

Memo

To: Members of the Administrative Review Team

From: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Director

Date: July 17, 2023

Initiated By: Zach Hounshell, Planner II

Re: Administrative Approval – Block G, Dog Park – Vestibule Modifications

Summary

Planning staff administratively approved minor modifications to a public dog park located northeast of the intersection of Tuller Ridge Drive and Dale Drive, zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District – Scioto River Neighborhood District. The approval is for modifications to the location of the vestibule entrances into the park. The dog park was approved with the development of Block G (Case #20-045FDP) in Bridge Park. The dog park was approved with a single vestibule entrance located at the intersection of Dale Drive and Tuller Ridge Drive. The applicant is requesting two entrances in lieu of the approved single entrance due to existing utilities and grading around the original location. Both vestibule entrances will be designed similarly to the previous plan, with a double-gated entrance to keep pets from leaving the park. Both entrances will be located on the south and west sides of the park, fronting both public streets adjacent to the site. No modifications to the design of the dog park are proposed with these improvements.



Criteria

The Bridge Street District Code states that the Director may authorize Administrative Approvals to approved Development Plans, Site Plans and Minor Projects that are required to correct any undetected errors or omissions, address conditions discovered during the permitting process or construction, or that are necessary to ensure orderly and efficient development. The criteria for minor modification review and approval are found in Section 153.066(L). The applicable criterion is listed below:

(k) Other modifications deemed appropriate by the Director that do not alter the basic design or any specific conditions imposed as park of the original approval.

Planning Analysis

The modifications are minor in nature, allows the proposal to meet all applicable code requirements and meets the criterion listed above, and therefore Planning has administratively approved the request.



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 15, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G
20-199CU**

Conditional Use

Proposal: Conditional Use request to permit Bridge Park, Block G, Building G2 (McCallum Garage) to be unlined along a public street, Mooney Street.

Location: Northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street and zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood.

Request: Review and approve a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.

Applicant: Evan Salyers, EMH&T

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-199

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded, to approve a Conditional Use without conditions to allow Bridge Park, Block G to locate the garage and adjacent building services solely along Mooney Street.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Conditional Use was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

294AB8C8363F490...
 Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 15, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

2. **Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G** **Final Development Plan** **20-045FDP**

Proposal: Construction of a 4-story residential building, a 4-story parking garage, and a 5-story mixed-use office building with 0.58-acres of open space within Bridge Park, Block G zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood.

Location: Northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street.

Request: Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Mathew Poindexter, EMH&T

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-045

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded, to approve two Administrative Departures:

1. §153.062(O)(12)(a)(1) — **Front Property Line Coverage**
Requirement: A minimum 90 percent front property line coverage is required.
Request: 83 percent be required to be provided along Dale Drive when Buildings G1 and G2 are calculated together.
2. §153.062(O)(3)(a)(4) — **Change in Roof Plane**
Requirement: A single roof plane shall extend not greater than 80 feet in length.
Request: Permit a single roof plane to extend 85 feet in length along the north elevation of Building G3.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The two Administrative Departures were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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



2. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G 20-045FDP

Final Development Plan

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to approve 28 Waivers:

1. §153.062(O)(5), (O)(12), (O)(3) — **Lot Coverage**

Requirement: Maximum impervious combined lot coverage for the Corridor Building, Parking Structure, and Apartment building shall not exceed 80 percent for the Corridor Building and Parking Structure, and shall not exceed 75 percent for the Apartment Building.

Request: Combined lot coverage, for Block G, not exceed 90 percent.

2. §153.062(O)(5)(b) — **Building Height, Ground Story and Upper Stories**

Requirement: Ground story floor height shall be a minimum of 12 feet and a maximum of 16 feet. Upper story floor height shall be a minimum of 10 feet and a maximum of 14 feet.

Request: Ground story height for west end of the first story be permitted to be a maximum of 25 feet in height, and the fifth story be permitted to a maximum of 18 feet in height.

3. §153.062(D)(1)(a) — **Parapet Roof Types**

Requirement: Shall be no higher than necessary to screen roof appurtenances from view from street or adjacent building of similar height. Parapets shall be no less than 2 feet and no greater than 6 feet in height.

Request: Parapet heights less than 2 - foot minimum. (1.25 feet in height)

4. §153.065(E)(3)(b) — **Mechanical Screening**

Requirement: All roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from view at ground level on all sides by one of the primary materials and colors of a street facing façade. Metal is not a permitted primary material for the Corridor Building Type.

Request: Permit rooftop mechanicals to be screened by metal.

5. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(1) — **Street Facing Transparency**

Requirement: A minimum 60 percent transparency be provided on the ground story of street-facing facades.

Request: Reduced ground story, street-facing transparency along Mooney Street, Bridge Park Avenue, and Dale Drive:

- Mooney Street (West) — 35%
- Bridge Park Avenue (South) — 48%
- Dale Drive (East) — 40%

6. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(1) — **Blank Wall Limitations**

Requirement: Blank walls are not permitted. A blank wall is an elevation with a stretch of 15 feet or greater of uninterrupted façade.

Request: Permit a 17-foot blank wall along the west elevation of the connector to Building G2 Parking Structure.

7. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(3) — **Building Entrances**

Requirement: The principal building entrance must be located along a Principal Frontage Street. The Code requires one building entrance every 75 feet along street facing facades.

Request: Permit the principal building entrance (office lobby) along a Neighborhood Street (Mooney Street), and to permit entrances at lengths greater than permitted:

- Dale Drive: 164 linear feet = 3 entrances required, 2 provided
- Bridge Park Avenue: 197 linear feet = 3 entrances required, 5 provided
- Mooney Street: 164 linear feet = 3 entrances required, 3 provided



2. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G 20-045FDP

Final Development Plan

8. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(4) — Vertical Façade Divisions

Requirement: A vertical façade division is required every 45 feet to ensure a varied building plane.

Request: Permit fewer vertical façade divisions than required by Code:

- East Elevation: ±89-foot increments
- North Elevation: ±96-foot increments
- South Elevation: ±97-foot and ±95-foot increments
- West Elevation: ±52-foot increments

9. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(5) — Materials

Requirement: 80 percent primary building materials (glass, brick, stone).

Request: Permit 68 percent primary building materials on the west elevation (Mooney Street).

Building G2 (Parking Structure)

10. §153.062(C)(1) — Incompatible Building Types

Requirement: Parking Structure and Single-Family Attached Building Types are not permitted directly across the street from one another or on the same block face.

Request: Building G2 (Parking Structure) adjacent to Sycamore Ridge Apartments (Single-Family Attached)

11. §153.062(O)(12)(a)(1) — Required Build Zone (RBZ)

Requirement: The front and corner-side required build zones for a Parking Structure are 5 feet to 25 feet from the property line.

Request: To permit zero feet to 25 feet required build zones to accommodate the following building siting:

- Front: 2.86 feet provided. Encroaches 2.14 feet beyond the required RBZ
- Corner Side: 1.46 feet provided. Encroaches 3.54 feet beyond the required RBZ

12. §153.062(D)(4)(a) — Towers, Location and Quantity

Requirement: Towers on Parking Structures are permitted on facades only at terminal vistas, corners at two principal frontage streets, and/or adjacent to an open space type. Where permitted by building type, only one tower is allowed per building.

Request: Northwest tower allowed to deviate from location requirement, and a total of three towers be permitted.

13. §153.062(D)(4)(b) — Towers, Height

Requirement: Tower height shall not be greater than the height of one additional upper floor of the building to which the tower is applied. The width of a tower shall not exceed its height. The maximum upper story height for Parking Structures is 12 feet.

Request: Permit deviations from height and width requirements:

- Building G2 Northeast Tower: Height 19.33 feet, width 21.33 feet
- Building G2 Northwest Tower: Height 17.33 feet, width 21.33 feet
- Building G2 Southwest Tower: Height 12.67 feet, width 18 feet

14. §153.065(B)(5)(c) — Interior Circulation, Ceiling Clearance Heights

Requirement: A minimum ceiling clearance height of 12 feet is required where the parking structure has street frontage, excluding the driveway opening, and the parking structure shall be designed and constructed to allow potential occupancy of the first 20 feet of building by a commercial or civic/public/institutional use.

Request: Permit at the Mooney Street frontage clear ceiling height at ±10 feet.



2. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G 20-045FDP

Final Development Plan

15. §153.062(O)(12)(c) — **Occupied Space**
Requirement: Parking structures are required to be line with occupied space with a minimum depth of 20 feet along principal frontage streets.
Request: Occupied space along Dale Drive be permitted to be less than 20 feet at 16.83 feet.
16. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(1) — **Street Facing Transparency**
Requirement: A minimum 65 percent storefront transparency be provided on the ground story of facades facing a principal frontage street.
Request: 41 percent ground-story storefront transparency along Dale Drive.
17. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(2) — **Blank Wall Limitations**
Requirement: Blank walls are not permitted. A blank wall is an elevation with a 15 foot or greater stretch of uninterrupted façade.
Request: Permit the south façade, adjacent to public open space, to be fully screened by scrim.
18. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(3) — **Building Entrances**
Requirement: The Code requires one building entrance every 75 feet along street-facing facades.
Request: Permit one entrance along Mooney Street where two are required.
19. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(4) — **Vertical Façade Divisions**
Requirement: A vertical façade division is required every 30 feet to ensure a varied building plane.
Request: Permit fewer vertical façade divisions than required by Code:
 - East Elevation: ±102 foot increment
 - West Elevation: ±85 foot increment
20. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(5) — **Materials**
Requirement: 80 percent primary building materials (glass, brick, stone).
Request: Permit 35 percent primary building materials on the south elevation (open space).

Building G3 (Apartment Building)

21. §153.062(O)(3)(a)(1) — **Required Build Zone (RBZ)**
Requirement: The front required build zone for an Apartment Building is 5 feet to 20 feet from the property line.
Request: To permit zero feet to 20 feet required build zones to accommodate the following building siting:
 - Front: Dale Drive – Minimum 0.38 ft. provided
 - Front: Tuller Ridge Drive – Minimum 4.75 feet provided
22. §153.062(O)(3)(d)(3) — **Building Entrances**
Requirement: One building entrance every 75 feet along street-facing facades.
Request: Permit one entrance along Tuller Ridge Drive where three are required.
23. §153.062(I)(2)(a) — **Stoops**
Requirement: Stoops shall have a minimum width and depth of five feet of open area.
Request: Three stoops provide smaller than the minimum dimensions required, and three provide an at-grade sidewalk entrance (no stoop).



2. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G 20-045FDP

Final Development Plan

24. §153.062(O)(3)(d)(4) — Vertical Façade Divisions

Requirement: A vertical façade division is required every 40 feet to ensure a varied building plane.

Request: Permit fewer vertical façade divisions than required by Code:

- East Elevation: 64.54 foot increment, 40.21 foot increment
- North Elevation: 65.63 feet, 65.04 foot increments
- West Elevation: 64.58 - foot increment, 40.29 77- foot increment

25. §153.062(O)(3)(d)(5) — Materials

Requirement: 80 percent primary building materials (glass, brick, stone).

Request: Permit 46 percent primary building materials on the west elevation (Mooney Street); 44 percent primary building materials on the north elevation (Tuller Ridge Drive); and 46 percent primary building materials on the east elevation (Dale Drive).

Open Space

26. §153.064(F)(6) — Open Space Type, Park

Requirement: Parks (minimum of 2 acres in size) provide informal active and passive larger-scale recreational amenities to city residents and visitors. Parks have natural plantings and can be created around existing natural features such as water bodies or tree stands. Parks can be used to define edges of neighborhoods and districts.

Request: Permit a dog park to be designated as a Park not meeting the intent and minimum 2-acres size defined in the Code.

27. §153.064(G)(1)(b) — Open Space Proportions

Requirement: With the exception of the Greenway, all Open Space Types shall be sized at a ratio of not more than 3:1, length to width

Request: Permit a Pocket Park between Building G1 and G2 that has a length-to-width proportion of over 6:1.

28. §153.064(G)(4)(f) — Impervious and Semi-Pervious Area

Requirement: For a Pocket Park, the maximum permitted impervious area is 30 percent with an additional 10 percent semi-pervious permitted.

Request: Permit the open space between Building G1 and G2 to be approximately 58 percent impervious.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The 28 Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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



**2. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G
20-045FDP**

Final Development Plan

MOTION 3: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded, to approve a Shared Parking Plan:

A total of 526 parking spaces are required where 360 parking spaces are provided. Approval of a shared parking plan is requested.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Shared Parking Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION 4: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with 17 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide window specifications for Building G1 for staff review prior to submitting for permits;
- 2) That the applicant provide installation details for the proposed Juliet balconies on Building G3 with the building permit application;
- 3) That the applicant submit all proposed site furnishings associated with public open spaces for staff review, prior to submitting for permits;
- 4) That the applicant designate the location and quantity of required bicycle parking with the building and/or site permit applications;
- 5) That the applicant verify if parking structure security techniques and surveillance will be implemented in Building G2;
- 6) That the applicant provide the three required loading spaces on the site plan for staff review prior to submitting for permits;
- 7) That the applicant submit details of the proposed ground mounted mechanical enclosures with the building/site permit application;
- 8) That the applicant adjust the proposed site lighting plans to provide the required lighting uniformity with the site permit application;



**2. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G
20-045FDP**

Final Development Plan

- 9) That the sidewalk along Dale Drive be revised to provide a minimum of six feet of clear sidewalk width, subject to approval of the City Engineer;
- 10) That the applicant establish and execute a public access easement for the dog park, prior to issuance of a Site Only permit;
- 11) That the applicant work with Staff to revise the landscape plan as detailed in the Staff Report, prior to submittal of a Building Permit;
- 12) That the applicant extend design elements of the scrim screen through to the lower level Mooney Street plaza;
- 13) That the applicant revise Building G3 entries along Dale Drive and Mooney Street to provide architectural details, 153.062(I)(3)(a), for entrance design, in accordance with the Commission's discussion, subject to staff approval;
- 14) That Building G2's parapet along Dale Drive be broken up in accordance with the Commission's discussion, subject to staff approval;
- 15) That the applicant submit a comprehensive open space lighting package, subject to staff approval;
- 16) That the brick foundation cladding on the northwest corner of Building G3 be revised, subject to staff approval; and
- 17) That the fountain be revised to ensure a year round aesthetic, in accordance with the Commission's discussion, subject to staff approval.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

294A86C6363F490...
 Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner



~~Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]~~

~~Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed revised conditions. The applicant indicated he had no objection.
Mr. Way noted that the lighting package should not be limited to a lighting fixture, but should permit projecting lights and factor in the lighting in the overhang.
Ms. Call challenged staff to work with the applicant, encouraging their creativity to achieve differentiation for their building.~~

~~Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Minor Project with four conditions:
1) The applicant receive approval of furniture selections by the Administrative Review Team; and,
2) The applicant work with Washington Township Fire Department to finalize a fire protection plan prior to the issuance of a building permit.
3) The applicant provide an exterior lighting package, subject to staff approval.
4) The applicant work with staff to enhance the entry design along Longshore Street.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]~~

[Cases 1, 2 and 3 related to the same project were heard together.]

1. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G, Conditional Use, 20-199CU

Conditional Use to permit Bridge Park, Block G, Building G2 (McCallum Garage) to be unlined along a public street, Mooney Street. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street.

2. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G, Final Development Plan, 20-045FDP

Construction of a 4-story residential building, a 4-story parking garage, and a 5-story mixed-use office building with .58-acres of open space within Bridge Park, Block G zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street.

3. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G, Final Plat, 16-044FP

Plat for ±2.28-acre site (Lot 9) establishing public access easements for open space zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that these requests seek review and approval of a Final Development Plan with Conditional Use and a recommendation for City Council approval of a Final Plat for Bridge Park, Block G. Block G is located north of Bridge Park Avenue, south of Tuller Ridge Drive, east of Mooney Street and west of Dale Drive, and zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is bounded by an existing street network. An additional area northeast of the site is also proposed for improvement with this application. The site is currently undeveloped, although it is surrounded by

development – Bridge Park to the west and the Sycamore Ridge Apartments to the east. [site photos shown.]

Proposal

There are three requests with this proposal. The first is a Conditional Use to permit a parking garage that is unlined with commercial space along the new street, which is interior to the Bridge Park Development. The parking garage is lined along Dale Drive, which is the principal frontage street. The second request is a Final Development Plan approval of the development of three new buildings:

- Building G1, a five-story 125,000-square-foot mixed use building containing restaurant, retail and office space;
- Building G2, a four-story, 327-space parking structure lined with commercial space along Dale Drive, the principal frontage street, and associated storage and utility space; and,
- Building G3, a four-story multi-family building containing 86 dwelling units (8 units with 3 bedrooms, 22 units with 2 bedrooms, 54 units with 1 bedroom, and 2 studio units) with an associated 0.19-acre amenity space (not included in the open space calculation).

A total of ±0.58 acres of public open space and associated site improvements also is included. The open space is distributed between Block G and the dog park, which is off-site. The third request is for a recommendation of Council approval of a Final Plat. The plat combines three existing parcels owned by Crawford Hoying and establishes public access easements for open spaces. The office building, Building G1, is located at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street. On the ground story of that building, there is commercial space, including opportunities for retail and restaurants, as well as a lobby to the upper-story office building. Centrally located on the site is the 4-story parking structure, which is accessed via Dale Drive and Mooney Street. The ground story of the parking structure contains a variety of support services, as well as parking spaces to support the residential and commercial tenants on this block. In the northern portion of the site is a U-shaped condominium building, which contains the .19-acre amenity space. Approval of a parking plan also is requested. The parking plan will look holistically at parking across the Bridge Park Development, including opportunities for shared parking based on peak hour use. A total of 360 parking spaces will be provided via onstreet and structured parking spaces, although 512 parking spaces are required. A parking analysis has been conducted, and a proposal is made to co-park this block with Block C, which is immediately to the west of Block G and contains a large parking structure. The combined parking of Blocks C and G would be 1,306 parking spaces. Although that number does not meet BSD Code requirement, per the parking study, it would meet the need. The open space is also calculated on a ratio basis for the combined uses. A total of .44 acres of open space is required; 0.588 acres of open space will be provided. There will be three pocket plazas, located: at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street; Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge Drive; and Dale Drive and Tuller Ridge Drive. A linear, pocket park will be located immediately north of the office building, south of the parking garage, connecting Mooney Street to Dale Drive. Due to the significant grade change between Mooney Street and Dale Drive, the linear pocket park will be tiered with the lower level being along Mooney Street and the upper level along Dale Drive. The accessible path between the two is an interior elevator within the office building, as well as an exterior stair. A scrim screen (metal panel) is proposed to clad the entirety of the south elevation of the parking garage. The screen will contain a naturalized image, which will be a unique placemaking element within the City. The applicant will coordinate with the Dublin Arts Council to select the art. Per Final Development Plan (FDP) requirements, a final landscape plan was provided; staff is recommending several plant modifications.

Offsite open space is provided via a 17,000-square foot dog park, located at the intersection of Dale Drive and Tuller Ridge Drive. The dog park contains curvilinear pods for play; artificial turf, per the Parks

& Recreation staff recommendation; walking paths and shade trees; and a six-foot fence enclosing the area, as well as perimeter screening.

Pocket plaza designs have been provided. The two smallest pocket plazas are located along Tuller Ridge Drive. The primary pocket plaza is located at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street, which will contain a water feature, movable furniture and a raised planting area. Not all of that area is designated as open space, as there will be an opportunity in the corner for a private tenant to have a private patio.

Building G1

Building G1 is a five-story, Corridor Building with the ground story occupied by restaurant/retail and lobby space associated with the office users. The upper stories (floors 2-5) are occupied by office. A fully enclosed pedestrian circulation connection between Buildings G1 and G2 is provided via a tunnel at the ground floor and by elevator lobbies on the second through fifth floors, providing office tenants on all levels with access to the parking garage. The predominant exterior building materials are a combination of brick, concrete panel, concrete masonry, and glass storefront system. Medium gray toned masonry defines the base of the building, with dark gray, medium gray, and white brick on the upper stories. The secondary materials are composite metal panel, and glass/metal spandrel. Teak metal wall panels highlight the office balconies at the southwest corner, which overlook the public open space at the corner of Mooney Street and Bridge Park Avenue.

Building G2

Building G2 is a four-story parking structure containing 327 parking spaces and ingress/egresses on the east and west sides of the building. The ground level of the parking structure includes a refuse/storage room, water meter room and a generator for support of the uses in Buildings G1, G2, and G3. The parking structure is unlined by commercial uses along Mooney Street (west), requiring review and approval of a Conditional Use application. Along Dale Drive (east) three commercial tenant spaces line the garage on the ground story. The spaces will have a warehouse aesthetic with tall ceilings and large windows. The parking structure is clad predominantly in brick and has metal window frame inserts.

Building G3

Building G3 is a four-story apartment building containing 86 dwelling units (8 units with 3 bedrooms, 22 units with 2 bedrooms, 54 units with 1 bedroom, and 2 studio units) with an associated 0.19-acre amenity space. The east and west halves of the building are offset to accommodate the significant grade change across the site. The offset design breaks down the mass and scale of the building adjacent to Block H. The building is clad in a combination of brick, stone, and fiber cement siding.

Final Plat

Approval of a Final Plat is requested in conjunction with the Final Development Plan, establishing a single, 2.286-acre developable lot (Lot 9) along with necessary public access easements for open spaces. Lot 9 is the result of the combination of three parcels.

Staff has reviewed the proposal against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of a Conditional Use; two Administrative Departures; 30 waivers; a Parking Plan; a Final Development Plan with 11 conditions; and a Final Plat.

Commission Questions for Staff

Ms. Fox inquired if the total square footage of the buildings increased since the previous review.
Ms. Martin responded that actually, the height of the office building decreased from six to five stories.

Ms. Fox inquired if the footprints of the buildings increased in size.
Ms. Martin responded that she is not aware of any increase. The site plan and the foundations have remained the same.

Ms. Fox requested clarification of the use on the corner of Mooney Street and Bridge Park. Would part of that pocket park be utilized for private dining, and would the square footage of that pocket park change?

Ms. Martin responded that the applicant has already accounted for that. The entire area at that corner is not designated as open space; it is only a portion of that space.

Ms. Fox inquired if the public open space would be where the fountain is and outside of that; anything interior would become private.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox inquired if there is an ADA-compliant ramp in the pedestrian midway.

Ms. Martin responded that is not a ramp; it is an elevator. It is necessary to enter the lobby to access that elevator to reach the upper story of the pedestrian midway.

Ms. Fox inquired if the pedestrian midway is permitted to count as open space or if it is a sidewalk.

Ms. Martin responded that a midblock pedestrian way is permitted to traverse through an open space. Open spaces are required to consist of a certain proportion, so a waiver is requested to the proportions of open space; this is consistent with waivers that have been approved in other blocks at Bridge Park.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the midway park had been compressed since the previous review.

Ms. Martin responded that she does not believe it has been, but she would defer to the site civil engineer or landscape architect.

Ms. Call stated that the staff report indicated that 512 parking spaces were required, but 360 are provided. The applicant conducted a parking study, which was submitted for review. Per the study, this Block and the adjacent block will provide a total of 1,306 parking spaces. What was the total amount originally required for those two lots?

Ms. Martin responded that a parking plan for a reduced parking plan also was approved for Block C. The original development plan for this mixed development did not anticipate development this dense. Staff has concerns about over parking Bridge Park. C Block was approved for approximately 100 fewer spaces than required.

Ms. Call stated that it appears that independently, each parcel is underparked according to Code and the design criteria. She asked the applicant to address the changes that have been made since the previous review.

Applicant Presentation

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying, Riverside Drive, Dublin, Ohio stated that the Commission has reviewed this block several times, and it has evolved both in use and shape; however, the shape of the park has not changed. Nor has the office building changed; its proportions are very specific to ensure the right sizes are provided for office spaces.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying, stated that one area that did change was the ground floor retail, which is smaller. The wall of the retail spaces was pushed back 10 feet, creating an overhang above that space for outdoor seating. This was done to create more outdoor space on Bridge Park Avenue in response to

the Commission's input at the previous meeting. The building is also smaller in relation to midblock pedestrian way, which will allow a larger open space on Mooney Street and on Dale Drive.

Mr. Hunter provided a visual presentation depicting the variety of open spaces, softening the foundations of the buildings and creating a cohesive open space from the inner section of the block to the façades of the buildings. The appropriate amount of space is provided along the building façade so that future tenants will be able to express their ideas regarding how to engage the open space. The ground-floor storefronts will not be designed, allowing a variety to develop among the tenants. He showed views of the proposed paintable scrim wall of the parking garage, which faces the interior courtyard. He has contacted Mr. Guion, Director of the Dublin Arts Museum about the opportunity for discussion of art ideas. A brief review of the revisions to the garage, dog park, service tunnel, parking and building floor plates was presented.

Mr. Yoder stated that a holistic evaluation of the parking within the District was conducted on a summer evening when restaurants and patios were full; there were 1,884 empty parking spaces. The proposed parking for Block G will add 100 surplus parking spaces every night and 200 spaces on weekends. The proposed parking plan will provide the appropriate level of parking space.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Fishman stated that he appreciates the fact that currently, the District is overparked. However, some day those buildings will have different owners. Are there cross easements to allow full use of the parking?

Mr. Hunter stated that these are public parking garages, so there will be no future issues. Anyone can park anywhere, anytime.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the use of a green material at the entrance to office building. He was looking for other uses of that color within the block, but it appears to be a single occurrence. Is that use a deliberate intent to accentuate the office building entrance?

Dan Pease, M + A Architects, 775 Yard St., Suite 325, Columbus, OH stated that the color is intended to draw attention to that offset niche.

Mr. Hunter stated that they recently held an interior design meeting for the public spaces within the office building; there are opportunities for additional use of that color and material.

Ms. Fox stated that the steps that lead to the upper plaza do not make it apparent that the destination is the midway plaza. Currently, they appear to lead into the building.

Mr. Pease responded that the area has been maximized to the extent possible, and the stairs span that space. The green color is replicated up the stairs and on the scrim of the garage, and night lighting will invite patrons to the upper plaza.

Mr. Yoder stated the green box actually is not an entrance to the offices. It is an entry to a public space and a public elevator, which provides access to the garage and plaza, traversing the distance between the lower and upper plazas.

Mr. Hunter provided further details on the green color and layout/connection of the area.

Mr. Supelak requested additional details about the scrim.

Mr. Hunter stated that a scrim also exists in Crocker Park. This is a paintable, translucent metal scrim, punctuated with holes to allow air flow. The current view to the east is the side of the hill and trees. The thought was to accentuate that green aspect within the space; however, other ideas can be entertained.

Mr. Yoder stated that it could be a canvas for public art within Bridge Park, elevating this public space with a unique idea not used elsewhere within the District.

Mr. Supelak stated that the side panels of this garage are a great opportunity, a large canvas for an idea. Is that idea bound to a flat façade, or would the Dublin Arts Council have some opportunity, perhaps with three individual panels to provide some dimension relief? Three dimensionality often is beneficial, as they can sometimes integrate light.

Mr. Way stated that there is opportunity to include a pop of color in the courtyard that would tie into the scrim. Perhaps there could be a color theme for the courtyard, reflected by the furniture and lighting.

Mr. Hunter indicated that he liked that suggestion.

Mr. Way that that in regard to the Dale Drive façade of the parking garage, it might be possible to break the parapet line into three components, rather than one flat composition.

Mr. Hunter responded that the building will reflect a warehouse architecture style, but it might be possible to break up the center line.

Mr. Yoder stated that they have already elevated the garage architecture from that of the previous open garage concept, but they would take a look at the possible opportunity.

Mr. Way that he appreciates that they have succeeded in making the structure not look like a parking garage, but the Code does contain direction about breaking the roofline periodically. This might be an area where it would make sense to do so.

Mr. Hunter stated that the Dale Drive façade probably would not benefit from that, because of the asymmetry of the liner, but the Mooney Street façade perhaps could benefit.

Mr. Way stated that he is less concerned about that façade, because there is not a view of the entire composition; on Dale Drive, it can be seen.

Mr. Yoder stated that it would be just a matter of knocking the parapet up above the black portion and below.

Mr. Way stated that he would not attempt to design it, but the long facade with no break in the parapet caught his eye.

Mr. Hunter stated that there are two primary piers in the middle, and they would not necessarily need to protrude more; it may be possible to use brick and detailing and make the parapet pop up. Creating a break might be simple.

Mr. Yoder stated that the 1919 Building west on Bridge Street also reflects a warehouse design, which is an interesting, utilitarian aesthetic. He was excited to be able to implement that look here, but there is an art to getting it right.

Mr. Way stated that he was suggesting only that they think about it. He also has a question about the corner of the residential building at Tuller and Mooney streets. The brick panel on the corner piece that extends outward looks foreign to that entire corner piece. Is it occurring for a structural purpose? It would appear that if it were "pushed back," the corner piece would read as one architectural element.

Matt Lytle, Architect, SB Architecture, architect for the residential building, responded that as the height of the grade increases along Tuller Ridge, the grade is raised above the floor line. They wanted the wall to have a grounding element; the masonry was used to accomplish that. Perhaps it would not need to reach to the bottom of the transom. It could be lowered to be at the bottom of the larger pane of glass.

Mr. Yoder stated that he would be supportive of that idea.

Mr. Lytle noted that they also wanted to provide some privacy for that particular unit, rather than pedestrians having a straight view into the unit.

Mr. Call stated that if they were going to lower the brick there, she would prefer they also maintain symmetry around the corner.

Ms. Fox stated that the individual doorways on the residential units do not have stoops, as there is insufficient room; six to ten doorways face the sidewalk. Is it possible to elevate the appearance of those doorways?

Mr. Lytel responded that the units along Mooney Street do not have direct access to the elevator, so there is a need to provide an accessible, unique entrance to each of those units. That is the reason there are no stoops leading up into those units. The units along Dale Drive have corridor access to the elevator that is shared with the garage. The doorways could be embellished with landscape.

Ms. Fox stated that her issue is not the missing stoops; however, it is important that the entrance to the building become a focal point, such as a portico. The doors should not look similar to the windows. The entrances must stand out from the flat façade.

Mr. Lytel responded that the doorways could have a covered element with columns on either side, keeping it out of the right-of-way, of course.

Mr. Fishman referred to the scrim wall of the garage. He would suggest that they attempt not only to make it beautiful, but also unusual – not just a painting on a wall, but an element that people have not seen anywhere else. It should be an element that would stand out and draw people to that area.

Mr. Supelak stated that it is essential that it not be a flat canvas. It might be possible to use hydrochromic inks, which when wet, become something different, or thermochromic inks. There are vertical, seagrass lights, almost fiberoptic, that “wander.” Looking at the surrounding space, there may be elements in that space that could be integrated with the wall. Although it would become a larger undertaking, it could be an incredible public art opportunity, if embraced appropriately.

Mr. Fishman stated that it should not be just a mural, but an attention-grabbing form of art that draws people to that area to see it.

Mr. Yoder stated that they have budgeted the ability to hide the garage behind this interesting feature, and he likes the ideas. However, some of the ideas posed would require a separate budget. Dublin Arts Council does have a separate public arts budget that perhaps could be applied. With this wall, they have provided a starting point. From there, the Dublin Arts Council potentially could use a focus group and come up with an interesting idea.

Mr. Supelak responded that the developer has budgeted a scrim, furniture, and lights, and perhaps that is the appropriate mix without the need to spend more substantial dollars. That conversation should occur soon, however, before other decisions are made and taken too far.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call reviewed the general reasons for the 30 requested waivers and requested Commission comments.

Mr. Supelak stated the revised package is very good; their efforts are apparent. The renderings and elevations shown were very helpful to the Commission’s review. He appreciates the open space; the massing is good; the stepping in the parapets is well done on the north side; and he is excited about the public art, and the other details that will be added. He has no significant issues with the design and is supportive of the project. He would suggest the inclusion of up lighting for the buildings.

Ms. Fox complimented the applicants on the re-design. She appreciates that they reduced the level of the parking garage. She has some concerns about the residential building on the other side of Mooney Street. While it is possible to screen mechanicals from the ground units, what about the upper residential units?

Mr. Hunter responded that staff and their designers looked at that aspect thoroughly.

Ms. Fox stated that particularly since we are doing noncompatible residential units in this area, it is essential that the mechanicals be screened. She also has concerns about the lot coverage. Is the combined lot coverage for Block G 90%? If so, what is the reason?

James Peltier, Engineer EMH&T, stated that the overall lot coverage is 82%. They attempted to achieve as much greenspace on the block as possible. That is always a challenge with an urban development.

Mr. Yoder stated that a contiguous dog park area was added to the project to achieve several things: one was to meet the requested open space requirement; the other was to meet the impervious surface requirements. At 82% lot coverage, they are near the Code requirement of 80%.

Ms. Fox stated that she would prefer to see them adhere to the 75% and 80% requirements. The added landscape makes it a more interesting and timeless development. However, she does not see how they can have sidewalks greater than five feet wide, without reducing lot coverage. The proposal is for six-foot sidewalks.

Mr. Peltier responded that the five-foot width sidewalk is along Dale Drive, which is along the right-of-way. The lot coverage does not take into account that sidewalk in the right-of-way.

Mr. Fox inquired if it would be possible to have a 6-foot wide sidewalk, although some landscaping will be lost.

Mr. Peltier responded that they would be able to do so, as it is within the right-of-way. It will not impact the lot coverage for the development.

Ms. Fox stated that she is disappointed with the space on the corner of Bridge Park and Mooney streets. Although the square footage is good – 1,382 square feet, some of it is being used as private space. The only public space available will have a few linear benches along the perimeter. She would encourage them to find a way in which to achieve more bulk space on the corners, not just tiny seating spaces. She inquired about the blank wall limitations waiver along Mooney Street.

Ms. Martin responded that Waiver #8 relates to the connector between Building G1 and G2; there is a stretch greater than 15 feet. The request is to permit a 17-foot length of blank wall.

Ms. Fox inquired if the reason is the grade change.

Ms. Martin responded that she believes it is to address the interior functionality of the space and the elevator shaft.

Mr. Hunter responded that to reduce the size of the connector, there was a redesign that placed the elevators against that wall. The elevators are in the area where the teak material is used.

Ms. Fox stated that she likes that material. She was thinking that it was the west elevation on McCallum Garage.

Ms. Martin stated there is a second blank wall limitation, reflected with Waiver 19, which is the garage wall on which the scrim is located.

Ms. Fox stated her primary concern is the doorway entrances. Street level entrances into the residential building need to be enhanced. In regard to the open spaces – she likes the water feature. However, she believes the open spaces on the block are simply benches that wrap the corners. Those spaces are less innovative than is typical and are lacking in the placemaking element. She requested the sample images she provided to be shown. [Images shown of linear open space, mid pedestrian ways, and outdoor dining areas.] She believes these areas need to be made more attractive and appealing, similar to what is being done with the scrim wall. Aside from that, she believes the design is very well done.

Mr. Yoder noted that the impervious space percentage has improved. In Blocks B and C, it was 97-98%; however, in Block G, it is 82%.

Mr. Fox stated that she appreciates that improvement and really likes the water features. These are the elements that will make the development timeless. However, she would ask them to attempt to ensure the open spaces are not comprised of just a bench or table and chairs. More creativity is needed in these gathering places, as was illustrated in the aspirational images she provided tonight.

Mr. Schneier stated that he believes the revised design is very good. He appreciates the applicants listening to the Commission's previous comments and making some significant changes. The development team has exhibited expertise, and they are aware of the direction of the Commission's comments. The Commission is encouraging as much as possible within the bounds of its authority and Code. However, he congratulates them on this great design.

Mr. Grimes stated that this is a beautiful project. He likes the diversity within and throughout and the changes in elevations. Block G is a gem block in this District – an excellent example is being set. He appreciates the manner in which the applicant has responded to the Commission's constructive criticism, which is focused on seeing a high degree of excellence. Although the Commission urges for more, we appreciate what they have done and will do. There is no bad side to this development!

Mr. Fishman stated that he agrees with his colleagues. He appreciates the fact that this project has evolved into something better. The applicant has listened to the Commission's comments and he is confident they will do so with today's comments, as well. The Commission is focused on achieving the best out of every greenspace, for which Ms. Fox has provided some excellent suggestions. He appreciates their efforts toward achieving excellence and really likes the project.

Mr. Way stated that the Office Building is stunning, the Residential Building is top-notch, and the way in which the Garage is addressed is unique. His remaining comments relate to three items. The staff report noted some concerns about the viability of plants in the courtyard because it will be shaded year-round. Sometimes, it is possible to use art and other elements to enliven a space. He would encourage them to work toward that goal. He loves working fountains, but there was no discussion about what happens to the fountain in the winter. He would encourage them to think about the water feature as water moving over a surface, as when the fountain is turned off, there is still something to view that is attractive and usable. Additionally, the southwest corner of this block will receive a significant level of sunlight and direct heat in the summer. Shade will be important; perhaps they are considering mechanical shade, such as umbrellas. This corner will be loved or hated, depending on the time of year. Those are his comments, but this is a great project; their efforts have produced a great outcome.

Ms. Call stated that these buildings fit within Bridge Park. They display differentiation in architecture, but work together. This project does not deviate from the high standard established in Bridge Park. She appreciates the applicants taking the feedback from Commissioners' different perspectives and creating a cohesive design that reflects the vision of Bridge Park being a unique destination.

Ms. Call stated that actions on the following items are requested:

Conditional Use, 20-199CU:

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

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

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Final Development Plan, 20-045FDP

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the following Administrative Departures:

- 1) 153.062(O)(12)(a)(1) — Front Property Line Coverage

Requirement: A minimum 90 percent front property line coverage is required.

Request: 83 percent be required to be provided along Dale Drive when Buildings G1 and G2 are calculated together.

2) 153.062(O)(3)(a)(4) — Change in Roof Plane

Requirement: A single roof plane shall extend not greater than 80 feet in length.

Request: Permit a single roof plane to extend 85 feet in length along north elevation of Building G3.

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

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Motion #3:

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following 28 waivers:

1. §153.062(O)(5), (O)(12), (O)(3) — Lot Coverage

Requirement: Maximum impervious combined lot coverage for the Corridor Building, Parking Structure, and Apartment building shall not exceed 80 percent for the Corridor Building and Parking Structure, and shall not exceed 75 percent for the Apartment Building.

Request: Combined lot coverage, for Block G, not exceed 90 percent.

2. §153.062(O)(5)(b) — Building Height, Ground Story and Upper Stories

Requirement: Ground story floor height shall be a minimum of 12 feet and a maximum of 16 feet. Upper story floor height shall be a minimum of 10 feet and a maximum of 14 feet.

Request: Ground story height for west end of the first story be permitted to be a maximum of 25 feet in height, and the fifth story be permitted to a maximum of 18 feet in height.

3. §153.062(D)(1)(a) — Parapet Roof Types

Requirement: Shall be no higher than necessary to screen roof appurtenances from view from street or adjacent building of similar height. Parapets shall be no less than 2 feet and no greater than 6 feet in height.

Request: Parapet heights less than 2 - foot minimum. (1.25 feet in height)

4. §153.065(E)(3)(b) — Mechanical Screening

Requirement: All roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from view at ground level on all sides by one of the primary materials and colors of a street facing façade. Metal is not a permitted primary material for the Corridor Building Type.

Request: Permit rooftop mechanicals to be screened by metal.

5. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(1) — Street Facing Transparency

Requirement: A minimum 60 percent transparency be provided on the ground story of street-facing facades.

Request: Reduced ground story, street-facing transparency along Mooney Street, Bridge Park Avenue, and Dale Drive:

- Mooney Street (West) — 35%
- Bridge Park Avenue (South) — 48%
- Dale Drive (East) — 40%

6. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(1) — Blank Wall Limitations

Requirement: Blank walls are not permitted. A blank wall is an elevation with a stretch of 15 feet or greater of uninterrupted façade.

Request: Permit a 17-foot blank wall along the west elevation of the connector to Building G2 Parking Structure.

7. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(3) — Building Entrances

Requirement: The principal building entrance must be located along a Principal Frontage Street. The Code requires one building entrance every 75 feet along street facing facades.

Request: Permit the principal building entrance (office lobby) along a Neighborhood Street (Mooney Street), and to permit entrances at lengths greater than permitted:

- Dale Drive: 164 linear feet = 3 entrances required, 2 provided
- Bridge Park Avenue: 197 linear feet = 3 entrances required, 5 provided
- Mooney Street: 164 linear feet = 3 entrances required, 3 provided

8. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(4) — Vertical Façade Divisions

Requirement: A vertical façade division is required every 45 feet to ensure a varied building plane.

Request: Permit fewer vertical façade divisions than required by Code:

- East Elevation: ±89-foot increments
- North Elevation: ±96-foot increments
- South Elevation: ±97-foot and ±95-foot increments
- West Elevation: ±52-foot increments

9. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(5) — Materials

Requirement: 80 percent primary building materials (glass, brick, stone).

Request: Permit 68 percent primary building materials on the west elevation (Mooney Street).

Building G2 (Parking Structure)

10. §153.062(C)(1) — Incompatible Building Types

Requirement: Parking Structure and Single-Family Attached Building Types are not permitted directly across the street from one another or on the same block face.

Request: Building G2 (Parking Structure) adjacent to Sycamore Ridge Apartments (Single-Family Attached)

11. §153.062(O)(12)(a)(1) — Required Build Zone (RBZ)

Requirement: The front and corner-side required build zones for a Parking Structure are 5 feet to 25 feet from the property line.

Request: To permit zero feet to 25 feet required build zones to accommodate the following building siting:

- Front: 2.86 feet provided. Encroaches 2.14 feet beyond the required RBZ
- Corner Side: 1.46 feet provided. Encroaches 3.54 feet beyond the required RBZ

12. §153.062(D)(4)(a) — Towers, Location and Quantity

Requirement: Towers on Parking Structures are permitted on facades only at terminal vistas, corners at two principal frontage streets, and/or adjacent to an open space type. Where permitted by building type, only one tower is allowed per building.

Request: Northwest tower allowed to deviate from location requirement, and a total of three towers be permitted.

13. §153.062(D)(4)(b) — Towers, Height

Requirement: Tower height shall not be greater than the height of one additional upper floor of the building to which the tower is applied. The width of a tower shall not exceed its height. The maximum upper story height for Parking Structures is 12 feet.

Request: Permit deviations from height and width requirements:

- Building G2 Northeast Tower: Height 19.33 feet, width 21.33 feet
- Building G2 Northwest Tower: Height 17.33 feet, width 21.33 feet
- Building G2 Southwest Tower: Height 12.67 feet, width 18 feet

14. §153.065(B)(5)(c) — Interior Circulation, Ceiling Clearance Heights

Requirement: A minimum ceiling clearance height of 12 feet is required where the parking structure has street frontage, excluding the driveway opening, and the parking structure shall be designed and constructed to allow potential occupancy of the first 20 feet of building by a commercial or civic/public/institutional use.

Request: Permit at the Mooney Street frontage clear ceiling height at ± 10 feet.

15. §153.062(O)(12)(c) — Occupied Space

Requirement: Parking structures are required to be line with occupied space with a minimum depth of 20 feet along principal frontage streets.

Request: Occupied space along Dale Drive be permitted to be less than 20 feet at 16.83 feet.

16. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(1) — Street Facing Transparency

Requirement: A minimum 65 percent storefront transparency be provided on the ground story of facades facing a principal frontage street.

Request: 41 percent ground-story storefront transparency along Dale Drive.

17. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(2) — Blank Wall Limitations

Requirement: Blank walls are not permitted. A blank wall is an elevation with a 15 foot or greater stretch of uninterrupted façade.

Request: Permit the south façade, adjacent to public open space, to be fully screened by scrim.

18. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(3) — Building Entrances

Requirement: The Code requires one building entrance every 75 feet along street-facing facades.

Request: Permit one entrance along Mooney Street where two are required.

19. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(4) — Vertical Façade Divisions

Requirement: A vertical façade division is required every 30 feet to ensure a varied building plane.

Request: Permit fewer vertical façade divisions than required by Code:

- East Elevation: ± 102 foot increment
- West Elevation: ± 85 foot increment

20. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(5) — Materials

Requirement: 80 percent primary building materials (glass, brick, stone).

Request: Permit 35 percent primary building materials on the south elevation (open space).

Building G3 (Apartment Building)

21. §153.062(O)(3)(a)(1) — Required Build Zone (RBZ)

Requirement: The front required build zone for an Apartment Building is 5 feet to 20 feet from the property line.

Request: To permit zero feet to 20 feet required build zones to accommodate the following building siting:

- Front: Dale Drive – Minimum 0.38 feet provided
- Front: Tuller Ridge Drive – Minimum 4.75 feet provided

22. §153.062(O)(3)(d)(3) — Building Entrances

Requirement: One building entrance every 75 feet along street-facing facades.

Request: Permit one entrance along Tuller Ridge Drive where three are required.

23. §153.062(I)(2)(a) — Stoops

Requirement: Stoops shall have a minimum width and depth of five feet of open area.

Request: Three stoops provide smaller than the minimum dimensions required, and three provide an at-grade sidewalk entrance (no stoop).

24. §153.062(O)(3)(d)(4) — Vertical Façade Divisions

Requirement: A vertical façade division is required every 40 feet to ensure a varied building plane.

Request: Permit fewer vertical façade divisions than required by Code:

- East Elevation: 64.54 foot increment, 40.21 foot increment
- North Elevation: 65.63 feet, 65.04 foot increments
- West Elevation: 64.58 - foot increment, 40.29 77- foot increment

25. §153.062(O)(3)(d)(5) — Materials

Requirement: 80 percent primary building materials (glass, brick, stone).

Request: Permit 46 percent primary building materials on the west elevation (Mooney Street); 44 percent primary building materials on the north elevation (Tuller Ridge Drive); and 46 percent primary building materials on the east elevation (Dale Drive).

Open Space

26. §153.064(F)(6) — Open Space Type, Park

Requirement: Parks (minimum of 2 acres in size) provide informal active and passive larger-scale recreational amenities to city residents and visitors. Parks have natural plantings and can be created around existing natural features such as water bodies or tree stands. Parks can be used to define edges of neighborhoods and districts.

Request: Permit a dog park to be designated as a Park not meeting the intent and minimum 2-acres size defined in the Code.

27. §153.064(G)(1)(b) — Open Space Proportions

Requirement: With the exception of the Greenway, all Open Space Types shall be sized at a ratio of not more than 3:1, length to width

Request: Permit a Pocket Park between Building G1 and G2 that has a length-to-width proportion of over 6:1.

28. §153.064(G)(4)(f) — Impervious and Semi-Pervious Area

Requirement: For a Pocket Park, the maximum permitted impervious area is 30 percent with an additional 10 percent semi-pervious permitted.

Request: Permit the open space between Building G1 and G2 to be approximately 58 percent impervious.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Motion #4:

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Shared Parking Plan permitting 360 parking spaces to be provided where 526 are required.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Motion #5:

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the Following 17 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide window specifications for Building G1 for staff review prior to submitting for permits;
- 2) That the applicant provide installation details for the proposed Juliet balconies on Building G3 with the building permit application;
- 3) That the applicant submit all proposed site furnishings associated with public open spaces for staff review prior to submitting for permits;
- 4) That the applicant designate the location and quantity of required bicycle parking with the building and/or site permit applications;
- 5) That the applicant verify if parking structure security techniques and surveillance will be implemented in Building G2;
- 6) That the applicant provide the three required loading spaces on the site plan for staff review prior to submitting for permits;
- 7) That the applicant submit details of the proposed ground mounted mechanical enclosures with the building/site permit application;
- 8) That the applicant adjust the proposed site lighting plans to provide the required lighting uniformity with the site permit application;
- 9) The sidewalk along Dale Drive be revised to provide a minimum of six feet of clear sidewalk width, subject to approval of the City Engineer;
- 10) The applicant establish and execute a public access easement for the dog park prior to issuance of a Site Only permit;
- 11) The applicant work with staff to revise the landscape plan, as detailed in the staff report, prior to submittal of a Building Permit.
- 12) The applicant extend design elements of the scrim screen through to the lower level Mooney Street plaza.
- 13) The applicant revise Building G3 entries along Dale Drive and Mooney Street to provide architectural details, 153.062(I)(3)(a), for entrance design, in accordance with the Commission's discussion, subject to staff approval.
- 14) Building G2's parapet along Dale Drive be broken up in accordance with the Commission's discussion, subject to staff approval.
- 15) The applicant submit a comprehensive open space lighting package, subject to staff approval.
- 16) The brick foundation cladding on the northwest corner of Building G3 be revised, subject to staff approval.
- 17) The fountain be revised to ensure a year round aesthetic, in accordance with the Commission's discussion, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Final Plat, 16-044FP

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded a recommendation of City Council approval of the Final Plat with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission to City Council for approval.

Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Mr. Yoder and Mr. Hunter thanked staff, Commission and the consultants for all their time and tireless efforts to reach this successful outcome.

~~6. Specialty Hospitals Administrative Request – Code Amendment, 21-009ADM~~

~~Review and recommendation to City Council for a Code Amendment to establish requirements for Specialty Hospitals.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Rauch stated that at the March 18 discussion, the Commission discussed the draft Code language requested the following changes be made:~~

- ~~• A maximum building size be proposed for Specialty Hospitals.~~
- ~~• Fence specifications be omitted and if a fence is requested, those requirements would default to Code.~~
- ~~• Parking standard be omitted and a Parking Plan defining the parking requirements based on their operational needs be submitted.~~
- ~~• Addition of an emergency and perimeter security plan.~~
- ~~• References in the use specific standards that state "unless otherwise approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission" be omitted.~~
- ~~• Licensing or certification requirements be explored.~~

~~The requested modifications have been made with the exception of the licensing or certification requirements. After significant research, there is no consistent state requirement for this process; therefore, this was not included in the modification. Additionally, the Commission requested information concerning minimum lot sizes and proximity to residential uses, and that information has been provided in the packet that show that no residential areas will be negatively impacted.~~

~~Commission Questions/Discussion~~

~~Ms. Fox stated that a requirement has been included [page 9] that a Specialty Hospital must be located a minimum of 500 feet from any residential district or use; however, on the following page, the language states that the required Rear Yard "shall not be less than one-fourth of the sum of the height of the structure. In no case, should the rear yard be less than 15 feet." This seems to be a contradiction. Mr. Rauch stated that those are two different items. A residential use cannot be within 500 feet, as measured from the rear property line. The rear yard setback addresses where the building can be located on that parcel.~~