



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, March 15, 2018

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

- 1. BSD SRN – Z Cucina Patio Expansion** **6584 Riverside Drive**
18-008MPR **Minor Project Review**
- Proposal: A patio expansion for an existing tenant space in Block B of the Bridge Park Development. The site is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood.
- Location: East side of Riverside Drive, approximately 200 feet southeast of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue.
- Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
- Applicant: Brad Parish & Bryan Galli, Architectural Alliance.
- Planning Contact: Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II.
- Contact Information: 614.410.4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us
- Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/art/18-008

Request: Approval of this request for a Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Determination: This application was approved. This approval shall be valid for a period of two years from the date of approval in accordance with Zoning Code §153.065(H) and §153.066(G).

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Vince Papsidero
Vince A. Papsidero, FAICP *me*
Director of Planning





MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, March 15, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner/Chief Building Official; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Logan Stang, Planner I; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Michael Hendershot, Civil Engineer II; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant; Jimmy Hoppel, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Brian Galli, Architectural Alliance (Case 1); Andreas Larisch, M+A Architects; Nathan Harrington, Osborn Engineering; and Michael Villipoto, TMG Adventure Parks, Inc. (Case 2); and Brian Sell and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan (Case 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the February 15 meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTION/DETERMINATION

1. BSD SRN – Z Cucina Patio Expansion 18-008MPR

6584 Riverside Drive Minor Project Review

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for a patio expansion for an existing tenant space in Block B of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood and is on the east side of Riverside Drive, approximately 200 feet southeast of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented the aerial view of the site to show the location as it relates to the other blocks and the proposed site plan that delineates the layout of the proposed patio. She reported the existing patio area that was approved with the original site is along portions of the western and southern facades of the building and the proposed patio would be adjacent to the existing open space in between buildings B1 and B2.

Ms. Burchett said 550 square feet has been added for the proposed patio but no canopies or awnings were proposed. She explained the proposed landscaping planter boxes are made of steel and will limit/enclose the area. She said a 6-foot encroachment into open space areas is permitted under the development agreement and the Law Director's office has supported this encroachment. Ms. Burchett said the patio includes outdoor seating and presented the proposed furniture and fixtures; which includes Brazilian teak table tops with a metal disc base and cushioned exterior side chairs. She added no outdoor speakers or advertising are proposed at this time.

Ray Harpham asked if the only entrance to this area was through the restaurant to which Ms. Burchett answered affirmatively.



Claudia Husak noted the proposed expansion went beyond the 6-foot allowance; the expansion is actually 10 feet, 1 inch. She reported that Staff had concerns about the patio extending out from the building when in fact this patio would not extend past the existing architectural precast concrete curb and would just fill the portion that was notched out from the building originally. Vince Papsidero said it serves as an alcove while leaving the integrity of the open space protected. Ms. Burchett said the existing pedestrian zone will be maintained through the open space as the patio is flush with the outer edge of the building. She reported that the Zoning Inspectors have reviewed the existing trees and determined that they would not thrive in the approved location and were supportive of their removal.

Donna Goss inquired about the seating capacity as she wanted to ensure there was enough room for circulation and ADA access. Ms. Burchett said the applicant is proposing the number of seats as shown on the floor plan, which consist of three, two-top tables and three four-top tables that equate to 18 seats. She said clearance accessibility must meet standards with the proper egress which is good and this would be further verified with the building permit.

Mr. Papsidero asked what the General Staff Review comments were of this proposal. Ms. Burchett reported additional egress for fire was requested and has since been addressed by the applicant. Mr. Papsidero asked if the applicant was meeting requirements for landscaping to which Ms. Burchett answered affirmatively.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for a Minor Project Review with no conditions.

The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a motion to approve the Minor Project with no conditions. Mr. Harpham motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and the vote was unanimous to approve the Minor Project Review.

CASE REVIEW

2. ID-2 – Urban Air Adventure Park 17-101WID-DP

7679 & 7685 Dublin Plain-City Road Development Plan Review

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for two, one-story, 20,000-square-foot indoor entertainment and recreational use facilities for an approximately 2-acre parcel and a 2.88-acre parcel, both located in the West Innovation District and zoned Research Flex District. He said the site is south of Dublin Plain-City Road, approximately 750 feet west of the intersection with Cosgray Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.042(D).

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and reported this was last reviewed at the end of last year and the applicant has returned with a revised submittal. He presented the site plan that was proposed in December 2017. He said the zoning code contains a size limitation for this use and therefore the development will be constructed on two parcels with a single shared access. He said the applicant is working directly with ODOT on the location of the access and installation of a left-turn lane as the right-of-way is under ODOT's control. He said the location of the parking and the distance of the building from SR 161 has been a concern because code requires that parking be minimized in front of the building.

Mr. Stang said based on previous discussions and the concerns outlined by Staff that the applicant proposed two conceptual site options for review. He presented the revised site plan and noted the courtyard space was changed to distribute parking to the sides and back of the building and a continuous drive aisle was added to improve circulation. He said Staff previously had concerns with the dead end drive aisle on earlier iterations of the site and that the loop now resolves that concern.

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~~