetation would be important.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is not opposed to adjusting the beds, so long as other things occur, such as taller walls, to establish the necessary perception of safety.

Ms. Call stated that if the elevation of the planters were to be changed that would give opportunity for them to be L-shaped and provide public seating. She noted that this Commission requires applicants to abide by the Sign Code, and the signage elements appear to be in excess of Code.

Ms. Martin noted that for clarification purposes, every open space within Bridge Street is located within private property and is accessible to the public and has a private-public element. This is intended to be similar. Additionally, staff is recommending approval of the waiver for the building encroachment, as well as the streetscape modifications. The reason is that, on the approach to the intersection, the planters do not narrow. However, they are much narrower north of the intersection. As traffic slows on the approach to this corner, tapering that planter would not be an issue, per Engineering's review. In regard to changing the elevation, mass and scale of the planters, she would defer to Engineering to comment.

Michael Hendershot, City Engineer, stated that in considering a potential increase in planter height, Engineering would look at site distance triangles to make sure that the height does not impede visibility at that intersection.

Ms. Martin noted that staff would work with the applicant to ensure the signage package meets Code.

Ms. Call referred to the nine proposed conditions and inquired if the applicant had any objection to the first condition to remove the hanging planters and work with the Dublin Arts Commission on identifying a piece of art.

Mr. Roberty noted that it appears that there are two separate pathways of discussion, the pocket plaza and the design of the space. Would it possible to separate and review them separately?

Ms. Martin responded that has occurred previously for some other cases. Typically, there is a trigger point at which the applicant must bring back a revised design to the Commission for consideration, perhaps prior to submitting a Building Permit application.

Mr. Roberty inquired if the Commission would be agreeable to considering them separately. The goal is to advance the project and the pocket plaza seems to be the primary point of contention.

Ms. Call stated that in her view, because of the interplay between the restaurant and the pocket plaza and because part of the pocket plaza would be utilized for restaurant seating, she does not see a way to keep those lines blurred yet delineated for the sake of approvals.

Mr. Way stated that all of the project is part of the corner, so it needs to be considered together. Mr. Supelak expressed agreement.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would want the Commission to consider the proposed items and proceed with a vote at this time.

Mr. Roberty requested that their application be tabled. There is some confusion on their part as to the Commission's direction. The direction seems to be that the pocket plaza needs to be separate from the restaurant; however, there have also been comments that the two should be integrated.

Mr. Supelak responded that the design needs to be integrated; all the components on this corner need to work together well. The applicant has attempted to "spill out" into the space appropriately. However, as proposed, it very much appears to be restaurant space only. The big question is how that area could appear more of a public space. He likes the design of the two sides of the building; however, the corner is a strange amalgamation of "stuff." It needs to be refined more thoughtfully. The public-private areas and the perception of public access is presently incorrect.

Ms. Call stated that she would agree that the design must be integrated, but both private and public uses must be accomplished. Currently, the public use is not present.

Mr. Roberty responded that the challenge is that if the design is integrated, that space will look like part of the restaurant, which conflicts with a public use.

The Commission recommended separating the three tables within the outdoor area from the rest of the public seating. Placing the railing between the two, with the public seating on the outside pointing away from the restaurant would delineate the private use from the public use. The public would be invited from the sidewalk to utilize the public seating outside the railing.

Mr. Roberty inquired if there were one or two successful public plazas in Dublin that he could visit. He believes there is a standard or level that the Commission is trying to describe to them, which he would like to understand.

Ms. Call responded that public plazas are somewhat unique to the Bridge Street District, which is relatively new.

Ms. Martin responded that there are a variety of examples of pocket parks. Staff would review Bridge Park's open space plan to identify other such space for the applicant's consideration.

Mr. Roberty stated that even if it were not within Bridge Park, if they could be directed to an example elsewhere that reflects what the Commission is hoping to achieve, it would be helpful.

Mr. Fisherman stated that the issue is that this is an attempt to put too much restaurant in too little space. He is not in favor of expanding the size of the current tenant space. The open space needs

to remain as large as it is. He also is not supportive of forfeiting any of the sidewalk space. Although he recognizes the applicant's efforts and the proposed restaurant space is beautiful, we want to retain the public space and delineate it as public space. He does not believe it will be sufficient just to point the public seating in the opposite direction of the restaurant. If the restaurant is immediately adjacent, and the tables are right there, the public will not be comfortable in seats that are near the tables, regardless of the direction they are pointing. He would reiterate that this is too much restaurant in too little space, and the building should not be expanded. The plan needs to be re-worked.

Ms. Martin suggested the applicant could capitalize on the Parisian café theme. The types of movable seating and chairs would not be conducive to dinner service. They would be more conducive to card games. There are some design opportunities. Staff would recommend Commission members share any urban design photos they might have available.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant and staff would be amenable to individual Commission members providing staff with preferred pocket plaza ideas, and staff compiling the items on which there is commonality. That consensus pocket plaza ideas and information would be provided to the Commission for consideration and ultimately be forwarded to the applicant to provide better direction for preparing a revised proposal for Commission consideration.

Mr. Boggs stated that individual members could share and discuss their ideas with staff, but a round robin discussion between all members would not be appropriate. It would be staff's responsibility to compile the similar ideas to provide to the applicant. When the applicant returns with a revised plan, that compilation of ideas document would be part of the public record. All of the Commission's consideration would be on the record.

Mr. Way noted three preliminary recommendations: (1) the operable windows between the restaurant and the pocket plaza make the plaza feel a part of the restaurant; solid windows would not; (2) there are too many elements that wall the space off from the right-of-way; the elements should face out toward the right-of-way; (3) the column is a fundamental part of that open space. Perhaps the column and the underside of the balcony could comprise a space.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would be amenable to receiving a compilation of the Commission's public plaza ideas from staff.

Mr. Roberty responded that it would be helpful to review.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of a motion to table the application.

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

[Motion approved 5-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

- ~~Ms. Rauch stated that staff had been working with the Llewellyn Farms neighborhood as well as the commercial property owner related to the DCAP MUR-4 area, and the parties had~~



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 17, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

2. **Baltimore Corner Restaurant at 4595 Bridge Park Avenue 21-017MPR** **Informal Review**

Proposal: Encroachment of the Riverside Drive right-of-way with a building addition and covered patio. This will accommodate a restaurant tenant located within Bridge Park, Block B zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood District.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Riverside Drive.

Request: Informal review and non-binding feedback for a future development application under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Applicant: Carter Bean, Bean Architects; and Wayne Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-017

RESULT: The Commission conducted an informal review and provided non-binding feedback on the proposal to encroach the Riverside Drive right-of-way with a building addition and covered patio. The Commission expressed appreciation for the reduction in size of the building addition and the more open corner for pedestrian circulation. Members of the Commission noted that they could support encroachment into the right-of-way along Riverside Drive provided that the building addition and covered patio blurs the lines between the indoors and outdoors. Members of the Commission noted that the design, as presented, does not create the sense of place the Commission desires.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

| | |
|----------------|--------|
| Jane Fox | Yes |
| Warren Fishman | Yes |
| Mark Supelak | Yes |
| Rebecca Call | Yes |
| Leo Grimes | Yes |
| Lance Schneier | Yes |
| Kim Way | Absent |

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Nichole M. Martin

294AB0C6363F490...

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner



INFORMAL REVIEW CASES

2. Baltimore Corner Restaurant at 4595 Bridge Park Avenue, 21-017, MPR, Informal Review

A request for Informal Review of a proposal permitting encroachment of a building addition and covered patio within the Riverside Drive right-of-way to accommodate a restaurant tenant located within Bridge Park, Block B, zoned Bridge Street District (BSD), Scioto River Neighborhood District.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for an Informal Review of a building located in the Bridge Park Development within the Bridge Street District. The site is located on the east side of Riverside Drive, immediately south of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue adjacent to future Riverside Crossing Park and the DublinLink pedestrian bridge. The site is located on the northwest corner of Building B2, which is the Baltimore Building. This is the ground-story tenant space, which occupies approximately 6,000 square feet. There is a vertical pier and tower element, as well as a pocket plaza at the corner.

History

At the April 1, 2021 PZC meeting, the Commission provided informal feedback regarding façade/storefront alterations, a 625-square-foot building addition, and a 400-square-foot covered patio. At the time, the Commission identified:

- An opportunity to activate the streetscape with the tenant space design;
- The importance of the vertical expression of the building at the gateway;
- Support for the traditional storefront character specifically the conceptual design details depicted in the inspiration images;
- Reservations regarding occupation of the pocket plaza and right-of-way for indoor dining although general support for the covered outdoor dining;
- The pocket plaza, including gateway and public art, serves a greater public purpose that should be preserved and enhanced; and,
- Differing views on alterations to the Riverside Drive streetscape and Shopping Corridor width.

Since April, the applicant has revised the proposal to:

- Retain the pocket plaza at Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive;
- Reduce the total square feet of the building addition and total number of restaurant seats;
- Reinforce the gateway by exposing the base building's vertical pier; and
- Identify opportunities for public art and seating at the gateway.

The design of this tenant space will be further refined if the Planning Commission is supportive of encroachments along the Riverside Drive right-of-way. At the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park, the tenant space is pulled back and is wholly within the private property along Bridge Park Avenue. Along Riverside Drive, the building addition and covered patio are proposed to encroach into the right-of-way by a variable width of 4 feet-11 inches at the south to 6 feet-4 inches at the north. In order to provide clear pedestrian circulation width, the applicant is reducing the width of the planter beds to provide a minimum of 8 feet of sidewalk.

Updated character renderings have been provided. For the pocket plaza, the building has been pulled back from the pedestrian realm to allow for additional circulation and congregation at this

key location. Should the Commission support encroachment along Riverside Drive, the applicant welcomes feedback on the proposed architectural character.

Staff has provided the following questions for the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Does the Commission support encroachments into the Riverside Drive right-of-way for a building addition and a covered patio and associated modifications to the Riverside Drive planters?
- 2) Does the Commission support a Waiver to the Shopping Corridor requirement that a minimum of 12 feet of clear pedestrian area be provided?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual open space details and architectural character?
- 4) Other considerations by the Commission.

Applicant Presentation

J. Carter Bean, Architect, 4400 N High St, Columbus, OH, stated that Ms. Martin's presentation was very thorough. They will continue to work with staff on the details of the project, but, tonight, they would like to ensure they are pursuing the right path regarding encroachment issues and design.

Wayne Schick, Senior VP of Restaurant Planning and Procurement, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants, 390 W. Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, Ohio 43215, stated that they are looking for the Commission's direction so they can continue to move forward and, ultimately, open the restaurant. There are different ways to solve some of the issues, and they have been working with staff on solutions. They are anticipating the Commission's feedback.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Partners, Executive Vice President of Development, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, Ohio, stated that he was not present at the first review of this application; Mr. Hunter represented the company. He reviewed the Commission's comments reflected in the minutes, and they have addressed those concerns with the proposed changes. They would appreciate the Commission's additional feedback.

Commission Questions

Mr. Schneier inquired if staff has a position on the review questions.

Ms. Martin responded that staff is supportive of this project proceeding in some capacity, but there are opportunities to tweak the design. Pulling back the building at the corner begins to fulfill the Code requirements for a gateway site, as well the previously approved pocket plaza. Activating this tenant space and the streetscape in tandem with the opening of Riverside Crossing Park is a significant opportunity for the City and the community. Staff is supportive of the project but would defer to the Commission on the final details.

Mr. Schneier stated that the waiver for encroachment of the outdoor dining space does not seem to be a significant issue, but is that the same for the encroachment for the condition space?

Ms. Martin stated that outdoor dining is an element contemplated in the Bridge Street District, but when there are condition areas, they can become permanent and prominent. Provided that this can be designed and integrated with the tenant space, staff is supportive, assuming that the minimum of an 8-foot sidewalk can continue to be provided.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call requested the Commission to respond to the review questions provided:

- 1) Does the Commission support encroachments into the Riverside Drive right-of-way for a building addition and a covered patio and associated modifications to the Riverside Drive planters?

Ms. Fox stated that she is excited to have this restaurant here. This is a prestigious corner in Bridge Park, from the perspective of the walk from for the Pedestrian Bridge, Riverside Crossing Park and the drive along Riverside Drive. She is supportive of the encroachment for the outdoor dining space, but she is uncomfortable with the design of the building addition. She would have no objection to the dining space being a four-season outdoor dining space. However, the proposed design on this significant corner does not justify giving that land away for this purpose. The City's intent is to invigorate that significant corner; it is paramount in the City's intentions. If something different, dynamic and unique can be captured on that corner, she would be willing to permit encroachment. This gateway element must have artistic interest and invite people to that area to linger. The intent of a 6-foot encroachment is for outdoor dining, but it needs to feel like an outdoor café to draw in passersby. She has forwarded staff a few photos of the type of dynamic spaces that would be desirable on this corner. Paris, for example, is known for its outdoor cafes. Incorporating an indoor-outdoor element that, if heated, could be used in all seasons, would be desirable. [Photos of indoor-outdoor dining spaces shown.] People should be drawn to this corner because it offers a unique dining experience. She would encourage the applicant to elevate the design aesthetics to warrant the encroachment.

Mr. Schneier expressed agreement with Ms. Fox's comments. If the condition space can be transformed to outdoor space at appropriate seasonal times, he would be supportive.

Mr. Grimes stated that the design needs some refinement, but he is supportive of the proposed encroachment.

Mr. Supelak stated that he could be supportive of encroachment, but with stipulations, such as those alluded to by Ms. Fox. Everything along Riverside should have a higher level of vibrancy and animation. This is a prominent corner, but the energy on this corner is lackluster. The design palette is currently underwhelming. The design character is "old," but not vintage and "cool". Cameron Mitchell restaurants do a great job with old, vintage and cool designs, but it is "not there" yet, and presently does not capture energy on this corner. Rather than attempting to alter small nuances, it may require a re-layout of the restaurant to achieve the desired level and flow into the space. If the energy can be achieved, he would be supportive of the encroachment.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is agreement with fellow Commissioners' comments. He hesitates to allow this encroachment, however, as it is not consistent with the intent for this space directly across from the pedestrian bridge. He would like to add a caveat that this building addition be made a conditional use. If this restaurant should leave, the space must be restored to the original intent. Although he is confident in Cameron Mitchell's ability to achieve what the City desires here, he looks at development in the long term. In his experience, variances have often been granted, then long-term, development within a space becomes lacking what was desired.

Ms. Call stated that she is in agreed with fellow Commissioners. While the proposed design is aesthetically pleasing, this particular corner is held to a different standard. It is a "platinum plus"

corner, due to the vision established by City Council for this area, and due to this parcel's relationship to the linear park on the other side of the road. She noted that the following two questions have been somewhat addressed by the Commission. Are there other comments, however?

- (2) Does the Commission support a Waiver to the Shopping Corridor requirement that a minimum of 12 feet of clear pedestrian area be provided?
- (3) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual open space details and architectural character?

Ms. Fox stated that in regard to open space, the pocket plaza is very important. As they design the entrance to the restaurant, they should attempt to achieve a truly unique entranceway, not done elsewhere in the City, or perhaps Columbus. She was somewhat disappointed, as the Commission was told that the vertical element was the pole. The mosaic only extends upward halfway, so the vertical element is only "half dressed." She does not see how that vertical element is addressed, unless some impressive entranceway is incorporated into the plaza that minimizes the importance of the vertical element. The vertical element is very important. At this point, the pocket plaza has only a couple of benches. The encroachment desired can be warranted only with a very attractive, eye-catching design, which Cameron Mitchell is known for.

Mr. Supelak stated that the applicant has an opportunity to create an amazing energy on the corner that is directly associated with the restaurant. In regard to the architecture, previous packet materials reflected several inspiration images that had more energy and reflected a cooler vintage feel than what is accomplished with the proposed design. More of that should be incorporated into the architecture.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant required further input or direction.

Mr. Starr stated that the input has been clear and positive. Encroachment is not off the table, but it requires a "wow" factor.

Mr. Schick stated that there are a couple of items on which he would like additional clarity on the indoor-outdoor dining space. The Avenue was mentioned, but the City has indicated that the manner in which that outdoor dining spills out onto the plaza using vinyl drop-downs is not desired elsewhere. Yet this Commission has stated that the proposed design has too many windows. Windows were used that retract horizontally, because they were unable to use vinyl dropdowns for the four-season aspect.

Ms. Call requested that the photographs of Paris cafes provided by Ms. Fox be shown again, as they address that item directly.

Ms. Fox stated that she was attempting only to show how corner cafes could be integrated with the building. The Avenue's outdoor vinyl windows are not as attractive as The Pearl's outdoor dining area. [Photos shown] Discussion occurred on the indoor-outdoor spaces.

Mr. Schick stated previous staff's direction was that the plaza park should be its own entity and it should not relate to the restaurant. The Commission's feedback tonight appears to want the

restaurant to own the corner plaza and make it truly dynamic and integrated with the feel and design of the restaurant.

Ms. Fox responded that Crawford Hoying had the opportunity to design a plaza, here, if desired. The better design outcome is if there were a significantly beautiful architecture piece in this restaurant, it could be ensured that there was a marriage of the elements to make it look like it belongs there. A couple of benches and a planter pot look inappropriate next to all the investment in this building. She would encourage Crawford Hoying to work with the applicant to make sure that design element is truly "wow." The restaurant and the plaza should look like they belong together.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would be much more in favor of the encroachment if there was an amazing blend of those elements there, improving the overall area. In regard to the Conditional Use factor he suggested, he wants to ensure that it is recognized that it is an encroachment by the next tenant that may occupy this space.

Mr. Starr pointed out that the vertical column that extends upward into the second story is part of a different tenant space. They will have to study that issue.

Ms. Fox stated that she could disregard that unattractive column if this corner were to be made outstanding with a distinct gateway impression. The tower is not a gateway element, only a pole.

Karen Halon, KHA Design Inc., Hollywood, Florida inquired if a fountain could be added.

Ms. Fox stated that the Commission is open to other suggestions, if they are impressive.

Mr. Bean requested the images shared in the meeting be forwarded to them.

Ms. Call thanked the applicant for the presentation. The Commission is anticipating the next iteration and discussion.

~~Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), Mixed-Use Regional (MUR-4) - Informal Review~~

- ~~3. Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), 19-117ADMC - Code Amendments~~**
- ~~4. Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), 21-086ADMC - Design Guidelines~~**
- ~~5. Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), 21-087ADMC - Area Rezoning~~**

~~Request for Informal Review of a proposed Code Amendment creating a Mixed Use Regional (MUR 4), Llewellyn Farms Office, Zoning District and associated development standards, design guidelines and area rezoning.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Rauch presented an overview of the proposed Zoning Code requirements, Design Guidelines and Area Rezoning for the MUR-4 Zoning District within the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP). The Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP) was adopted in September 2018 by City Council as a Special Area Plan within the City of Dublin Community Plan, which included the creation of four new Zoning Districts: MUR-1 (Metro/Blazer District), MUR-2 (Tuttle/Rings District), MUR-3 (Emerald District), and MUR-4 (Llewellyn Farms Office District). The application before the Commission tonight is only the MUR-4 Zoning District. The goals behind the development of the DCAP plan were to:~~

- ~~• Reposition the "legacy" office sites within the planning area for success~~
- ~~• Create a walkable, mixed use environment~~
- ~~• Identify under-served markets~~



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 1, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Baltimore Corner Restaurant at 4595 Bridge Park Avenue
21-017MPR Informal Review**

Proposal: Modifications to accommodate a restaurant tenant including façade/storefront alterations, a 625-square-foot building addition, and a 400-square-foot covered patio located within Bridge Park, Block B zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood District.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Riverside Drive.

Request: Informal review and feedback of a future development application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Carter Bean, Bean Architects

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-017

RESULT: The Commission acknowledged the opportunity to activate the streetscape with the design of the tenant space. Members of the Commission encouraged that the vertical expression of the building be retained. The Commission expressed support for the traditional storefront character specifically the conceptual design details depicted in the inspiration images. The Commission had reservations regarding occupation of the pocket plaza and right-of-way for indoor dining although supported the covered patio space. The Commission noted that the originally approved pocket plaza including gateway and public art serves a greater public purpose that should be preserved and enhanced. Some members supported alterations to the Riverside Drive streetscape while other members indicated the Shopping Corridor should be retained.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

| | |
|----------------|--------|
| Jane Fox | Yes |
| Warren Fishman | Yes |
| Mark Supelak | Absent |
| Rebecca Call | Yes |
| Leo Grimes | Yes |
| Lance Schneier | Yes |
| Kim Way | Yes |

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Nichole M. Martin

294AB066363F490...

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner



CONSENT CASE

2. ~~7211 Sawmill Road, 21-029CU, Conditional Use~~

~~A request for a Conditional Use to allow a Personal Service Use in an existing tenant space zoned Suburban Office and Institutional District, on a site located southwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road with Bright Road.~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Conditional Use with no conditions.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Way, yes. [Motion approved 6-0].~~

INFORMAL REVIEW CASE

1. Baltimore Corner Restaurant, 4595 Bridge Park Avenue, 21-017MPR, Informal Review

A request for modifications to accommodate a restaurant tenant including façade/storefront alterations, a 625-square-foot building addition, and a 400-square-foot covered patio on a site located within Bridge Park, Block B, zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood District, southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Riverside Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and non-binding feedback for a future restaurant, named the Baltimore Corner due to its location. The proposed site is a 6,200-square-foot vacant space located within Bridge Park Block B, Building B2, the Baltimore Building. The development is zoned Bridge Street District (BSD) – Scioto River Neighborhood District and is located southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive, adjacent to Riverside Crossing Park at the terminus of the Dublin Link Pedestrian Bridge. The site is subject to the Neighborhood District standards, which establish unique development regulations in key areas, including gateway locations, shopping corridors, open-space nodes and corridors, and also identify important street network connections and principal frontage streets. A Neighborhood District is intended to have a greater level of activation, as well as pedestrian-friendly placemaking. The intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive is identified as a gateway in the Neighborhood standards. The Code defines gateways as points of interest that provide a sense of arrival to the area. Gateways are intended to provide a combination of architectural elements, landscape features and public open spaces in a manner that is pedestrian-oriented. In areas such as this, with the intersection and the terminal landing of the pedestrian bridge, terminal vistas are required by the Zoning Code. Terminal vistas are defined as vertical landscape or building elements, such as a fountain, tower, bay window or courtyard with sculpture. The final element of the Neighborhood standards is a shopping corridor. Within Neighborhood Districts, shopping corridors are required to be designated in key areas, and a shopping corridor was designated along the frontage of this tenant space. Shopping corridors have an elevated level of treatment, including a minimum of 12 feet of clear pedestrian circulation, within which neither outdoor dining nor seating are permitted. The 600-foot shopping corridor is located on the east side of Riverside Drive and the south side of Bridge Park Avenue.

Background

The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and approved a Development Plan with Conditional Use on July 9, 2015, and a Site Plan, including all final development details, on August 20, 2015 for Bridge Park, Block B. The approved development plans included building types, open space, neighborhood standards, parking, and stormwater details. The original development of Block B required that a minimum of 1.08 acres of open space be provided. At that time, 0.33-acre of open space was provided on-site; 0.75-acre of open space was provided off-site in Riverside Crossing Park; and a 514-square-foot pocket

plaza was designated at the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. The applicant would work with the City and the Dublin Arts Council to develop final elements for that pocket plaza. The Administrative Review Team (ART) is the deciding body for Minor Project Reviews, except in cases where there are complex issues that warrant the Commission's consideration and in cases where Waivers to Code requirements are requested, which are both applicable in this case. On March 11, 2021, the ART determined that the proposal raises complex issues with potential community-wide effects, including:

- Elimination of a 515-square-foot publically accessible pocket plaza intended to serve as a gateway element with public art meeting the Open Space and Neighborhood Standards requirements of the Code;
- Encroachments into the right-of-way within a designated Shopping Corridor typically requiring a minimum 12 feet of clear pedestrian circulation area as established by the Neighborhood Standards; and
- Modifications to public infrastructure (planters) within the Riverside Drive right-of-way to accommodate adequate clear pedestrian circulation area.

The following questions are provided to guide the Commission's Informal Review discussion:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of modifications to the Riverside Drive streetscape?
- 2) Does the Commission support a Waiver to the Shopping Corridor requirement that a minimum of 12 feet of clear pedestrian area be provided?
- 3) Does the Commission support alterations to the originally approved development plan including the pocket plaza, redesigning the gateway/terminal vista, and modifying the condition to provide public art?
- 4) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual architectural character including building materials and design details?

Proposal

The proposal includes three primary elements: façade/storefront alterations, a 625-square-foot building addition, and a 400-square-foot covered patio. The primary tenant entrance is located along Bridge Park Avenue; the building addition is located at the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, and the proposed covered patio is located along Riverside Drive. The storefront character blends traditional details and modern aesthetics with a mix of high quality materials, textures, furniture, finishes, and lighting. The tenant improvements along Bridge Park Avenue do not encroach into the right-of-way. Along Riverside Drive, the building addition and covered patio are proposed to encroach into the right-of-way by a variable width of 4 feet, 11 inches at the south to 6 feet, 5 inches at the north. The existing development agreement provides for the encroachment of patios at the discretion of the City Engineer. As a practice, the City Engineer requires no less than 8 feet of clear pedestrian circulation area throughout the BSD. This minimum circulation distance is greater within a shopping corridor where the Code requires 12 feet of clear pedestrian circulation area. In order to provide additional pedestrian circulation area, the applicant is proposing to reduce the width of two existing planters along the Riverside Drive frontage of the tenant space. The first planter south of the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue is proposed to be reduced by a width of 2 feet-4 inches; the second planter to the south is proposed to be reduced by just under 2 feet. With the expansion of the occupied space in the building and the modifications to the planters, a variable width of sidewalk is achieved, ranging from 8 feet-1 inch at the northern point to 9 feet-2 inches at the southern point.

The applicant is also seeking Commission feedback on the proposed character of the tenant space including entry design, building addition character, and covered patio finishes. The primary elevation of the entire tenant space is proposed to be finished in a tile veneer in a sage color. The entrance incorporates a display window in a decorative dark-stained wood surround adjacent to a matching full-lite wood door and prefinished aluminum revolving door. The entrance is accented by a canopy with canvas valance and marquee bulbs and a series of movable planter pots and benches. Two canopies are

proposed to be constructed: one for the main entry along Bridge Park Avenue, and one highlighting the building addition along Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive. The canopies would be supported by decorative steel columns resting on cast stone plinths and will be finished in a fiber cement panel and fascia trim painted dark brown. The building addition incorporates large, operable, vertical bifold windows in a black finish. Ground-mounted planter boxes would be located between the columns, beneath the windows. The intersection is highlighted by the angle of the building juxtaposed with the corner of the canopy, which is accented with marquee bulbs, planter pots, and two oversized sconces. The covered patio would be enclosed with a dark brown, prefinished curved baluster railing with planter boxes and be covered with a closed-end, multicolor striped canvas awning. Four types of lighting are proposed: marquee bulbs, coach lights, ceiling fans and pendant lights. Patio furniture would consist of black metal table bases with Cambria table tops and brown woven aluminum chairs with a bamboo look.

Applicant Presentation

J. Carter Bean, Architect, 4400 N High St, Columbus, OH, showed images of the proposed elements. They have been aware from the outset that they were requesting major conceptual deviations, but they have worked with staff on designing what is now shown to the Commission. They are showing more information than is typically necessary to give the Commission a full picture of what they are proposing. Everyone recognizes that this is a major intersection in Bridge Park due to the roadways and the pedestrian bridge. The vehicular Riverside Drive traffic and the pedestrian traffic from the bridge converge at this intersection. Although parallel parking and narrower walks exist in this area, the vehicular traffic has slowed considerably from the roundabout up to this intersection. The discussion site is located at the end of that compression of slowing traffic. [Showed slides of the area and existing conditions.] This building has a tower element at the corner, and the proposed tenant site is at the base of that tower. Although this project would eliminate some of the planned public space, currently, the existing space at this intersection is void. The proposed plan would create more sense of arrival in that gateway area. Although they would be reducing the width of the shopping corridor, the compromise will provide a width of 8 feet or more within the space. The proposed modification to the planters would not impact the existing trees. Eliminating two feet from the northern planter and nearly two feet from the southern planter will permit them to extend their space slightly into the right-of-way but still permit the flow of pedestrian traffic. Their service door on the east façade will be within a shared storefront that provides access to the stories above; the new service door will be aluminum and glass. Mechanicals for fresh air intake and HVAC hoods, etc. will be addressed via louvers within transom areas. [Showed 3-dimensional renderings of the proposal.] They have removed the corner column and opened up this corner to enable pedestrian activity. Controlled lighting will be used to activate the space at night.

Commission Questions for Staff

Ms. Fox requested that staff clarify the pocket plaza within the proposed design.

Ms. Martin identified the pocket plaza location and stated that the original development text for Block B of Bridge Park required a certain amount of open space, based on the composition of residential units and commercial square footages. At the time, a total of 1.08 acres for the entirety of Block B was required; the vast majority of that – 0.75 acres, was permitted to be provided in Riverside Crossing Park. The remaining 0.33 acres was to be provided within the Block. The 515-square-foot pocket plaza adjacent to Building B2 was counted toward that overall public open space requirement. The proposed building addition on this corner would incorporate that public space.

Ms. Fox inquired if the public plaza/park was within the building boundaries.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. The 515 square feet of open space is beneath the existing canopy, not the proposed canopy. The open space had to be within the private space, not the right-of-way, which is the reason it is within the footprint of the building.

Mr. Way inquired if the Bridge Street guidelines permit a building to be extended 6.5 feet past the building line.

Ms. Martin responded that is not a provision of the Bridge Street Code. The development agreement between the City and the developer provides some opportunities for right-of-way encroachment of up to six feet at the discretion of the City Engineer, if sufficient circulation space would be remain. The type of items that might be permitted to encroach would be outdoor patios, outdoor seating and overhead canopies.

Mr. Way inquired if there have been any other encroachments to date that fall within that category.

Ms. Martin responded that there have been other encroachments within Bridge Park, but there have not been encroachments within the shopping corridor. What makes this building unique is that it is sited at the boundary of their property and inches from the right-of-way. Consequently, any type of improvement inherently would have to be within the right-of-way.

Mr. Fishman stated that when the Bridge Street Code was developed, pocket parks and open space was a significant topic in every discussion. Although we have given up some space in residential areas of the District, this is a very important corridor. This corner will become a gathering point for people coming across the pedestrian bridge. Because of this, there was already some concern about the amount of public space provided on this corner, and if we give that up, this will be like any other downtown area – no open space to walk or gather. Although the proposed design is quite attractive, we need to look at options that would not encroach into that public area. There is already limited public area, and once it is given away, it cannot be recaptured. This was one of the key elements of the Bridge Street Development Code – open spaces where people could walk and gather. It is unfortunate that the building is inches from the right-of-way, and the only opportunity for adding square footage to the building is to encroach. His position is that the project should be designed to fit within the permitted space, and the City should not give up that very valuable open space for pedestrian activation.

Commission Questions for Applicant

Mr. Way inquired the reason the applicant needs to expand the footprint.

Mr. Bean responded that the reason is to enable viability of a restaurant on this corner. Currently, there is insufficient space to justify the cost of locating there. Additional square footage would permit more seating, which would make the pro forma work. He noted that the way in which the building developed, there is remaining open space to the east; perhaps it would be possible to relocate the 515 square feet there. In addition, there may be opportunity to incorporate more open space into the next phase of development in this District.

Russell Hunter, Executive VP, Development & Design, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Dr, Ste 500, Dublin, Ohio, 43017, stated that Block G will be coming before the Commission in two weeks. There is an aggregate of over 7,000 square feet of open space in that block. The purpose of an Informal Review is to bring forth ideas that may not fit neatly within the boxes but have value. They are aware, however, that this is an "ask."

Mr. Schneier inquired how many seats exist without the pocket plaza area, and how many additional seats would be gained with the area.

Mr. Bean responded that the addition of the pocket plaza would permit 26 additional seats.

Ms. Fox inquired if any consideration was given to placing the entrance to the building at the corner, rather than on the side of the building.

Mr. Bean responded that from the tenant's perspective, that is their "beachfront property." They wanted their diners to be able to look out to the pedestrian bridge. From a functional standpoint, the parking

area is located to the east; 90% of their patrons will be parking there, walking down Bridge Park, and the first opportunity they will encounter is this restaurant.

Ms. Call inquired if there had been any pedestrian traffic studies that could help the Commission understand the potential impact of a diminished pedestrian corridor.

Mr. Hendershot responded that there were no studies that he is aware of, but staff could look into whether it is an item that should be investigated.

Mr. Way requested the applicant's vision of the overall architectural character. It appears a touch of old world charm is proposed within a very contemporary Bridge Park area. What is the inspiration for this architectural character?

Mr. Bean responded that the inspiration are the restaurants that Karen Hamlin, their designer, has completed elsewhere. The concept is Italian, and the detailing is reminiscent of what their designer has done in the other restaurants. In all of them, there is a combination of old world and modern. This is achieved via materials, form, components and lighting, differentiating this building from the rest of their architectural environment, and providing a focal point on this important corner. [inspirational images shown.] They are transforming a monolithic building into a more pedestrian-friendly space at this intersection.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on this case.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call stated that she would suggest the Commission begin its discussion in the reverse order, beginning with the architectural character.

Question #4: "Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual architectural character including building materials and design details?"

Mr. Fishman stated that he likes the proposed architecture.

Mr. Grimes stated that he very much likes the architecture. The materials are warm and inviting. It will provide more vitality at that corner than an art object.

Mr. Schneier stated that he has no objection to the material selections, which are consistent with the architectural theme.

Ms. Fox stated that she likes the aspirational images. She does not object to something unique at the street level, which would be attractive to those coming across the bridge. The overhead balcony overwhelms the ground floor space. Buildings located on corners are positioned to activate the public realm with visual interest. There is an opportunity with this design to add even more visual interest and further accentuate this corner by adding an art element. There was a condition in the development plan that there should be a piece of art work at this corner. To instead add a building expanse that looks like a storefront does not satisfy the promise for this gateway. She has no objection to not placing the interest on the corner, but an interesting space should be created there. She is not in favor of eliminating public space for additional table space in a restaurant, but if they can come up with a great design that will incorporate public art, interest and excitement for that corner, she would be more receptive.

Mr. Way stated that the existing architecture was designed as a vertical element to accentuate the gateway. The column extending down to grade was intended to express that tower. By obliterating the column, the tower appears to have no base. He would prefer that the column be integrated into the design at the ground level, so that it maintains the integrity of the vertical nature of that building at that corner. He likes the mix of old world charm with modern; the details are done nicely. He wonders if it

could look out of place in the Bridge Park streetscape along Riverside Drive. Will this be a “one off,” or perhaps other things will be happening in that corridor that would provide a modulation of the new with the older.

Mr. Hunter responded that there are couple of other places that do something similar, such as Cap City Diner, which is a 50’s diner at the base of a very modern building. There are some additional ones anticipated in Block D across from the North Market. He does not believe this will be a “one off;” he is excited by the layers that are happening. Five years in, the development is beginning to mature and it is beginning to feel authentic. We will continue to see this type of modulation.

Ms. Call stated that she agrees with both Mr. Way in regard to the vertical element and with Ms. Fox regarding an art element, and if Italy is the inspiration, there is no shortage of potential art pieces that would achieve both. Her only other comment concerns the planters. Water will seek the lowest level, and hence the public plaza on the corner. That corner could become unattractive quickly if the planters do not receive regular upkeep. Some of the planter frames appear to be wood, which could leak water and stain the concrete. She likes the general architecture and believes there is opportunity to further enhance its character by bringing more of it to the forefront.

Ms. Fox stated that her impression is that even though it adds a little old world Italian character at the streetscape, it is non-distinct; it could be found in any shopping district; it does not “wow” pedestrians coming across the street. If outdoor dining is included, there needs to be more emphasis between the ground floor and the second floor, as that second floor is a strong element; it overwhelms the streetscape. It will be important to make a strong effort to ensure that the architectural detailing and projections project the impression of a classy, unique restaurant. If there is insufficient detail, it will be lost by the heavy impression of the upper floors.

Question #3: “Does the Commission support alterations to the originally approved development plan including the pocket plaza, re-designing the gateway terminal vista, and modifying the condition to provide public art.”

Ms. Fox stated that she does not support the alterations as proposed. The originally approved development plan included the pocket plaza for a reason, although, currently, it is unattractive and unusable. She would consider relocation of the public plaza, but she is not willing to give up the public art and gateway feature. Currently, the trade-off is inadequate. It is important to ensure that this corner does exactly what we want it to do. The Bridge Street Development Code does permit public plazas to be covered structures. The applicant could incorporate the pocket plaza into the design of the building and include the column in an interesting manner, but it would be a creative challenge. However, she would not be willing to sacrifice this public right-of-way for the purpose of adding extra tables.

Mr. Fishman stated he agrees with Ms. Fox’s comments. He believes Mr. Hunter indicated that they could make up the public space with the next building project to the north. That might be a consideration, if they could make this corner exciting by including public art interest. He inquired if the public space to the north would be 500 square feet.

Mr. Hunter responded the current space at this corner is 515 square feet, and the overage within G Block, which is to the east, is over 7,000 square feet.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would be willing to consider this possibility, if a solid commitment were made to not take away any more public space from Bridge Street. Public space eliminated in one place would need to be made up within a reasonable distance. A significant amount of arduous work was invested in the development plan to ensure there would be pocket parks and open space that would make Dublin’s downtown area unique. This corner would need to be made spectacular, as we are envisioning hundreds of people coming across the pedestrian bridge. As has been stated, with the Italian theme, it should be

possible to identify a vertical piece of art. While the effort of the proposal is good, he opposes the loss of any more public space in Bridge Park. If the applicant would commit to replacing the public space, he would be willing to consider it, depending on how public interest on this corner would be achieved.

Mr. Way stated that his issue with the three proposed alterations is that there is no plan for replacing the public plaza, vertical element or public interest. He would feel more comfortable if options were proposed. It would be difficult to integrate a public park at this corner, so it may need to be an architectural corner, and that column should be part of it. There could also be a way to keep the open space around the column. He would like to see some options before deciding to eliminate any of these items.

Mr. Schneier stated that while he has no objection to the architectural character of the design, he does object to elimination of the public plaza. He believes it needs to remain here and not be traded off for another location -- this corner is a focal point. He is not supportive of the applicant's proposal to claim and enclose the space in exchange for open space somewhere else. Although the current public space is not attractive, it exists. He is not in favor of any tradeoff; it should remain and be enhanced. The Commission would be very interested in suggestions for making the public space more attractive.

Mr. Grimes stated that he finds it difficult to believe the existing space could be turned into something more attractive; hiding it would be better. He loves pocket parks and believes there should be many integrated frequently throughout the District; however, the size of this public space is so small, he is not convinced it rises to the level of a pocket park. This corner is immediately across the street from a large public park, and there will be a large number of pedestrians gathering on this corner before crossing the street. He is concerned that enclosing the corner could diminish the ability for pedestrians to cross the street from both directions. He believes that pedestrians crossing from the bridge would be less interested in stopping at this corner than in moving on into the District. Therefore, he would be favor of moving the public plaza up/down the street or around the corner. For relocating the public space to be considered, it would be necessary for the applicant to provide a creative, interesting solution for this corner. As such, it would be reminiscent of many other interesting corners that he has seen around the world; they become public rendezvous sites, a restaurant that is a destination. It will require a professional with artistic inspiration to find a compromise that can achieve this while also provide what the developer wants. This restaurant could be an attractive, pulsating destination point for pedestrians crossing from the other side of the river. This would have a positive impact on surrounding businesses, as foot traffic also moves further into the District. Having a busy restaurant on this corner would add appeal and draw in more visitors to the District. The volume of both vehicular and pedestrian in this area, particularly if there is an event, will need to be managed. With the plethora of outdoor amenities throughout the area, what would the City gain or lose with this proposal? That question will remain open until more information is provided for further consideration, but he likes what he has seen.

Ms. Call stated that to help in distinguishing between a public plaza and a pocket park, she would read the Code definition for public plazas. "Pocket plazas are intended to provide a formal open space of relatively small scale to serve as an impromptu gathering place for civic, social or commercial purposes. The pocket plaza is designed as a well-defined area of refuge separate from the public sidewalk. These areas contain a greater amount of impervious coverage than other open spaces. Seating areas are required, and special features such as fountains and public art installations are encouraged." Pocket plazas serve a different purpose than pocket parks, and the Code encourages uniqueness within these spaces. In addition to the lack of an impromptu meeting place with seating area, there is the issue of the terminal vista. Traffic from the pedestrian bridge is not all destined for the same restaurant. The public plaza should be a meeting place and a transitory place. It is not just an issue of how the front of the building is faced. What is there now was never going to be its future.

Mr. Fishman stated that he agrees with those comments. In retrospect, he would be agreeable to trading off the public plaza only if there was no other support on the Commission for keeping it. Keeping it is consistent with the significant planning investment that went into this District. He believes the Commission should encourage the applicant to revise the design in a way that would not eliminate the public plaza.

Question 2: "Does the Commission support a Waiver to the Shopping Corridor requirement that a minimum of 12 feet of clear pedestrian area be provided?"

Ms. Call stated that a large number of pedestrians crossing from the bridge will be congregating at this corner, as they have not yet decided where they are going when they reach this stretch of sidewalk. As the foot traffic dissipates into the District as their destination is known, the density of pedestrians will become lighter. The greatest density will be at the terminus of the bridge, directly across the street, and at this corner. It is important to consider the question from the perspective of visitors experiencing this area for the first time and from a 5- to 20-year planning perspective.

Mr. Grimes and Mr. Schneier expressed support for the Waiver.

Mr. Way stated that he was not supportive of the Waiver. Much time and effort were invested in establishing the guidelines for how development would occur in this area, and it includes many good ideas. He has worked on shopping corridors all over the world, and there are certain dimensions that should not be reduced. Four people -- two people walking side by side from both directions -- can meet and pass within a 12-foot corridor. That is an intended dimension, one which he himself has used many times, as it allows for easy movement. Reducing it to 8 feet would be too constrained. He believes it is important to retain the 12-foot corridor.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement.

Ms. Fox stated that in general, she also agrees. However, she would consider some encroachment for outdoor dining. The Code states that, "the shopping corridor is to provide continuous mixed-use street frontages, with retail uses, eating and drinking facilities occupying the ground floor of buildings located on streets with a well-defined and detailed pedestrian realm." That is the key. Because the area along Riverside Drive is the front door for pedestrian traffic coming from the bridge, it should be activated. Unfortunately, it is difficult to achieve activation from streetside dining because of the lack of space here. Therefore, she would give some consideration to the outdoor dining piece including the possibility of adjusting the planters. However, the design will have to be so impressive and satisfy all the desired elements for her to give that consideration. This restaurant must be significantly classy and stunning to give away such valuable right-of-way and be able to create a streetscape that is very activated and inviting. She is thinking of European plazas -- this proposal is not there yet with just a striped awning, wrought iron dividers and planter boxes. Currently, no level of beauty exists for which she would consider giving away right-of-way. It may be able to reach that; however, it would be a challenge. At this point, she can say only that she would give it some consideration.

Ms. Call stated that because of all the previous thought and planning and due to how dense the foot traffic can be in areas of passing, she would be more supportive of shrinking the shopping corridor at the end of the denser area, in the transition areas. Here, a width of 12 feet is necessary for stacking traffic, children and strollers. She agrees with Ms. Fox that there might be some possibility, if there were some appealing trade-off.

Question 1: "Is the Commission supportive of modifications to the Riverside Drive streetscape?"

Mr. Way stated that if the 12-foot corridor is not retained, there is no need to reduce the width of the planters. The comment was made earlier that reducing the width of a planter would not impact the plants

within it; however, in order to re-install the curb, it will be necessary to cut into that planter significantly. That would be disruptive to the existing landscape, although it could be replaced. Because a beautiful streetscape has been implemented here and is now enjoyed, eliminating and changing some parts of it does not seem to be the right direction. In view of the intensive level of thought, effort and investment previously made, he believes the streetscape should be left as it is.

Mr. Schneier stated that he has no objection to reduction of the planter space. He would be willing to consider it in order to gain the outdoor dining, which would bring energy to the area. Facilitating the necessary outdoor seating to have that would be worth the trade-off.

Mr. Grimes stated that he would be supportive of the modification to the Riverside Drive streetscape.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is in agreement with the comments offered by Mr. Way.

Ms. Fox clarified that for the building footprint, she is not willing to reduce the 12-foot corridor. For the outdoor dining component, she would be willing to consider a lesser amount of encroachment, although she would prefer to keep the sidewalk 12 feet. We have been supportive of outdoor dining throughout the District both to activate the streetscape and for pandemic-related reasons, and that outdoor dining has proven to be popular. It would be preferable to tuck the outdoor dining more into the building footprint, if it were possible. Although she is not supportive of the building encroaching into the right-of-way, she would be inclined to consider a waiver for the outdoor dining.

Ms. Call stated that although it is not desirable to disrupt attractive landscaping, she would be more supportive of shrinking a planter slightly than shrinking the width of the walkway.

Mr. Hunter stated that the 12-foot area they are asking to reduce is to the south of Bridge Park Avenue and along Riverside Drive; it is not the side adjacent to Bridge Park Avenue. The planter that they are proposing to reduce is currently 16 feet wide.

Ms. Fox inquired if the planter on the corner of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park within the area of the proposed outdoor dining and the planter on Bridge Park Avenue near the restaurant entrance were the same widths.

Mr. Hunter responded that the planter on Bridge Park Avenue is 8 feet wide; the planter on Riverside Drive is 16 feet wide.

Ms. Fox inquired if moving southward on Riverside Drive, the planter widths decreased, or if they were all 16 feet wide.

Mr. Hunter responded that he believes they are all 16 feet wide up to Banker Drive.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission appreciates working with partners who are attempting to bring incredible assets to the City. This restaurant would be a significant asset; however, there will be hurdles to jump.

Mr. Way inquired if there is a residential unit immediately above the canopy on the corner.

Mr. Bean responded that he believes it is a dentist's office.

Mr. Way questioned the safety situation for a dentist's office with a railed balcony. If someone were to climb over that railing and access the roof, the roof has no barriers. Are there any associated Code requirements?

Mr. Bean responded that the existing railing satisfies Code.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had sufficient direction to proceed.

Mr. Bean responded that they appreciate the feedback, none of which was a surprise. They would consider the comments and determine if modifications were possible that would enable them to proceed with the project.



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, March 11, 2021

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

4. Baltimore Corner Restaurant **4595 Bridge Park Avenue**
21-017MPR **Minor Project Review**

Proposal: Construction of a ±6,200-square-foot restaurant with 400 square feet of outdoor dining patio space at an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Riverside Drive.

Request: Review and approval for the Minor Project Review to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission for determination under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Carter Bean, Bean Architects

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/art/21-017

Request: Forward the Minor Project Review application to the Planning and Zoning Commission for review and determination as raises complex issues with community-wide effects that would benefit from a public review and decision.

Determination: This application will be forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission for determination (7 – 0).

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Jennifer Rauch

C08B79E0958D44D...

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP
Planning Director



conditions.

~~**Votes:** Ms. Gilger, yes; Mr. Fagrell, yes; Mr. Hamilton, yes; Mr. Hendershot, yes; Mr. Flora, yes; Sergeant Rice, yes; Mr. Hiatt, inaudible; and Ms. Rauch, yes. The Minor Project was approved with three conditions (7-0).~~

RECOMMENDATION

4. **Baltimore Corner Restaurant 21-017MPR**

4595 Bridge Park Avenue Minor Project Review

Ms. Martin said this a recommendation for a proposal for the construction of a ±6,200-square-foot restaurant with 400 square feet of outdoor dining patio space at an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The aerial view showed the multiple blocks and buildings in this development. Building B2 (the Baltimore Building), where the tenant space is located, was highlighted and she noted the terminus of the Dublin Link Pedestrian Bridge and River Crossing Park, which are nearby.

Ms. Martin presented the existing conditions of the tenant space as viewed from Riverside Drive looking east up Bridge Park Avenue, including the outside patio, sidewalk, and cycle track. The second view is the primary entrance located along Bridge Park Avenue. Building B2 sits right along the right-of-way line with the majority of the sidewalk and planter in the public right-of-way of Riverside Drive. The tenant improvements along Bridge Park Avenue do not encroach the right-of-way.

Ms. Martin stated on July 9, 2015, the PZC reviewed and approved the Development Plan with Conditional Use and a Site Plan, including all final development details, on August 20, 2015, for Bridge Park, Block B. This included the designation of a shopping corridor. Also in 2015, publically accessible open space was required to be provided based on a calculation of the combination of uses. One of the uses was a 515-square-foot pocket plaza where this tenant will reside.

Ms. Martin said the proposal includes façade/storefront alterations, a 625-square-foot building addition, and a 400-square-foot covered patio. The tenant modifications are intended to establish a brand identity and to activate the streetscape consistent with the goals and objectives of the BSD. The storefront character blends traditional details and modern aesthetics with a mix of high-quality materials, textures, furniture, finishes, and lighting. The primary entrance is located along Bridge Park Avenue. Along Riverside Drive, the building addition and covered patio are proposed to encroach the right-of-way by a variable width of 4 feet, 3¹/₈ inches at the south gradually widening to 6 feet, 5 inches at the north end. The approved development agreement provides for the encroachment of patios at the discretion of the City Engineer. As a practice, the City requires no less than 8 feet of clear pedestrian circulation area throughout the BSD. The applicant is proposing to reduce the width of an existing planter by 2 feet, 4 inches, located within the right-of-way, originally constructed with the Riverside Drive realignment. With the proposed planter modifications, the applicant is able to provide a variable clear pedestrian circulation width of 8 feet, 1¹/₂ inches at the north to 9 feet, 9³/₄ inches. Adjacent to the covered patio further south, there is an 8-foot-⁵/₈ inch width of clear pedestrian circulation.

Most recently, the proposed tenant modifications were introduced to the ART on March 4, 2021. At the time, the ART identified a number of items for the applicant's consideration detailed below:

- Projects in the BSD require a delicate balance between pedestrian circulation and streetscape activation.
- Riverside Drive frontage is an underutilized opportunity for Bridge Park tenants.



- Concern regarding constricted pedestrian circulation at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive acknowledging that in the future this may be one of the busiest pedestrian intersections in Dublin.
- The Gateway element, required by the Neighborhood Standards, at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive should be maintained.
- Public art and open space, meeting the original intent, should be provided.
- Opportunity to provide more integration between the second story balcony, proposed canopy, and sign design at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive.
- Encouraged a more organic arc to the proposed planter modifications.

Ms. Martin stated Staff has identified several complex items, which are the basis for a recommendation to the Administrative Team Review that the application be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their consideration as follows:

- 1) Elimination of a 515-square-foot publically accessible pocket plaza intended to serve as a gateway element with public art meeting the Open Space and Neighborhood Standards requirements of the Code;
- 2) Encroachments into the right-of-way within a designated Shopping Corridor typically requiring a minimum 12 feet of clear pedestrian circulation area as established by the Neighborhood Standards; and
- 3) Modifications to public infrastructure (planters) within the Riverside Drive right-of-way to accommodate adequate clear pedestrian circulation area.

Ms. Martin said there were no public comments at this time.

Mr. Bean, Architect, said he wanted to address some of the items of concern from last week's ART meeting and had additional materials to share. Conversation constricting pedestrian flow at the corner toward the south along Riverside Drive only showed modifications to the northern most streetscape planter. The plans today show a decrease to the width of the second planter as well. He presented updated renderings that showed less construction, removed a column, and showed the additional modifications to the planters so they align with a gentle arc design, as recommended by the ART. The result is favorable as originally they proposed 8 feet of pedestrian circulation clearance and now they can provide 9 feet, 2 inches. To address the ART's concerns about photometric light levels, the applicant generated a new Photometric Plan. The original plan showed maximum output levels but they will not have the light set at full output, using dimmers to use 60% light levels. A rendering was shown of the overhead view to show the proposed modifications that included the adjusted planters with the gentle curve. The column had been removed and contrasting color pavers added. The windows retracts up and out of which he provided in the nighttime view. Wall washing features were added to rail planter boxes. He presented a rendering of the proposed covered patio with awning. Renderings indicated the trees and configuration in the existing planters with the modified curve will not affect the root zone.

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, addressed the shopping corridor and open space issues. He said Crawford Hoying Development Partners are willing to find other areas or blocks for open space. He ensured this proposal is activating this gateway and corner, while acknowledging the loss of open space at the same time.

Mr. Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said he had been meeting with potential users and this location is where they all wanted to be. He stated this is an important corner and Crawford Hoying wanted a particular use to activate this corner in a high quality way. Additionally, the tenant had to tie into what was happening across the street; these are not easy asks but achieved with the height quality approach. If the tenant had to strictly operate within the boundaries of the property lines, this project would not be financial viable.



Ms. Rauch recalled the complexity discussion at the last ART meeting. She said the applicant will need a Waiver in conjunction with the proposed improvements and will require the PZC's review. She asked the ART members for further comment. Mr. Hendershot said he appreciates the updates, including moving the post. He agreed, this will need a review from the PZC as this is now not within the ART's authority.

Ms. Martin said there were no public comments to add.

Ms. Rauch made a motion and Mr. Hendershot seconded, for the recommendation to allow further review from the PZC and they will be the determining reviewing body for this application.

Votes: Mr. Flora, yes; Sergeant Rice, yes; Mr. Hiatt, inaudible; Mr. Hamilton, yes; Mr. Fagrell, yes; Ms. Gilger, yes; Mr. Hendershot, yes; and Ms. Rauch, yes. The motion passed 7 – 0.

ADJOURNMENT

~~Ms. Rauch asked if there were any other comments or questions [Hearing none]. She adjourned the meeting at 3:04 pm.~~





RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, March 4, 2021

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

- 1. Baltimore Corner Restaurant** **4595 Bridge Park Avenue**
21-017MPR **Minor Project Review**
- Proposal: Modifications associated with the construction of a restaurant including a 625-square-foot building addition, and a 400-square-foot covered outdoor dining patio space at an existing tenant space located within Block B of the Bridge Park Development.
- Location: Southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Riverside Drive.
- Request: Review and non-binding feedback of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
- Applicant: Carter Bean, Bean Architects
- Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II
- Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us
- Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/art/21-017

Request: Review and non-binding feedback at the introduction of a Minor Project.

Result: The Administrative Review Team provided non-binding feedback on the proposed site and building modifications. Members generally agreed that the reduction in clear pedestrian area was not preferable, specifically citing the requirements for pedestrian walkways in dedicated Shopping Corridors. Additionally, members expressed that in no case should the pedestrian clear area be reduced to less than eight feet in width. ART members requested that the applicant explore ways to ensure adequate clearance in the area adjacent to the proposed restaurant along Riverside Drive. The Team identified that foot traffic in the immediate area is expected to increase once Riverside Crossing Park opens to the public. ART members acknowledged and generally agreed that the pedestrian activation along Riverside Drive has not reached intended levels, partly due to a lack of tenant space engagement with the street, and this proposal provides the desired activation. ART members expressed that the gateway element should be maintained, and emphasized the importance of the gateway in relation to the pedestrian bridge. The ART generally agreed that there is an opportunity to provide more integration between the second story balcony, proposed canopy, and sign design at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive. Members encouraged a more organic arc to the planters along Riverside Drive, should they be modified.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP
Planning Director





MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, March 4, 2021 | Live Streamed on YouTube at 1:00 pm

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Rauch welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm.

Per the State of Emergency, laws were enacted including the Stay at Home Order for which the City will need to live-stream all public meetings until that order has lifted. Comments can be submitted on the City's website before or during the meeting.

ROLL CALL

ART Members and Designees present: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Director (Chair); Brad Fagrell, Director of Building Standards; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect Manager; Renae Rice, Police Sergeant; and Brad Flora, Washington Township Fire Department Inspector.

Staff Members present: Chase Ridge, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner II; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Assistant II.

Applicants present: (Case 1) Carter Bean, Architect; Wayne Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants and Karen Hanlon, Karen Hanlon Design.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Rauch made a motion and Ms. Gilger seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on February 11, 2021.

Votes: Mr. Fagrell, yes; Mr. Stanford, yes; Mr. Krawetzki, yes; Mr. Flora, yes; Sergeant Rice, yes; Ms. Gilger, yes; and Ms. Rauch, yes. The minutes were approved 7 – 0.

Ms. Rauch noted the two Minor Modifications:

1. Bates and Brown Barbershop – Storefront modifications – Change in building material or color.
2. Germain Honda of Dublin – Permeable pavement – Other modifications deemed appropriate by the Planning Director.

INTRODUCTION

1. Baltimore Corner Restaurant 21-017MPR

4595 Bridge Park Avenue Minor Project Review

Ms. Martin said this an introduction for a proposal for the construction of a ±6,200-square-foot restaurant with 400 square feet of outdoor dining patio space at an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park with Riverside Drive in Block B of the Bridge Park Development. She presented a graphic of the proposed site plan and noted the tenant space was in the northwest corner Building B2. She provided detail of the site, noting the terminus of the Dublin Link Pedestrian Bridge and River Crossing Park.

Ms. Martin presented the existing conditions of the tenant space as viewed from Riverside Drive looking east up Bridge Park Avenue, including sidewalk, cycle track, and outside patio. The tenant space above will be discussed later in this presentation. The tenant space is within the black enclosure proposed to be occupied by the applicant. Additional views were provided of the site and the surrounding context. The first looks south along Riverside Drive; note the black enclosure is the tenant space to be modified with this application. Looking north along Riverside Drive; note the planters along Riverside Drive that were part of public improvements with the realignment of Riverside Drive. Building B2 sits right along the right-of-way line with the majority of the sidewalk and planter in the public right-of-way. Additional context of the pedestrian gathering area right at the intersection was presented.

Ms. Martin presented a graphic of the overview of Block B in context with the surrounding blocks in the development. It is important to note that with the original approval of this block development, a shopping corridor was designated as required by the neighborhood standards and this site is presently zoned the Scioto River Neighborhood District. The shopping corridor has additional standards with a use-specific standard of a minimum 12-foot clear pedestrian circulation area that shall be provided along the shopping corridor frontage. This allows for activation of the public street in the shopping area.

Ms. Martin presented two graphics of the approved open space plan in detail. She noted the designated public open spaces and the 512 square feet of open space designated as a pocket plaza for Building B2, which serves as a gateway location and contributes to the overall amount of open space.

Ms. Martin presented the site plan in detail with interior tenant improvements as well as exterior improvements proposed. She highlighted the right-of-way encroachments including the open and enclosed patios along Riverside Drive. The enclosure of the plaza area extends along Riverside Drive, west of the right-of-way line. The enclosed patio encroachment is 6 feet, 5 inches and encroachment of the open and covered patio area is 4 feet, 3 inches. To accommodate the clearance requirement, the applicant is proposing to modify the size of the City planter within the right-of-way by decreasing the width by 2 feet to provide 8 feet of clear circulation. This modification would provide only 6 feet in some areas whereas 12 feet is the minimum requirement in the shopping corridor.

Ms. Martin said the applicant provided character images to help the ART understand the text and scope of improvement. In the graphic, the enclosed covered patio and the Nano wall system for the covered and open patio system, along with the modified planter width were shown as part of this proposal. She noted the main entrance to the restaurant and the modifications along Riverside Drive that occur within the public right-of-way. For context, a view looking north along Riverside Drive shows the covered and open patio as well as the enclosed patio, which becomes a building addition in this case. The main entrance enclosure is part of the original dedicated open space area.

Ms. Martin provided an overview of the ART process for this application. She said in today's meeting, the expectation is that the ART makes a determination that this proposal impacts the greater surrounding community so it should be further reviewed by the PZC for ultimate consideration. Hence, the scope of the presentation today only covered overarching improvements of this proposal; at the next ART hearing, Ms. Martin plans to provide design finishes. She concluded her presentation by opening the meeting up for discussion.

Mr. Krawetzki said he understands modifying the front planter but inquired about how the pedestrian way is impacted on the other side with the cycle track. Ms. Martin answered, the modifications along Bridge Park Avenue will not encroach the right-of-way. Therefore, clearance for the cycle track and sidewalk will be maintained.

Mr. Fagrell asked how patrons enter into the narrower eating area. Mr. Bean, Architect, shared his screen to show there are accessible paths for the two doors leading out to the eating area in the outdoor patio space. He indicated it is tight at the pier but he established accessible eating in the northern portion of the dining area. He noted the access and egress aisle is 44 inches narrowing down to a 36-inch path. Mr. Fagrell

requested the total width of the area out toward the building. Mr. Bean answered 7 feet, 8 inches.

Mr. Bean asked if it was appropriate to add some discussion about building materials or to just entertain more questions. Ms. Rauch asked the ART if there were additional questions. [Hearing none] the applicant was permitted to move forward with a presentation.

Mr. Bean indicated he was aware the proposal does not fit within the original requirements established for this block. He indicated the submission did not address overarching planning for getting where they are today. Mr. Bean said he had a series of slides he wanted to present to show their thought process for this project. As one drives along Riverside Drive from the roundabout, the vehicle is at a higher speed of travel and the site scape and the buildings react to this condition with taller buildings with detail elevated, pedestrian spaces on the exterior, and elevated pedestrian areas to establish clear definition between car and person. Proceeding north, the traffic slows down in the "compression zone". Approaching the end of Block A, views start to open up, the scale of buildings is reduced, and more pedestrian ways are introduced continuing north. Block B is the beginning of the compression zone; pedestrian areas become closer to street level. Moving toward Pins, there is more guarded outdoor space. The building is set back and the height of the building is reduced down to two stories. Levels of pedestrian space open up above. This is where one becomes aware of the Dublin Link Bridge. Along with the pavilion in Riverside Crossing Park that is now erected, one starts to see break lights from the stacking of traffic. Moving toward the northern part of Block B, where this proposal exists, the northern building has a much more reduced scale, and the pedestrian activity is down at the streetscape level. This is where the pedestrian crossing is approached. The intersection shows the tenant space and area the applicant plans to occupy along the street. There is a clear definition of street scape space and the intention of slowing traffic approaching the pedestrian crossing where there is: more outdoor activity spaces; canopies coming off the building at a pedestrian scale; off-street parking; and pedestrian seating areas translating these zones to an overall plan. He noted the Dublin Link Bridge, terminating at the north side of the intersection. Along Block A there is a higher vehicular speed zone, along the south half of Block B is the beginning of the compression zone and in the north part of Block B is the height of compression approaching the pedestrian crossing. Once through that intersection with on-street parking, there is a reduced speed zone. With a reduction in scale and the increase of detail and activity, this proposal reinforces the evolution of space and perception additionally, as one is arriving as a pedestrian that crossed the bridge, creating an inviting, energized space. This tenant space is an opportunity to further detailing of the building and pedestrian scale for further awareness of pedestrian activity and calmness of traffic.

Mr. Bean presented renderings of a higher quality than what was submitted. He said they created intentional spaces where pedestrians are invited, feel comfortable, and activate that area to increase everyone's awareness and experience.

Mr. Bean explained the precession of elements from a covered outdoor patio to an indoor/outdoor enclosed space is further compression from outside. This piece on the corner will be indoor/outdoor space. The windows will fold up and project out providing a lot of communication at a high level of detail to this plaza. By building out into this area, this is still a very sizeable plaza at the corner.

Mr. Bean indicated he likes how the pavilion has turned out across the street. The best aspects of it, since he has seen it mainly at night, is how that corner is lit up at night. The applicant does not want this to disappear at night and by adding a nice lighting plan, it will heighten one's awareness and marks the important pedestrian intersection crossing. Lastly, he presented a patio view for the pedestrian.

With regard to the 12-foot pedestrian way along the street, Mr. Bean said they are asking for a reduction in width, in conjunction with modifying the planter, proposing 8 feet of clearance instead of 12 feet. He presented the City's planter in its existing condition - a before and after modification of the planter as proposed with the new edge pushed in. This will still remain out of the drip line of the trees planted there and will not impact the plantings negatively. The building would project out and they would maintain an 8-foot clearance. The aerial view he presented was a recap of everything he mentioned – the scale heading

northbound from Block A to Block B south to Block B north. This proposal is in line with the intention of reducing scale and increasing interest and activity in this area.

Ms. Rauch indicated that by the applicant providing a background and the additional pictures, it was helpful to the team to better understand the proposal.

Ms. Rauch asked if any public comment was received. Ms. Martin answered there were no public comments. Ms. Rauch called for questions.

Mr. Krawetzki indicated there has been a lot of discussion on how protrusions might affect the cycle track and movement of pedestrians. He noted that the rendering shows that it is still fairly open for the cyclist. He stated he was not concerned with the planter but is concerned about the compression of that open space that is receiving pedestrians from the Dublin Link Bridge and cycle track as that whole movement is being compressed.

Ms. Martin stated pedestrian circulation is the number one goal of the Bridge Street District as a whole - to prioritize the pedestrian experience. When we consider vehicular uses versus pedestrian uses, we will always maintain as much room for the pedestrian as possible. Hence, the reason for the 12-foot clearance that was adopted in the Zoning Code. By asking to narrow pedestrian circulation that is asking for a deviation of the Code and conflicts with the goals and objectives for the Bridge Street District. The PZC may be better able to address. Staff would always advocate for as much space as possible for pedestrians. Staff believes the applicant can still achieve objectives while being cognizant of the City's intentions.

Mr. Krawetzki said he likes the design but because this is a gateway and the amount of space that was carved out for that purpose, he is concerned about the gathering of people happening at that corner. He thought the PZC should review.

Ms. Rauch asked Mr. Krawetzki where he thought people will be coming from. Mr. Krawetzki answered the corner and how it protrudes into the space where the brick was a little deeper into that corner. This puts pedestrians in conflict with cyclists at the corner. Ms. Rauch noted the corner of the building extends out a little bit.

Mr. Bean addressed to some degree movement around the corner to be eased is the goal and was a design challenge for establishing a canopy and dealing with the relation with the balcony above. From an aesthetic standpoint, it was completed while allowing for a path at the corner. Mr. Krawetzki asked if the post for support could be removed and have the corner of the balcony cantilever out. Mr. Bean said he will consider that option as he could justify removing the column. Mr. Schick said the corner was designed as such because of the structure above it. He agreed to study what type of support would be needed in place of that post.

Mr. Krawetzki added that with the south end of the planter being modified, there are two bike racks that may need to be adjusted so the back of bikes do not extend into the pedestrian way.

Mr. Stanford indicated Engineering focused on transportation mobility and the streetscape. He said a reduction of 12 feet to 8 feet is fine by engineering as measured from outside the planter boxes to the planter bed areas. He requested the applicant study the streetscape purpose and not just modifying the end planter and then engineering would evaluate.

Mr. Stanford asked the applicant to consider the second planter in this transition as it is a long planter. This is an opportunity to ease transition, visually. Mr. Stanford asked Mr. Krawetzki if all planters in the Bridge Street District have irrigation. Mr. Krawetzki answered there may be drip irrigations and they are not difficult to move. He added he likes Mr. Stanford's idea of transition. Mr. Stanford further explained, that overall, engineering wants balance and activations to make this happen but not by making critical mistakes. Engineering believes 8 feet gives everyone what they need while still allowing pedestrians space in that zone. Engineering can provide their perspective while providing the applicant guidance and direction.

Mr. Bean asked if they needed to modify the whole planter or organically transition just part of it. Mr. Stanford answered this is an opportunity to achieve the goal of a fixed point to the south, lining up with the short planter. He suggested making the transition gradual so it does not appear abrupt or forced, opening naturally to the corner. Tree placement is important as well.

Mr. Krawetzki stated conceptually that could work. He reiterated ensuring there is no abruptness from a holistic standpoint.

Ms. Rauch asked Mr. Fagrell, Mr. Flora, and Ms. Gilger if they had any comments. Ms. Rauch said she would relay any concerns Sergeant Rice might have had; she had to leave the meeting early due to a scheduling conflict.

Ms. Martin reiterated that with the development of Block B, there was an open space plan approved by the PZC and in order to alter, the PZC needs to be the reviewing body. She added the neighborhood standards include a schematic that shows a gateway at this intersection. Because of the overlap between the shopping corridor and the gateway requirement, this corner was designated as a pocket plaza. A condition of approval was imposed on the original application to work with the Dublin Arts Council for public art to be installed at a future date.

Ms. Rauch asked what the Code states for meeting gateway requirements. Ms. Martin paraphrased from the Code that states gateways are identified as points of identification, provide a sense of arrival, are required to be pedestrian oriented in scale, and may include a combination of architectural elements, landscape features, and/or public open space. The area is required to be consistent with the Principles of Walkable Urbanism, as defined in the Code and should be provided per the schematic in the neighborhood standards.

Ms. Rauch advised the applicant to prepare to answer the gateway questions during the PZC review and how that requirement might be accommodated.

Mr. Bean said that by creating a place that is architectural, begins to satisfy the gateway requirement. He stated he would work with Crawford Hoying Development Partners for the transplant of 514 square feet and establish a place for public art.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the sign as shown on Riverside Drive and the adjacency to the balcony above.

Mr. Bean stated final signage has not been determined but will return when fully designed but this is what they are working toward. A dentist's office is the second floor user at this corner. They would see the sign out and below them but it would not be terribly obtrusive. Because of their use, the space would be unoccupied at night so light from the sign would not affect the dentist office. Residential units start on the fourth floor.

Ms. Rauch asked the ART if they are comfortable recommending this proposal to be heard by the PZC. She said the recommendation would be determined at the next ART meeting. By asking each member: Mr. Krawetzki agreed; Mr. Stanford agreed, as he said this is a very important corner and a lot has to be taken into consideration; Mr. Fagrell agreed, stating the proposal is important enough to do that; and Mr. Flora and Ms. Gilger agreed, also.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any other comments or questions [Hearing none]. She stated staff will be meeting internally and will provide feedback to the applicant in time so they can review the comments and direction. She adjourned the meeting at 1:57 pm.





PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

AUGUST 20, 2015

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

| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| 1. | BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block 15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU | Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue Site Plan Review |
|-----------|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Proposal: | A new mixed-use development, on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the intersection of (future) Bridge Park Avenue. |
| Request: | Review and approval for a Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. |
| Applicant: | Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners. |
| Planning Contact: | Joanne Shelly, AICP, RLA, LEED BD+C, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect. |
| Contact Information: | (614) 410-4677, jshelly@dublin.oh.us |

MOTION #1: Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the following primary materials:

1. Composite Metal Panels (CMP)
2. Stainless Steel Metal Mesh Panels (MMP)

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: These materials (CMP and MMP) were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION #2: Ms. Newell moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the following secondary materials:

1. Thin Brick
2. Profile Metal Horizontal Panel, smooth and not embossed, 032 thickness or equal

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: These materials were approved.

(Continued on Next Page)

1. **BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block
15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU**

**Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue
Site Plan Review**

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION #3: Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve 13 Site Plan Waivers:

1) §153.062(D)(1)(a)-(c), Parapet Roof Type

- a. *Parapet roof height shall be between 2 – 6 feet in height;* A request to allow the height of parapets to drop below the minimum height of 2 feet in numerous locations on buildings B1, B2, B3 & B4 as the roofline jogs in height across the elevations.
- b. *Parapets shall wrap around all sides of the building;* A request to allow parapets, which are not continuous. Parapets are present on portions of the front and side facades of all buildings, but as the roofline jogs up and down along the elevation, the parapet is not continuous.
- c. *Horizontal Shadow Lines:* Encouraged to distinguish parapets from upper stories and to define the top of the parapet. Horizontal shadow lines have been incorporated to define the tops of some parapets, but not always between the upper story and the bottom of the parapet.

2) §153.062(N)(4)(a)5, Façade Requirements

- a. *Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements;* these elements are not permitted to be part of any street-facing façade, unless permitted for individual building types. A request to allow dryer vents, range vents and fresh air intake vents located on street-facing facades of buildings B1, B2, B3, and B4.

3) §153.062(O)(5) & (12) (1)a, Building Siting

- a. *Front Required Building Zone, 0 - 15 feet;* A request to allow building B1 to have 128 feet of the building façade outside of the RBZ due to a recess in the building centered on the façade to create a large entry and private patio. A large staircase enhances the public streetscape and accommodates some change in grade.
- b. *Corner Side RBZ, 5 - 25 feet;* A request to allow building B5 (parking garage) to encroach on the RBZ below the minimum 5-foot requirement.
- c. *Right-of-Way Encroachments, none allowed;* A request to allow the pedestrian bridge to encroach over the public right-of-way of Longshore Street to building B5.

(Continued on Next Page)

**1. BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block
15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU**

**Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue
Site Plan Review**

- 4) §153.062(O)(5)&(12) (a)(2), Buildable Area
- a. *Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage, 80%*; A request to allow 98% impervious lot coverage for:
 1. Lot 3 – buildings B1 & B2; and
 2. Lot 4 – buildings B3 & B4/B5
- 5) §153.062(O)(5)(d)1-2, Façade Requirements, Transparency
- a. *Ground Story Street Facing Transparency, 60% minimum*; A request to allow less than the 60% transparency required for building B4 west, east & south elevation at residential units. Typical residential transparency would be 30%.
 - b. *Street Façade, Blank Wall Limitations, not permitted*; A request to allow a blank wall on building B4 (west elevation) due to service.
 - c. *Street Façade, Blank Wall Limitations, not permitted*; A request to allow a blank wall on building B5 (south elevation) due to grade changes.
 - d. *Non-Street Façade, 15% minimum*; A request to allow less than 15% transparency required for building B4 (north elevation) due to the change in grade across the site.
 - e. *Non-Street Façade, Blank Wall Limitations, not permitted*; A request to allow a blank wall on buildings B1 & B4 (north elevations) due to service rooms on the building interior.
- 6) §153.062(O)(5)(d)3, Building Entrances
- a. *Principal Entrance Location, on primary street façade*; A request to allow building B2 entrance not on a PFS and building B3, primary entrance on the open space and not on the primary façade.
 - b. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 feet*; A request to allow the 2 lobbies for building B4 to substitute for the 4 required street entries.
 - c. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 feet*; A request to allow less than the required number of entries per street façade for building B5, east elevation 4 required, 1 provided; south elevation 3 required, 1 provided (through lobby); west elevation 1 required, 1 provided.
- 7) §153.062(O)(5)(d)4, Façade Divisions
- a. *Vertical Increments Divisions, no greater than 45 feet*; A request to allow the following deviations, which are greater than the 45-foot maximum due to variations in the overall building design.
 1. B1 – west, south & north elevations at parapet
 2. B2 – west elevation at parapet
 3. B3 – north, south, east & west elevations at parapet
 4. B4 – northwest section adjacent to building tower
 5. B5 – east & south elevations over garage vehicle access points

(Continued on Next Page)

**1. BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block
15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU**

**Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue
Site Plan Review**

- b. *Horizontal Façade Divisions, within 3 feet of the top of the ground story; A request to allow building B5 to forego horizontal façade division requirements where the façade is covered by the green screen screening material.*
- 8) §153.062(O)(5)(d)5, Façade Materials
- a. *Permitted Primary Material, Stone, Brick & Glass, minimum 80%; A request to allow façade materials to be less than 80% on the following elevations:*
1. B1 – east elevation, 71%
 2. B3 – north elevation, 56% & south elevation, 71%
 3. B4 – north elevation, 69% & east elevation, 69%
- b. *Permitted Secondary Façade Materials, maximum 20%; A request to allow secondary façade materials to exceed 20% on the following elevations:*
1. B2 – east elevation, 25%
 2. B4 – north elevation, 31%, east elevation, 31% & west elevation, 24%
- 9) §153.062(O)(12)(d)6, Parking Structure, Roof Types
- a. *Tower height/width, maximum height may not exceed width; A request to allow the height and width to exceed the allowable height of 14 feet and width of 14 feet for the tower on the following buildings:*
1. Tower height: B4/B5 16.88 feet
 2. Tower width: B4 – south elevation 41.61 feet & west elevation 27.15 feet
 3. Tower width: B5 – north elevation 34.85 feet & west elevation 48.18 feet
- 10) §153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-A, Open Space Types
- a. *Pocket Plazas, minimum 300 square feet/maximum 1,200 square feet; A request to allow The "Plaza" – pocket plaza to exceed the size requirements for pocket plazas.*
- 11) §153.065(B)(5)(a)-(d), Site Development Standards Parking Structure Design
- a. *Entrance/Exit, Number of Exits Lanes 5 required; A request to allow one less (4) than the required entry/exit lanes.*
- b. *Stacking Spaces, two 20-foot stacking spaces to be provided between right-of-way and entry gate; A request to allow the stacking to occur interior to the structure.*
- c. *Interior Circulation, Ceiling Clearance, 12 feet required.; A request to allow the Mooney Street entry to be 10.66 feet, which is less than the minimum requirement.*
- d. *Pedestrian Safety/Circulation – Maximum distance to nearest exit 200 feet; A request to allow the maximum distance to the nearest exit to be exceeded by 60 feet.*

(Continued on Next Page)

**1. BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block
15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU**

**Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue
Site Plan Review**

12) §153.065(I)(2)(a), Walkability Standards

- a. *Mid-Building Pedestrianways, Requiring a mid-building pedestrianway on buildings over 250 feet in length*; A request to allow the following: building B4 – 291.48-foot building length without a mid-building pedestrianway.

13) §153.062(E)(2)(a) Building Types, Materials, Façade Material Transitions

- a. *Material transitions shall occur at an inside corner*; A request to allow the materials to transition at the return of the primary material to the material on the balcony interior for buildings B1, B2, B3.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Site Plan Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION #4: Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve this application for Site Plan Review with 11 conditions:

- 1) That the Development Agreement that includes the aerial easements for the pedestrian bridge encroachments be enabled through the permitting process and infrastructure agreements;
- 2) That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy.
- 3) Building Type Conditions
 - a. That the balconies are modified to provide the required material transitions on the interior of the corner of the balconies;
 - b. That the applicant provide additional details for the canopies at the building entrances, including material, illumination, and mounting details, prior to building permitting and to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Master Sign Plan or by the ART through the Minor Project Review process, as applicable;
 - c. That the applicant continue to work with the City and the Dublin Arts Council as they develop the final elements for the building B2 and Bridge Park Avenue pocket plaza located at the terminal vista of the pedestrian bridge; and

(Continued on Next Page)

**1. BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block
15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU**

**Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue
Site Plan Review**

- d. That the applicant selects vents that are coordinated with the color of the adjacent exterior building finish materials, or that they are painted a coordinating color, subject to Planning approval.
- 4) Open Space Conditions
 - a. That the applicant continue to work with ART to provide a variety of design and seating opportunities within the pocket plaza prior to building permitting, subject to Planning approval;
 - b. That the building permit plans and Final Plat include notes that state that the Pocket Parks and Pocket Plazas will be owned and maintained by the property owner, with public access easements; and
 - c. That the applicant continues to work with Staff to ensure that additional pervious pavement is provided within the open space, subject to Planning and Engineering approval at building permitting.
 - 5) Parking & Loading Conditions
 - a. That the applicant provides information about how the parking spaces within the garage are to be controlled and/or designated for resident use, valet use, etc. at building permitting; and
 - b. That the applicant provide the cut sheets for the bicycle parking facilities (on-street and in the garages) at building permitting, subject to Planning approval.
 - 6) That the plans demonstrate compliance with the City of Dublin Stormwater Management Design Manual at building permitting, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
 - 7) That the applicant addresses Engineering comments subject to approval by the City Engineer;
 - 8) That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.065(E)(3) subject to Planning approval, prior to building permitting;
 - 9) That the applicant revise the lighting plans and provide fixture power and efficiency information at building permitting to verify that the exterior lighting requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(F) and Engineering standards are met, subject to Engineering approval at building permitting;
 - 10) That a Master Sign Plan be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the shopping corridor segments prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (B2 and B3); and
 - 11) That the applicant addresses the comments in the "Additional Plan Review/Detail Comments" section of this report at building permitting.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Site Plan Review was approved.

(Continued on Next Page)

**1. BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block
15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU**

**Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue
Site Plan Review**

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


Joanne Shelly, AICP, RLA, LEED BD+C
Urban Designer/Landscape Architect

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 20, 2015

AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block** **Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue**
15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU **Site Plan Review (Approved 7 – 0)**
- 2. NE Quad, Subarea 4A & 4B – Estates at Scioto Crossing III**
15-061AFDP **7850 Scioto Crossing Boulevard**
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 0)
- 3. Hoot Studio LLC – Fitness Use** **6365 Shier Rings Road, Suite D**
15-067CU **Conditional Use (Approved 6 – 0)**
- 4. Bridge Park, Section 2** **Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue**
15-069FP **Final Plat (Recommendation of Approval 7 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Amy Salay, Robert Miller, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, and Stephen Stidhem. Christopher Brown was delayed. City representatives present were: Philip Hartmann, Steve Langworthy, Alan Perkins, Claudia Husak, Joanne Shelly, Marie Downie, Aaron Stanford, Donna Goss, Logan Stang, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said Case 3, Hoot Studio, LLC was eligible this evening for the consent agenda. She determined the cases would be heard in the following order: Case 3, 2, 1, then 4.

- 1. BSD SRN- Bridge Park – B Block** **Riverside Drive & Bridge Park Avenue**
15-052 DP-BSD/SP-BSD/CU **Site Plan Review**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing residential; office; eating and drinking uses; and an 849-space parking structure on a 5.74-acre site. The site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the intersection of (future) Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for review and approval for a Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

The Chair swore in witnesses that intended to address the Commission regarding this case.

Joanne Shelly said there are four motions for the Commission this evening:

1. Primary materials review;
2. Secondary materials review;
3. Site Plan Waivers (13 requested); and
4. Site Plan Review

Ms. Shelly reiterated the previously approved applications:

1. Basic Development Plan – City Council (January 20, 2015)
2. Basic Site Plan – City Council (January 20, 2015)
3. Preliminary Plat – PZC and City Council (March 9, 2015)
4. Final Development Plan, Conditional Use, and Fee-in-Lieu (The Site Plan was tabled) – PZC (July 9, 2015)

Ms. Shelly presented the Bridge Park site along Riverside Drive in context with surrounding areas (Dublin Village Center, Wendy's International, Historic Dublin, and OCLC). She noted the dirt that has been moved on the site in preparation for development. She highlighted Block B as it appears in the proposed plan in the entire site. She said the proposal includes Lot 3 and Lot 4:

4 Mixed-Use Buildings & 1 Parking Structure

- B1 – Commercial / Residential
- B2 – Commercial / Residential
- B3 – Commercial / Residential
- B4 – Residential / Service
- B5 – Parking Structure

6 Open Spaces

- 1 Pocket Park
- 5 Pocket Plazas

Proposed Parking

- 850 garage spaces
- 44 on-street spaces
- 138 garage bicycle racks
- 30 on-street bicycle racks

Ms. Shelly presented the site plan overview of the four Mixed-Use Buildings distinguishing between the various areas:

- 228 Dwelling Units
- 42,644 square feet of Office space
- 55,500 square feet of Restaurant/Retail space
- 284,534 square feet for a Parking Structure (850 spaces)
- 18,141 square feet of Service areas
- 0.33 acres of Open Space

Ms. Shelly presented each of the buildings included in this Site Plan proposal, their locations in relation to the site, and the buildings they are adjacent to. She said for building B1, the applicant has added brick (Thin Brick) on the upper stories instead of the use of cementitious siding at the request of the Commission and they replaced the siding with composite metal panels. She noted that no changes have been made since the previous review to buildings B2, B3, B4, or B5.

Ms. Shelly presented the open spaces, how they are designated, their size, and location.

Ms. Shelly reported the ART did not conduct a new review so she restated a summary of the prior review from July 1, 2015, and included detailed illustrations.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, Dublin, said he was excited to be here again. He said he visited the site on the way to this meeting and noted the progress that was being made.

Mr. Hunter said he returned tonight to discuss much of what has been discussed in the past, including several of the buildings but focusing on material changes. He noted there was a change to building B2; the fiber cement on the tower is now a composite metal panel but it looks the same on the elevation. He said they just received information about a product and confirmed they would like to use it on building B3. He pointed out where composite metal panels have replaced the fiber cement panels on both locations of building B1. He indicated that pedestrians will see that detail. He said by adding the thin brick to reach up to the sky and also wrap the building helped with the massing. He explained full-depth brick cannot be used at that height for that building type. He said the Thin Brick provides shadow lines and returns in the windows; it is cut from the bricks used on the rest of the building so they are all going to match. He presented the before and after renderings to highlight the changes.

Mr. Hunter proposed a new ribbed aluminum metal panel system for building B3 that can be installed vertically or horizontally, is a concealed fastener, comes with a 30-year warranty, and it is not outrageously expensive. He said this information was not provided in the packets and not even presented to Staff yet as he was just informed of this yesterday. He said they have absolutely fallen in love with this product, it adds another material to the building, and it enhances the warehouse in an industrial contemporary way.

Mr. Hunter discussed bike racks, introducing more whimsy. He said they have introduced more wood style benches in addition to some of the Adirondack chairs. He presented the different bike rack designs as well as the new benches, both to be used throughout the open spaces.

Mr. Hunter presented the composite views of B1/B4, C2/B1, and C3/B3 to compare the various buildings. He concluded that the design team has "captured it" and agreed with the Commission that "they had not been there" before.

The Chair invited questions or comments.

Bob Miller inquired about colors of brick as they appear to have been changed. Mr. Hunter confirmed that the brick colors have not changed and explained that different applications used to create the images can change a color, which is not intended.

Amy Salay approved of the colors.

Cathy De Rosa asked if landscaping was part of this proposal this evening. She commended the applicant on their updates to the benches and bike racks. Ms. Shelly confirmed there have been no changes to the landscaping, itself. She said that through the permitting process there will be another scrutiny of the landscape material and plant selections.

Ms. Salay questioned the ivory and gray tones on building B2; her concern was whether these colors were going to clash or work well together.

Miguel Gonzales, Moody Nolan, 2501 Bristol Road, Upper Arlington, said the palette for B2 is warm and the colors all coordinate. He said for the images created with Revit, the color is hard to control.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Newell said she really liked the improvements to the elevations and they looked really nice. She said the Thin Brick will add to the building and is supportive of the materials proposed.

Ms. Salay agreed with her comments.

Chris Brown said he also agreed and was glad the brick reaches to the top of the buildings. He said kudos to the horizontal corrugated panels. He indicated the proposal is nice but not perfect.

Steve Langworthy said Staff does not have anything in the record about that latest material, just what was included in the applicant's presentation this evening. He confirmed that Staff had not seen this material before tonight. He said that specific language should be incorporated into the determination.

Ms. Newell asked if this would change Staff's calculations, which could affect the proposal this evening.

Ms. Shelly said Thin Brick is being requested for a secondary material and added into the other secondary material calculations as a second approved material for this project; the calculations would be wrong but would not significantly change the percentage. She said the Waivers are for 80% less of the primary material, that would not change.

Mr. Brown confirmed Thin Brick could be approved for building B1 and not the whole block. He said he did not want to see the applicant "handcuffed"; we do not want monotony as this project builds out.

Mr. Langworthy suggested this be dealt with tonight and when the next blocks come forward, we will explore options for a broader palette of materials.

Mr. Brown said other materials are good and said it was exciting that the applicant researched this product for it to be brought forward. He said that corrugated material lends itself dynamically to the urban environment to provide contrasting materials.

Ms. De Rosa said this proposal is great. She thanked the applicant for providing a landscape view and composite view because the images helped her to put the project together and in perspective and encouraged the applicant to continue to do that with future proposals. She said she liked the benches and racks and encouraged the applicant to push that envelope for design.

Ms. De Rosa asked Staff if some of these whimsical bike racks could be incorporated into the Park and Ride project. Ms. Shelly said COTA has some interesting options within their standards.

Steve Stidhem asked Staff what the speed limit will be on Riverside Drive. Aaron Stanford answered there is no proposed change to the speed limit. He said a speed study will be conducted and certain statutes will need to be met to change the speed limit. Ms. Salay said City Council is also interested in speed limits.

Mr. Stidhem said he is a huge fan of the whimsical side of this project.

Mr. Hunter said they would love for the Tim Horton's restaurant to be demolished sooner than later but the issue has been Columbia Gas. He said they need to disconnect it and remove the meters, which is two separate processes. Ms. Shelly confirmed the ART approved the demolition of Tim Horton's today.

Deborah Mitchell indicated her fellow Commissioners had already stated what she was thinking. She said she loved the whimsical bike racks and the benches are more sophisticated, which is really great and much desired.

Mr. Miller indicated that Nelson Yoder was frustrated at the last meeting and rightfully so. He said it is an example of the process working well and a credit to Crawford Hoying because even though they were frustrated, they returned with a better product.

The Chair said there will be four motions, the first being the approval of primary materials:

1. Composite Metal Panels (CMP)
2. Stainless Steel Metal Mesh Panels (MMP)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the primary materials as stated. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the secondary materials:

1. Thin Brick
2. Profile Metal Horizontal Panel, smooth and not embossed, 032 thickness or equal

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

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve 13 Site Plan Waivers as presented:

- 1) §153.062(D)(1)(a)-(c), Parapet Roof Type
 - a. *Parapet roof height shall be between 2 – 6 feet in height;* A request to allow the height of parapets to drop below the minimum height of 2 feet in numerous locations on buildings B1, B2, B3 & B4 as the roofline jogs in height across the elevations.
 - b. *Parapets shall wrap around all sides of the building;* A request to allow parapets, which are not continuous. Parapets are present on portions of the front and side facades of all buildings, but as the roofline jogs up and down along the elevation, the parapet is not continuous.
 - c. *Horizontal Shadow Lines:* Encouraged to distinguish parapets from upper stories and to define the top of the parapet. Horizontal shadow lines have been incorporated to define the tops of some parapets, but not always between the upper story and the bottom of the parapet.
- 2) §153.062(N)(4)(a)5, Façade Requirements
 - a. *Visible Vents/AC Units/Other Utility Elements;* these elements are not permitted to be part of any street-facing façade, unless permitted for individual building types. A request to allow dryer vents, range vents and fresh air intake vents located on street-facing facades of buildings B1, B2, B3, and B4.

- 3) §153.062(O)(5) & (12) (1)a, Building Siting
 - a. *Front Required Building Zone, 0 - 15 feet;* A request to allow building B1 to have 128 feet of the building façade outside of the RBZ due to a recess in the building centered on the façade to create a large entry and private patio. A large staircase enhances the public streetscape and accommodates some change in grade.
 - b. *Corner Side RBZ, 5 - 25 feet;* A request to allow building B5 (parking garage) to encroach on the RBZ below the minimum 5-foot requirement.
 - c. *Right-of-Way Encroachments, none allowed;* A request to allow the pedestrian bridge to encroach over the public right-of-way of Longshore Street to building B5.

- 4) §153.062(O)(5)&(12) (a)(2), Buildable Area
 - a. *Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage, 80%;* A request to allow 98% impervious lot coverage for:
 1. Lot 3 – buildings B1 & B2; and
 2. Lot 4 – buildings B3 & B4/B5

- 5) §153.062(O)(5)(d)1-2, Façade Requirements, Transparency
 - a. *Ground Story Street Facing Transparency, 60% minimum;* A request to allow less than the 60% transparency required for building B4 west, east & south elevation at residential units. Typical residential transparency would be 30%.
 - b. *Street Façade, Blank Wall Limitations, not permitted;* A request to allow a blank wall on building B4 (west elevation) due to service.
 - c. *Street Façade, Blank Wall Limitations, not permitted;* A request to allow a blank wall on building B5 (south elevation) due to grade changes.
 - d. *Non-Street Façade, 15% minimum;* A request to allow less than 15% transparency required for building B4 (north elevation) due to the change in grade across the site.
 - e. *Non-Street Façade, Blank Wall Limitations, not permitted;* A request to allow a blank wall on buildings B1 & B4 (north elevations) due to service rooms on the building interior.

- 6) §153.062(O)(5)(d)3, Building Entrances
 - a. *Principal Entrance Location, on primary street façade;* A request to allow building B2 entrance not on a PFS and building B3, primary entrance on the open space and not on the primary façade.
 - b. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 feet;* A request to allow the 2 lobbies for building B4 to substitute for the 4 required street entries.
 - c. *Street Façade Number of Entrances, 1 per 75 feet;* A request to allow less than the required number of entries per street façade for building B5, east elevation 4 required, 1 provided; south elevation 3 required, 1 provided (through lobby); west elevation 1 required, 1 provided.

- 7) §153.062(O)(5)(d)4, Façade Divisions
 - a. *Vertical Increments Divisions, no greater than 45 feet;* A request to allow the following deviations, which are greater than the 45-foot maximum due to variations in the overall building design.
 1. B1 – west, south & north elevations at parapet
 2. B2 – west elevation at parapet

3. B3 – north, south, east & west elevations at parapet
 4. B4 – northwest section adjacent to building tower
 5. B5 – east & south elevations over garage vehicle access points
- b. *Horizontal Façade Divisions, within 3 feet of the top of the ground story;* A request to allow building B5 to forego horizontal façade division requirements where the façade is covered by the green screen screening material.
- 8) §153.062(O)(5)(d)5, Façade Materials
- a. *Permitted Primary Material, Stone, Brick & Glass, minimum 80%;* A request to allow façade materials to be less than 80% on the following elevations:
 1. B1 – east elevation, 71%
 2. B3 – north elevation, 56% & south elevation, 71%
 3. B4 – north elevation, 69% & east elevation, 69%
 - b. *Permitted Secondary Façade Materials, maximum 20%;* A request to allow secondary façade materials to exceed 20% on the following elevations:
 1. B2 – east elevation, 25%
 2. B4 – north elevation, 31%, east elevation, 31% & west elevation, 24%
- 9) §153.062(O)(12)(d)6, Parking Structure, Roof Types
- a. *Tower height/width, maximum height may not exceed width;* A request to allow the height and width to exceed the allowable height of 14 feet and width of 14 feet for the tower on the following buildings:
 1. Tower height: B4/B5 16.88 feet
 2. Tower width: B4 – south elevation 41.61 feet & west elevation 27.15 feet
 3. Tower width: B5 – north elevation 34.85 feet & west elevation 48.18 feet
- 10) §153.064(G)(1)/Table 153.064-A, Open Space Types
- a. *Pocket Plazas, minimum 300 square feet/maximum 1,200 square feet;* A request to allow The “Plaza” – pocket plaza to exceed the size requirements for pocket plazas.
- 11) §153.065(B)(5)(a)-(d), Site Development Standards Parking Structure Design
- a. *Entrance/Exit, Number of Exits Lanes 5 required;* A request to allow one less (4) than the required entry/exit lanes.
 - b. *Stacking Spaces, two 20-foot stacking spaces to be provided between right-of-way and entry gate;* A request to allow the stacking to occur interior to the structure.
 - c. *Interior Circulation, Ceiling Clearance, 12 feet required.;* A request to allow the Mooney Street entry to be 10.66 feet, which is less than the minimum requirement.
 - d. *Pedestrian Safety/Circulation – Maximum distance to nearest exit 200 feet;* A request to allow the maximum distance to the nearest exit to be exceeded by 60 feet.

12) §153.065(I)(2)(a), Walkability Standards

- a. *Mid-Building Pedestrianways, Requiring a mid-building pedestrianway on buildings over 250 feet in length;* A request to allow the following: building B4 – 291.48-foot building length without a mid-building pedestrianway.

13) §153.062(E)(2)(a) Building Types, Materials, Façade Material Transitions

- a. *Material transitions shall occur at an inside corner;* A request to allow the materials to transition at the return of the primary material to the material on the balcony interior for buildings B1, B2, B3.

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

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve this application for Site Plan Review with 11 conditions as presented:

- 1) That the Development Agreement that includes the aerial easements for the pedestrian bridge encroachments be enabled through the permitting process and infrastructure agreements;
- 2) That the applicant obtains Minor Project approval for any ground floor tenant that elects to install a patio and/or modify the exterior tenant storefronts, prior to tenant occupancy.
- 3) Building Type Conditions
 - a. That the balconies are modified to provide the required material transitions on the interior of the corner of the balconies;
 - b. That the applicant provide additional details for the canopies at the building entrances, including material, illumination, and mounting details, prior to building permitting and to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Master Sign Plan or by the ART through the Minor Project Review process, as applicable;
 - c. That the applicant continue to work with the City and the Dublin Arts Council as they develop the final elements for the building B2 and Bridge Park Avenue pocket plaza located at the terminal vista of the pedestrian bridge; and
 - d. That the applicant selects vents that are coordinated with the color of the adjacent exterior building finish materials, or that they are painted a coordinating color, subject to Planning approval.
- 4) Open Space Conditions
 - a. That the applicant continue to work with ART to provide a variety of design and seating opportunities within the pocket plaza prior to building permitting, subject to Planning approval;
 - b. That the building permit plans and Final Plat include notes that state that the Pocket Parks and Pocket Plazas will be owned and maintained by the property owner, with public access easements; and
 - c. That the applicant continues to work with Staff to ensure that additional pervious pavement is provided within the open space, subject to Planning and Engineering approval at building permitting.

- 5) Parking & Loading Conditions
 - a. That the applicant provides information about how the parking spaces within the garage are to be controlled and/or designated for resident use, valet use, etc. at building permitting; and
 - b. That the applicant provide the cut sheets for the bicycle parking facilities (on-street and in the garages) at building permitting, subject to Planning approval.
- 6) That the plans demonstrate compliance with the City of Dublin Stormwater Management Design Manual at building permitting, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
- 7) That the applicant addresses Engineering comments subject to approval by the City Engineer;
- 8) That the rooftop and parking garage mechanical units are screened in an architecturally appropriate manner in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.065(E)(3) subject to Planning approval, prior to building permitting;
- 9) That the applicant revise the lighting plans and provide fixture power and efficiency information at building permitting to verify that the exterior lighting requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.065(F) and Engineering standards are met, subject to Engineering approval at building permitting;
- 10) That a Master Sign Plan be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the shopping corridor segments prior to occupancy of any of the buildings (B2 and B3); and
- 11) That the applicant addresses the comments in the "Additional Plan Review/Detail Comments" section of this report at building permitting.

The Chair asked the applicant if they agreed with the conditions. Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively.

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

The Chair thanked the applicant for being so patient as this has been a long process.

2. NE Quad, Subarea 4A & 4B – Estates at Scioto Crossing III

15-061AFDP

**7850 Scioto Crossing Boulevard
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a revision to the approved Final Development Plan to permit 43 detached, single-family condominiums with associated site improvements within Subarea 4, Sections 4A and 4B, of the NE Quad Planned Unit Development. The site is on the west side of Sawmill Road, north of the intersection with Emerald Parkway. She said this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan and three Minor Text Modifications under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in witnesses that intended to address the Commission regarding this case.

Marie Downie presented an aerial view of the site located just east of Emerald Fields Park and west of the existing multi-family units. She noted the site contains portions of Sections 4A and 4B. She said Section 4C is located north of the site and was previously approved for an Amended Final Development Plan to change unit types from multi-family to single-family. She said Section 4A is approved for a total of 144 multi-family units within 15 buildings and Section 4B is approved for 72 multi-family units within 10