



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 1, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the May 1, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Gary Alexander, Rebecca Call, Jamey Chinnock, Jason Deschler, Dan Garvin, Kathy Harter, Kim Way

Staff members present: Thaddeus Boggs, Jenny Rauch, Bassem Bitar, Rati Singh, Zach Hounshell, Heidi Rose, Tina Wawszkiewicz

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Deschler moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission and make the decision. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. The Rules and Regulations of the Planning and Zoning Commission state that no new agenda items are to be introduced after 10:30 p.m. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call explained the hearing process that would be followed.

Ms. Call swore in staff and audience members who anticipated providing testimony.

CASE REVIEW

Case #23-125Z-PDP

The Beacon – Preliminary Development Plan

Request for review and recommendation of approval of rezoning a +/-21.523-acre site from R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District; PCD, Planned Commerce Districts (7315 Sawmill Road and part of Milco Office Park); and PUD, Planned Unit Development District, Northeast Quad to a new PUD, Planned Unit Development District, and a Preliminary Development Plan for the construction of a continuum of care retirement community and associated site improvements and amenities. The site is located northeast of the roundabout at Bright Road and Emerald Parkway.

Applicant Presentation

Steve Newcomb, Developer, Newbury Companies, 10368 Forest Glen Place, Powell, stated that it has been more than four years since this project began. In 2019, he began looking at senior housing. He built a lot of condos including a section of Corazon Village. He looked at many retirement communities, such as Dublin Retirement Village, Friendship Village, First Community and Powell Senior Living (now StoryPoint). It became clear that the single level of care communities did not have a continuum of care that allows people to age in place. He stated that some of the communities have tremendous amenities and staff because they have 450 residents. A normal, single level of care community will have around 100-150 residents. After much research, he found that a larger number of people adds to the events and is what he would rather create. A larger, continuum of care facility requires a lot of land. The site under consideration this evening is 13 parcels with 7 different owners, which makes the process more complicated. Being from this area, he felt like this is a great opportunity to give back to the community.

Mr. Newcomb shared details of the proposed continuum of care retirement community and associated site improvements and amenities. The site consists of four buildings to be built in four phases. The Phase 1 building is in the center and will be 138 units of independent and assisted living. It will cost at least \$40 million. The Phase 2 building is a considerably smaller, one-story building with 32 memory care units. Phase 3 will have memory care on the first floor and assisted living on the upper floors. There could be some independent living as well. There will be approximately 36 memory care units and 85 assisted living units. The Phase 4 building will be the most active, youngest group. It will have 85 large independent living units. [Different elevations shown]. Mr. Newcomb stated that all of the utilities and most of the infrastructure will be installed immediately. He shared architectural details about Phase 1. They changed the roof height with this iteration giving higher ceilings and relief in the roofing system. There are large balconies planned that wrap around the corners and stone at the front entry. Much of this concept is about the amenities. Socialization is aimed at preventing isolation and getting people to be active. They will offer bocce ball, pickleball, croquet, and fire pits. The primary activity will be in the activity courtyard.

Mr. Newcomb shared additional renderings of Phase 1. He noted that the grade falls from Bright Road to the creek. They will have retaining walls and an outdoor dining space. There will be at least four dining facilities. There is an auditorium planned and a greenhouse to meet the desire for gardening. Mr. Newcomb stated that the layout for the building in the second phase will handle independent living, assisted living and memory care. There are memory gardens planned. There are mounding and trees planned along Bright Road. Phase 3 will have 36 units with memory care on the first floor, assisted living on the upper floors and dining on the fourth floor. There is a shared access with the office building off of Sawmill Road. Phase 4 is the final phase of the project and will have a similar style as the rest of the project. Design elements include large balconies, different rooflines and courtyard. Phases 1, 3 and 4 all have underground parking. There is a total of 439 parking spaces, 296 of which are underground.

Mr. Newcomb stated that there are two main areas for this development. Subarea A is a total of 17 acres and Subarea B is 4.4 acres. The lot coverage percentage when considering the entire area is 38%. Lot coverage of Subarea A only is 48%. The plan has a lot of open space. The idea is the ability to walk the site and connect with Dublin paths. [Inspirational images shared].

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that the site under consideration is surrounded by Bright Road, Sawmill Road and Emerald Parkway. The new Mt. Carmel Hospital is just to the south and Lifetime Fitness is located to the north of the proposed site. There is a neighborhood office park at the corner of Bright and Sawmill roads. The request is for a recommendation to City Council of a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and rezoning. The process for this type of application begins with an optional informal review, and then a concept plan review. The applicant has been before PZC three times for different versions of a concept plan review. The PDP and rezoning stage establishes the planned district, including a development text that sets the standards that become the zoning code for this particular development. This includes the site layout, open space and circulation. At this stage, specific details like plant species, specific architectural details, signage or lighting are not under consideration. With the recommendation of PZC, this application then moves to City Council. If approved by City Council, the applicant will come back to PZC for Final Development Plan approval.

Mr. Bitar stated that the current site consists of several parcels in several different zoning districts. The proposal would rezone all of those into this new planned unit district (PUD). There are three at the southwest corner of the site that are owned by the City of Dublin. The applicant is in discussions with the City about trading those for a couple parcels he owns on the south side of Bright Road. That trade agreement will be part of discussions with City Council. Surrounding properties are zoned R-1, suburban residential or different types of commercial planned districts. There are several vacant homes that would be demolished with approval of the development. The majority of the site is within the Neighborhood Office designation in the Community Plan. The principal uses envisioned for that are office, medical office and institutional office. Typical densities are less than is shown in this development, because the Community Plan covers different potential locations within the city that are labeled Neighborhood Office. In many cases, it is limited to two stories with cluster buildings. The northwest corner of this site is designated park/open space on the Future Land Use Map. It is intended for either public parks or open spaces/natural areas. The site is also within the Emerald Corridor Special Area Plan, which is a specific plan for the entirety of the Emerald Corridor from Tuttle Crossing all the way to Sawmill Road. The plan designates the area as Neighborhood Office, but there are some recommendations about preserving the green character along Emerald Parkway as well as protecting the stream corridor in the woodland areas. Mr. Bitar stated that the first concept plan to come before the Commission (January 2020) included several five-story buildings and a few smaller residential buildings closer to the southwest corner. At that time, the Commission supported the uses but expressed concerns about density, five-story height, placement of buildings on the site, the architecture and the development of the northwest corner. The applicant came back in November 2021. At that time, they had a contract on the property at the southwest corner of the roundabout at Emerald Parkway and Bright Road. That proposal showed a less intense development on the initial site complemented by uses like senior villas and support services. The Commission supported the synergy and use but expressed concern about the residential uses being out of character with the Community Plan. They emphasized the need to focus on the preservation of Billingsley Creek and expressed concern about impacts on adjacent neighborhoods. The applicant came back again in January 2022 with the development scaled back. That plan included a series of three- and four-story buildings in the back that were

intended to complement the creek. It also included a couple of small office buildings at the entrance to the development. The northwest corner was left in its natural state with the exception of a few pathways, and the southwest corner was complemented by some retention ponds and amenities. PZC supported the reduction in intensity and appreciated the responsiveness of the applicant. The current version is similar to the 2022 proposal. The main difference is that the two office buildings have been removed and in their place is the memory care structure, which makes sense with other uses on the site. The buildings are four stories in the same orientation as previously proposed. Another difference is the emergency access drive/walking path changes that were made based on feedback from the Fire Department. It has been designed in such a way that when it is not used for emergency access, it is part of the pedestrian pathway system.

Mr. Bitar stated that the Emerald Parkway Corridor is listed as a commuter boulevard with traditional Dublin character, including larger setbacks and natural character. It is also listed as a corridor of significance, which highlights major roadways and their impacts. The emphasis is on retaining the natural character. Bright Road is identified as a neighborhood boulevard with a river corridor character. Bright Road has recently been widened and the curb cut for this site has already been established. Sawmill Road is arterial and outside of the City's jurisdiction. The applicant provided a traffic impact study that has been reviewed by Columbus and Dublin. The applicant responded to some comments from the City of Columbus, and the final version is still under review. That will have to be finalized before Council's review of the application, but it does not have an impact on the specific access points nor the internal layout, so staff felt comfortable bringing this forward. The curb cut from Bright Road has been established with a secondary access off of a shared drive with the office park just to the south. Easements have existed there for that type of shared access. Staff is recommending that the setback on Emerald Parkway be increased from 50 feet as shown to at least 100 feet per the Community Plan Recommendation (Community Plan recommends 60 to 100 feet). Staff would like to continue work on the alignment of the entry drive. [Photos of existing conditions displayed].

Mr. Bitar stated that Staff is recommending that Subarea B remains in its natural state with no development beyond walkways and floodplain work. There would be additional tree removal that would exceed the amount that City policies cover as well as increased density, if it were to be developed. The density as proposed is 26,000 square feet per acre, which is more than what is typically recommended for neighborhood office, but staff feels that it is appropriate given the low intensity of this particular use. The applicant does have a tree preservation plan but some of the interior trees would be removed because of the grading for the site and the access. Those details will continue as this moves to the Final Development Plan (FDP) stage. Mr. Bitar noted that Phase 1 would include most improvements needed for the entire development including stormwater ponds, access drive and most of the parking. Much of the landscaping around the perimeter would be done as part of the first phase so that if subsequent phases do not occur for a long time, it still meets the intended character. Staff is supportive of the overall circulation plan for pedestrian pathways. There are six-foot sidewalks planned throughout site. The public sidewalk along Sawmill Road needs to be of the same character as that to the north. That will likely require an easement on the applicant's property. It is recommended that be constructed as part of Phase 1. Staff would like to see pedestrian movement separate from vehicular movement in accesses to parking structures. The buildings in the back are four-story buildings with terraces to address the meandering grade. The buildings closest to Bright Road will be one-story buildings with the highest point being 35 feet at the top of the peak. Those buildings are more in line with the massing and character of the adjacent office buildings to the east. Staff would like to continue to work on architectural details of the transitions at FDP. Staff's analysis is that the application meets or meets with conditions the criteria for approval of a PDP. Staff recommends that PZC recommend approval

to City Council with several conditions. The conditions are primarily to keep Subarea B free from development and other conditions related to the traffic impact study; the alignment of the entry drive; the meandering path along Sawmill Road; the safety around the entrances to the parking area; the setbacks along Emerald Parkway; the building elevation details; and coordinating with engineering staff on stormwater, utilities and other site improvements.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock asked if, as currently proposed, Phase 4 meets the 100-foot setback requirement. Mr. Bitar stated that everything shown is well beyond the minimum setback and is in compliance. He added that staff's main concern is Subarea B and any development there.

Ms. Call asked staff to talk through where the different plans speak to setbacks. Mr. Bitar stated that setbacks are part of the development text, which is one of the items PZC is being asked to recommend approval of. Specific details like architectural details, lighting, and signage would be discussed at a later stage. Ms. Call stated that the development text will become the code that would govern the development of this particular parcel. If there are differences in the text with higher level tools like the Community Plan, those need to be called out. Mr. Bitar stated that staff's recommendation is to follow the recommendation of Community Plan with regard to that setback.

Mr. Chinnock thanked the applicant for their presentation, whose passion is evident. He asked if the many amenities are available for residents and families. Mr. Newcomb stated that they are not open to the public but intended for residents and their families. Mr. Chinnock asked about the path to the north and if the applicant is open to including more pathways. Mr. Newsome stated that there is a lot of infrastructure going on with Phase 1. They are going to make this as nice as possible and are open to additional paths. Mr. Chinnock asked about the phasing schedule. Mr. Newcomb stated that each phase will probably take 18 months to two years. If leases fill up immediately, then it will go faster. Mr. Chinnock asked for more information on parking. Mr. Newsome stated that there will be plenty of parking for the residents. Not every resident will have parking needs. Mr. Chinnock asked if some residents will rely on surface parking. Mr. Newcomb stated that he does not see that happening. He noted that their calculations are based on consultant information.

Ms. Harter thanked the applicant for attending and sought confirmation that the plan calls for 375 total units. Mr. Newcomb answered in the affirmative. Ms. Harter asked if the units will have storage units. Mr. Newcomb stated he will work through that. Garage doors could be put on some of the spaces. There is sufficient parking to allow for that. Ms. Harter stated that sidewalks around the Columbus area and Bright Road are concrete but this is asphalt. Mr. Newcomb stated that some of the paths are asphalt, as they are more like bike paths and others are concrete. Ms. Harter asked if the bus stop on Sawmill Road will need to be enhanced. Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that a public project is under construction right now adding a concrete pad for the existing bus stop just to the south of the site, near the intersection of Bright and Sawmill roads. The City of Dublin plans to install a shelter, as discussed at City Council at a later date. Ms. Harter asked if the applicant has spoken with the City of Columbus. Mr. Newcomb answered that his engineers have. Ms. Harter thanked the applicant for meeting with the East Side Civic Association. She asked if he has spoken with Mt. Carmel and the nearby office owners. Mr. Newcomb stated that there have been good conversations. They have invited everyone to that site (biology professors,

residents, neighbors, etc.). Ms. Harter asked about the stacks on top of the buildings. Mr. Newcomb stated that it is an architectural design creating relief and allowing variety in ceiling height.

Matt Lones, Architect, Orange Frog Design Group, 411 Meditation Lane, Columbus, stated that they tried to design the parapets and step up areas so that there is not just a flat horizontal roof plane. They have tried to create an aesthetic that looks nice. The Phase 2 building was designed to respond to the office park next door. It has a pitched roof with some flat areas so they tried to step up elements at the corners and the entry to create more interest.

Mr. Way asked how the application meets open space requirements. Mr. Bitar stated that density standards and open space are set up in the development text and in the recommendations of the Community Plan but are not specific. It was clear from the beginning that there were natural areas and frontage along Emerald Parkway that are critical. Staff typically considers preserved green space and reasonableness of proposed lot coverage. Mr. Way asked if this application could meet requirements with just Subarea A or if it requires Subarea B. Mr. Bitar stated that if you count both Subareas, the site is at 40% lot coverage. If Subarea B is developed, lot coverage would be 48%. The development text provides leeway up to 47%. Staff is comfortable with some leeway, but the development of Subarea B would raise that number. Mr. Way asked if there would be requirements for upgrades to Subarea B to make the open space accessible. Mr. Bitar stated that staff does envision some pathways. Ideally, they would all be able to connect the site but it may be tough with the width of the floodplain. Mr. Way stated open space has to be accessible. He asked the applicant what the expectations are to make this accessible. Mr. Newcomb stated that his thought is that he would build a really nice project and would like the ability to do things that are good for community. This requires a lot of upfront infrastructure costs.

Phil Moorehead, G2 Planning & Design, 720 East Broad Street, Columbus, stated that open space is not necessarily the inverse of lot coverage. They have 42% open space south of the creek. Nothing north of the creek is being counted as open space but they are including the total acreage as the denominator.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission is asked to make a recommendation for development text and rezoning. She asked Mr. Boggs to address future phases and how they would go through the process should there be a desire for something to be developed on a parcel that is included in this development text. Mr. Boggs stated the Community Plan sets forth the framework and intended future land uses as adopted by Council. It is not a rigid document. It serves as a guideline and is not itself zoning but is certainly relevant and guides recommendations of staff and this commission's consideration. If a recommendation is made for approval and City Council approves the text, that text becomes the zoning code for this tract of property to which it applies. Future development would come back to the PZC for FDP and the Commission would be looking to see if it complies with development text. Mr. Boggs stated that if there is discrepancy between the text and the Community Plan, the text would supersede because it would be law.

Mr. Garvin asked why there is a need to change Subarea B at all. Mr. Bitar stated that this is all part of the same designation because it is part of the request for rezoning. It could be consistent with the Community Plan but be rezoned through this process. Mr. Garvin stated that any condition put on Subarea B would be included in the development text and would have to be

heard by the PZC to be changed. Mr. Boggs stated that anything other than very minor modification would come back as an amendment to the development text and be treated as a legislative act. It would come back through PZC for recommendation, and then Council would make a final decision because that would be changing the law that is applicable to this property.

Mr. Alexander asked if there is an agreement between the applicant and the office park regarding the access road. Mr. Newcomb stated that he is buying part of the parking lot. He gave up access to Bright Road. Mr. Alexander asked if engineering has reviewed stormwater for this project. Mr. Bitar stated that staff has been reviewing this for well over a year and they are down to a few final details. They have provided quite a few reports about floodplain, stormwater, and traffic impact. Engineering has done extensive reviews. Mr. Newcomb stated that the text states that development will be substantially similar to the plan associated with the development text. Any deviation would come back before the PZC. Ms. Call stated that individual agreements that apply to lots are different than zoning text. Mr. Alexander asked if the City of Columbus has plans to make changes on Sawmill Road. Ms. Wawzkiewicz stated that the current construction project includes a dual turn lane. That means the road north of the intersection will have to be widened to make all the lanes line up. Those improvements are happening now. She is not aware of additional roadway improvements in the immediate area.

Mr. Bitar stated that with regard to the stormwater, staff did not get information regarding Subarea B so that has not been reviewed. Also the access off of Sawmill Road has an existing easement.

Mr. Deschler asked if consideration was given to having asphalt paths more integrated around the retention ponds. Mr. Newcomb stated that the grade slopes off there. Mr. Deschler asked the applicant if he had any objections to the currently proposed conditions. Mr. Newcomb answered no. He would like to have a conversation about Subarea B. Mr. Deschler clarified that Condition 1) "The development of Subarea B is limited to the floodplain compensatory cut, temporary construction entrance, walking paths, and similar amenities, and references to any other development in the subarea are to be removed from the development text" limits the development of Subarea B to what is listed.

Mr. Garvin thanked the applicant for the presentation and the changes made since previous iterations. He is supportive of having less surface lot coverage by putting the parking garage under buildings. He asked if there was any way to appease the neighbors who were concerned about height. Mr. Newcomb stated that has not been a concern recently. From the front, it is four stories. Mr. Garvin asked about the development of Subarea B. Mr. Newcomb stated that he did not want to come back for that and have it be a surprise.

Ms. Call asked if staff is expected to park underground or in surface parking. Mr. Newcomb stated that it could be a mixture. He added that their consultant says there is more than enough parking.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that he is supportive of the project with conditions laid out by staff.

Ms. Harter stated that she thinks this is a great project. She is not concerned by the height. She suggested the applicant keep in mind the dense foliage as the character of the area.

Mr. Way stated that he has seen this project a number of times and has walked the site. This plan is developed with the ability to use the site to its maximum potential and save the character and quality of the stream corridor. He is very supportive of the project.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is supportive for a number of reasons. The density makes sense because it is a relatively low intensity use compared to multi-family of the same size. The use in the location makes sense. The massing is very logical by burying the taller structures deeper in the site. Dublin, as an aging community, benefits from having one more facility like this in the community.

Mr. Deschler thanked the applicant for the comprehensive presentation. He is supportive of the application with conditions.

Mr. Garvin stated that he is supportive of the request with the conditions listed. He appreciates the quality of work seen and agrees with Mr. Alexander about the need in the community. If there is a future application to modify what we recommend here for Subarea B, it could undermine this approval. It is important to keep that subarea as an open space.

Ms. Call stated that she is also supportive of the application. It has improved over time. She thanked the applicant for listening to the Commission, staff and residents. Open space in Dublin does not just benefit the property owner. The City has spent a lot of time waiting for the Emerald Corridor to develop. It would behoove us to look at the City to consider the open space not just from the particular user but people who live and walk along that area. To alter that experience could have negative effects. PUDs are wonderful because they provide flexibility. This deviates from the one- to two-story recommendation from the Community Plan. She is supportive of that because of the open space compensation. She does not necessarily think all of the improvement to that open space needs to be shouldered by the property owner.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Alexander seconded a recommendation of approval to City Council of the Preliminary Development Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) The development of Subarea B is limited to the floodplain compensatory cut, temporary construction entrance, walking paths, and similar amenities, and references to any other development in this subarea are to be removed from the development text.
- 2) The Traffic Impact Study should be finalized prior to City Council review, and the applicant is responsible for the cost of any off-site improvements, as determined by the study.
- 3) The on-site alignment of the entry drive off Bright Road should be further refined at the Final Development Plan (FDP) stage to minimize conflicts, add a focal point, and achieve a more curvilinear design.
- 4) That an asphalt path with a meandering alignment be incorporated along Sawmill Road as part of Phase 1 of the project, and that any easements needed to accommodate it be granted by the applicant.

- 5) That separated pedestrian paths be provided along the emergency access drive where entries to the structured parking are located.
- 6) That the development text be modified to increase the building and pavement setbacks along Emerald Parkway to a minimum of 100 feet.
- 7) The building elevations be refined to reflect vertical building material transitions at inside corners, consistent with the development text.
- 8) The applicant should continue to work with Engineering Staff to address comments as the plan moves through the FDP and Site Permit review process.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Chinock, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

Case #24-143AFDP

Bridge Park, Block H – Amended Final Development Plan

Request for review and approval of Amended Final Development Plan to develop ten 3-story townhome buildings. The +/- 2.25-acre site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood and is located southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Mooney Street.

Applicant Presentation

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated the plan is largely the same as seen at the informal review. There are a few minor changes. The landscape features at the corners of Johns Shields Parkway have been enhanced, creating a nice transition to the greenspace. Subtle enhancements were made to the corner of the building at John Shields Parkway. They lightened the materials. This project relates to the existing H block. Parapets were added on the south elevation. Auto court walls were removed, and the intent is to lean on landscaping to serve the same purpose but make that more porous. This plan is largely consistent with what was brought before at the informal review.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that Bridge Street District developments generally have a three-step process with the fourth step if there are amendments requested to Final Development Plans (FDP). Considerations tonight are alignment with the approved FDP and consistency with the surrounding character. PZC makes the final determination. Ms. Singh stated that the 2.2-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District (BSD) – Scioto River Neighborhood. The southern part of the site is surrounded by three streets and the northern part is surrounded by four streets. The site is centrally located in the neighborhood and is bordered by John Shields Parkway to the north and Dale Drive to the east, both of which are district connector streets that have a very high visibility frontage. The site is bordered by Mooney Street and Larimer Street to the west and south, both of which are neighborhood streets. The BSD-Scioto River Neighborhood provides a significant opportunity for a well-planned neighborhood. Special attention is given to the location and character of the buildings, streets, and open spaces establishing a coordinated mix of uses. Predominant land uses include residential, which complement and support a strong mix of uses. There is a greenway that connects the Scioto River Neighborhood to the Sawmill Center Neighborhood and provides a connection of open spaces and an active corridor for bike and

pedestrian connections. The greenway is owned by the City of Dublin and it will be developed by the City in the future. There was informal feedback provided in 2024. Key modifications include the relocation of the existing curb cuts, which were established with the development of the Block H1. Tonight, the Commission will be looking at 42 single-family attached units with revised building elevations.

Ms. Singh shared staff findings, waivers and conditions of approval. She explained that waivers are a standard part of the Bridge Street Code and help applicants to create distinctive, high-quality developments where requirements or conditions are not met. They must comply with the set criteria for any waiver to be approved. The first waiver request is for the property line coverage across Dale Drive and John Shields Parkway. The applicant has proposed two pocket park plazas to ensure that the intent of the Code is met, allowing pedestrian connectivity along those corridors. Waivers are requested for minimum finished floor elevations and minimum stoop size for specific buildings. These are requested due to the constraints for the easement locations, right of way, and grading. For all side elevations, there is a request for street façade transparency, blank wall limitations, horizontal windows, and vertical façade division. These are due to internal layout and site grading. For all rear elevations, there is a request for façade transparency, façade materials, tower quantity, and balcony size. These are due to structural constraints or site topography. Staff has additional conditions of approval. The first one is that the apron match what was approved for Block H1 to allow for consistency between all three blocks and the high-quality construction within the BSD. Some required building zone (RBZ) lines are not accurately shown. For Block H3, the applicant is required to work with staff to ensure that the green space can be increased if feasible. All criteria are met for the requested waivers, and Planning Staff recommends approval of 10 waivers and the Amended Final Development Plan with the following five conditions:

1. The applicant work with staff to revise the entrance apron material to match the entrance apron of Block H1 prior to building permit.
2. The applicant collaborate with staff to reduce the pavement and increase the green space at the entrance to Block H3 if feasible, while meeting the requirements of the Washington Township Fire Department.
3. The applicant accurately represent side RBZ lines prior to building permit.
4. The applicant provide samples for brick pavers and luminaire cut sheets prior to Building Permit.
5. The applicant work with Engineering Staff to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances, if required, at Building Permit.

Ms. Call asked staff to offer more information regarding waivers in the form-based code district.

Mr. Boggs stated that waivers in the BSD code are a way to tailor the application of that Code to a specific property and project. Form-based code looks predominantly at the physical form of the building with relation to lots and block and massing. The waiver process recognizes that every piece of land is unique so putting the regulations of a form-based code on every piece of land is not going to create the best project. The criteria are designed to elicit whether the waiver request is a matter of convenience or deviating to better tailor a project to the site. In a traditional zoning code, there is a variance process that is heard (in Dublin) by the Board of Zoning Appeals. After zoning is put in place, someone tries to alter the property and finds there is a hardship caused by the application of the zoning itself and so asks for a variance that is based on practical difficulty. Waivers in form-based code are done on the front end of development and

are based on the physical need of a property combined with the intended function of a project to ensure it meets the intent of the Code and results in the best possible project.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock asked about what has been done to improve the visibility of the interior elevations. Mr. Hunter stated the masonry now encompasses the entire first unit of each building. They have also added significant details around the windows (window heads, sills, jambs, etc.). Mr. Chinnock asked if the material used in addition to the brick is Hardie siding. Mr. Hunter answered affirmatively. Mr. Chinnock asked about the type of landscaping that is being proposed to replace the walls.

Dave Guappone, G2 Planning + Design, 720 E. Broad Street, Suite 200, Columbus, stated that within the courtyards they have planned evergreens to provide a lush environment and screening for utilities within the island. Mr. Chinnock referenced the landscaping near Dale Drive to the north. There seems to be no landscaping on that drive. Mr. Guappone stated that it was treated differently. There are transformers located between the buildings that terminate at the dead-end drive. The grade drops from the public right of way, so the utilities are hidden by the grade and then the landscape is on top of the grade. The area is screened in multiple fashions.

Mr. Chinnock referenced the side elevation transparency waiver. He stated that while it may be inconvenient with the interior floor plans, he asked if the applicant has considered adding more windows.

Chuck Wilson, Fischer Homes, 3940 Olympic Blvd., Suite 400, Erlanger, KY, stated that they looked at different opportunities to put windows there but felt that the current solution gives nice alignment and symmetry. If more windows are added, it will begin to look less controlled. There are limitations on the second level because that is a kitchen area. The double windows to the back of the building are in the garage and the third floor consists of a bedroom, bathroom and closet. They could add windows, but the organization will suffer. The number of windows and the amount of animation with the projected corner bay adds character. All side walls that are on high-visibility corners have at least one bay on those corners. What they have now has great character without adding anything more. Mr. Chinnock inquired if the applicant could possibly get closer to the required 20%. Mr. Wilson answered affirmatively.

Ms. Harter referenced the Juliette balconies on the front and asked if they could be opened. She asked if the 36-inch-high guardrail is high enough. Mr. Wilson stated that the residential requirement is a 36-inch-high guardrail. One of three doors opens all the way. Ms. Harter sought confirmation that the design is the same on the back. Mr. Wilson stated that they installed 42-inch guardrails on the back because of the height. Ms. Harter asked if space on the rooftop could be converted later to be usable. Mr. Wilson stated that a walkable membrane would need to be added on the portion of the roof that currently does not have it. Ms. Harter asked if that would be a good spot for solar panels. Mr. Wilson stated that it is a flat roof so there is no reason not to do that. Ms. Harter asked what material is being used for the siding in the back. Mr. Wilson stated that it is cementitious lap siding. Hardie is the most common product. It has nice depth and consistency. Ms. Harter asked if the goal is for the front and back to have genuine continuation. Mr. Wilson answered affirmatively. All sides have a nice character. The sides have a very nice, structured character. The parapets step up to provide movement. The design of the

buildings also push forward and pull back to provide interest. Materials and color variation create a nice character on all sides of the building. Ms. Harter asked if the landscaping can be personalized in the front garden plots. Mr. Hunter stated these are condominiums, so there will be a condo association. The exterior will be owned by everyone so if they are following the rules, they would not individualize those areas. Ms. Harter asked if staff has reached out to Mr. Ford regarding materials. Ms. Singh stated that they have not because they are very high-quality products that are listed in Code.

Mr. Way stated that landscaping is helping to mitigate concerns he had at the last review of this project. He asked if the applicant is open to using a taller evergreen at the ends of the dead-end drives. Mr. Guappone stated that they are open to different types of material. The Taxus could be shaped to achieve a different effect. Mr. Way asked if there is a lighting strategy for the pocket parks. Mr. Guappone stated that there are electric light poles intended to match the existing development. Mr. Way asked about lower-level lighting. Mr. Guappone stated that they can consider that. Mr. Way stated that both corners of John Shields Parkway would be a place to put a bike rack. Mr. Guappone stated that they can consider that. There are a few bike racks at the south end of John Shields Parkway.

Mr. Alexander stated that he was pleased to see these elevations. It was clear the applicant listened to the comments of the Commission. It appears that the applicant has prioritized plan organization rather than elevation organization. There is an odd asymmetry between the windows above the bay and the windows in the bay itself. He asked if the applicant explored how to modify the plan to make that work. Mr. Wilson stated that they are limited by bedrooms and window placement. Mr. Alexander asked if they explored reorganizing the plans. Mr. Wilson stated that they did not look at changing floor plans. They worked with the floor plans and coordinated the elevations in an organized way. Mr. Alexander stated that the plan calls for a different material than traditional Hardie. Mr. Hunter is stated that it is Nichiha. Mr. Alexander sought confirmation that when brick is indicated that it is full-depth brick. Mr. Wilson answered affirmatively.

Ms. Call asked for more detail on the Nichiha product. Mr. Wilson stated that it has a texture that can be faux wood but they are looking at smooth surface. The color is warm white. It mimics what would be a metal panel. Mr. Chinnock stated that it is an approved material.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that he is generally supportive of the project and feels the applicant addressed the Commission's comments. The landscaping needs further consideration and he is not in favor of granting waiver #3.

Ms. Harter stated that she is in favor of the project. She agreed with Mr. Chinnock.

Mr. Way shared his support for the proposal and noted that there are couple of things he would like to consider adding to the conditions.

Mr. Alexander agreed with the other commission members. He thinks the design would be better if the windows align, but the project has come a long way.

Mr. Deschler stated that he is generally supportive of the project as well. He shares Mr. Chinnock's concern regarding the blank wall waiver. He agrees with Mr. Way that additional surface lighting could be integrated and would like to see that added as a condition of approval.

Mr. Garvin stated that he is supportive of the project and all waivers. He echoes Mr. Way and Mr. Deschler's points about the ground lighting and the height of the landscaping screening.

Ms. Call summarized the requests of the Commission as follows:

- The applicant address vertical landscaping adjacent to the terminus of dead-end streets;
- More lighting in pocket plazas;
- The applicant work with staff to increase transparency to mitigate blank wall limitation in Waiver #3; and
- The applicant work with staff on additional bicycle racks.

Mr. Hunter asked if it is the intention that they work with staff to try to add or enlarge windows or are they bound to meet the original intent of the Code.

Mr. Boggs stated that without the waiver, if there is more than 14' between these windows, it is not in compliance. A condition could be placed on the waiver on working with staff to identify strategies to mitigate the blank wall.

With no objection from the Commission, Ms. Call called brief recess at 8:58 p.m. The meeting reconvened with all members in attendance at 9:04 p.m.

Mr. Garvin clarified that the condition regarding lighting in the pocket parks referred to ground lighting. Consensus of the Commission was that lighting in the pocket parks referred to ground lighting.

Mr. Garvin moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the waivers to the following Code sections:

- 1) 153.062 (O)(4)(a)(1) - Front Property Line Coverage to allow for front property line coverage less than 75%.
- 2) 153.062 (O)(4)(d)(1) - Street Façade Transparency to allow for full façade transparency less than 20% for all side elevations and rear elevation.
- 3) 153.062 (O)(4)(d)(1) – Blank Wall Limitation to allow for windowless portions of side and rear elevation walls with a horizontal distance greater than the Code limit of 15 feet.
- 4) 153.062 (1)(a) – Façade Materials to allow for less than 80% primary materials on rear elevations (visible from street).
- 5) 153.062 (D)(4)(a) & D(4)(b) - Tower Quantity, and Height to allow for multiple towers not located on the front façade, and the width of a tower to exceed its height.
- 6) 153.062 (I)(1)(a) - Balcony Size to allow all balconies to be less than six feet deep.
- 7) 153.062 (O)(2)(b) - Minimum Finished Floor Elevation to allow for finished floor elevation below 2.5 feet for Block H2 08-16 & Block H 15-17, 21
- 8) 153.062 (I)(3) - Minimum Stoop Size to allow for stoop depth less than 5 feet for Block H2 01-02 and H3 09

- 9) 153.062 (I)(1)(h) - Horizontal Windows to allow for horizontal windows on tall side elevations facing street.
- 10) 153.062 (O)(2)(d)(4) - Vertical Façade Division to allow for no vertical façade division widths greater than 40 feet (44 feet).

With the condition that waiver #3 shall be subject to the applicant working with staff and identifying a modification to mitigate the appearance of the blank wall.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Ms. Harter, yes.

[Motion carried: 7-0]

Mr. Deschler moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with staff to revise the entrance apron material to match the entrance apron of Block H1 prior to Building Permit.
- 2) The applicant collaborate with staff to reduce the pavement and increase the green space at the entrance to Block H3 if feasible, while meeting the requirements of the Washington Township Fire Department.
- 3) The applicant to accurately represent side RBZ lines prior to Building Permit.
- 4) The applicant provides vertical landscaping at the end of the dead end streets.
- 5) The applicant provide ground lighting in pocket park and movement of bike rack as discussed.
- 6) The applicant provide samples for brick pavers and luminaire cut sheets prior to Building Permit.
- 7) The applicant work with Engineering Staff to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code Ordinances, if required, at Building Permit.

Vote: Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes, Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes.

[Motion carried: 7-0]

Ms. Call noted that because the following two cases pertain to the same project on the same property with the same applicants, they will be discussed together. Separate votes will be held for each.

Case #24-157PDP

**Bridge Park, Block J – Preliminary Development Plan and Parking Plan
Request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan to allow a new mixed-use development. The 5.37-acre site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood and is located southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive.**

Case #25-037CU – Conditional Use

Request for a Conditional Use to allow a parking structure along the street. The 5.37-acre site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood and is located southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive.

Applicant Presentation

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated that it is remarkable that there continues to be interest in office space at Bridge Park. They have an anchor tenant that is heavily involved with the interior design of the space. An agreement has been reached with COTA. It is now understood exactly how the logistics will fall into place. Discussion continued after the Concept Plan review regarding the central street layout. There are a variety of logistical reasons they think it is important to connect the street. They heard the Commission's feedback that the central park open space must all feel like one space.

Hailey Wolfe, Landscape Architect, MKSK, 462 S. Ludulow Street, Columbus, stated that this is a lot less urban than other blocks in Bridge Park with more open space. As someone approaches the site, the most prominent corner is at Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive. There is a pocket park there. The grade change was a big challenge but offered opportunities for some playful design elements. At this corner, the building sits approximately seven feet above grade. Walking up the accessible pathway to the main open space in central park area, people will arrive at a promenade on the north side of the green space. This has been through many iterations. There is a desire for a more natural feel compared to some of the more structural site pieces. This is partly a daylighted stormwater element and partly an occupiable space for the public. A small, illuminated footbridge connects the office/restaurant building to the Phase 2 site. To the west is a bio retention area that is structured as a stream with meadows, large boulders and other natural elements. To have the desired arboretum feel, they intend to transplant mature trees from the COTA site to the central space. East of the footbridge is a community lawn, which could be substantial enough for events or just day-to-day activities. Bookending that to the east is a community deck. This will allow the space to be used year round. It could also be additional program space. Ms. Wolfe stated that they are bringing more wood material into the programmatic elements such as the foot bridge and the deck. On the private street that bisects the block north and south, the design breaks away from the normal Bridge Park standard of streetscapes. They are still using the same materials but using unique planters. The most pedestrian activity is anticipated at the core of the site and where it should be the most fluid. The material there is being changed to a brick material used in a flush condition. They are also trying to create smooth transitions between the private and public spaces. There is a clear divide from the amenity deck of the condos on the east side down into the private street/plaza area so they stepped gardens instead of doing a very harsh wall. That is something they tried to accomplish across the site. Various foundation plantings buffer along the road, especially along Bridge Park Avenue.

Dan Pease, MA Architects, 775 Yard Street, Suite 325, Columbus, began with the office building stating that he likes to consider the unique element to add to make each building a nice addition to Bridge Park and offer variety. The office building is a duality in composition. On the north side (Bridge Park Avenue) there is one aesthetic with a thicker, heavier brick base in charcoal with full depth brick above in light gray. There is a blue phenolic accent panel that was one of the things making this piece more unique. On the northwest corner is the blue phenolic panel wrapping the corner with balconies that offer a view down Bridge Park Avenue toward the river. The southwest corner and south side have a more simple elevation to offer an elegant backdrop to the park. They felt the park is what the attention should be on. There is a lot of detail but a simple order to this elevation. There is a wood look panel with a leathery texture. There will be an overlay pattern to light up the brick piers with sconces on the lower levels. On the southeast corner is the main entry.

At this corner, charcoal brick is used. The charcoal brick and light brick are the unifying elements around the whole building.

Mr. Pease spoke about the garage design. One would walk from the unique tower which is the main stair tower connected to the office building. It is what they call a beacon or anchor to the green space and residential courtyard. It will be frosted glass allowing people to be seen moving back and forth. The intent is to light it up at night to make it a unique feature. The garage was modeled after the North Market garage in Bridge Park. It is similar in proportion and details. In an effort to create something more unique, they looked to the stair towers on the library garage, which are concrete walls and stairs. The scrim and ceiling will be lit up and unify this whole elevation as a unique piece. They will be working with the Dublin Arts Council to determine the artwork for the scrim. The material will be the same PVC scrim as that used on the Block G courtyard. It provides another opportunity to expose artwork to the community.

Matt Lytle, Sullivan Bruk Architects, 8 South Grant Avenue, Columbus, stated that he is the architect for the condominium building and he noted that they have a great team assembled. Bridge Park Avenue is a fairly busy road and needs something to make a statement coming and leaving. That is why he created a grid around the balconies and colored it with a vibrant accent color. That can be seen on the corner of Bridge Park Avenue and Green Street as well as Bridge Park Avenue and Dave Thomas Boulevard. This is a five-story wood-frame building which poses some challenges and opportunities. Many of the same cues are being introduced that are being used on the garage and office building like a charcoal colored, full-depth masonry near the grade to help ground the building. They are using rusticated cast masonry that will undulate to get a nice shadow. From the second floor up in certain areas, he is introducing a thin brick material. It is essentially the same as the New Brick but behind this will be a concrete lined EPS rigid installation with a depth of 3¼". The thin brick has a depth of ½" which gives a full-depth brick look. The plan introduces pedestrian activity and unit connectivity for ground level units along Dave Thomas Boulevard.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that there are three determinations requested this evening for waivers, Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and Conditional Use (CU). The PDP process is intended to assure consistency with the Concept Plan and further determine building locations, character and massing. Finite details like materials and open space treatments come with the Final Development Plan (FDP). The project site sits just east of Block F and is in the Scioto River Neighborhood. There is an open space corridor on the north side of Bridge Park Avenue. Conversations are still needed between staff and the applicant about the treatment of the streets. This project went before City Council last Monday (April 21, 2025) and received approval of the Concept Plan. It was before PZC in December of 2024. Some of the comments from PZC and City Council included a desire for the open space to feed through the central private street. There was also a lot of discussion about the treatments of buildings, especially the garage. City Council referenced Block G as a good example of a garage that fits in well with the established character of that block. The site plan is largely the same as seen previously. Buildings are generally in the same locations. Open space is nearly the same. The applicant is requesting approval of a parking plan as they are providing less parking than is required based on the two phases. Parking plans are consistently used throughout Bridge Park. Information in the application states that they would look to other garages within 900 feet of the office/restaurant building. Just over 500 spaces in the area are available at peak times. The applicant continues to work on the green street in an effort to not create a prototypical street but cater toward a

pedestrian scale. They continue to work on that and the other street with Transportation and Mobility staff. The Conditional Use request is for the garage because it does not have a liner or usable commercial/residential space that screens the garage from the street. Conditional Uses for the garages have been approved on other blocks if they are interior to the block or site. The current site is the most acceptable location for the garage. There is one waiver request for this site regarding block size (length and perimeter). Staff does not consider the private street in their calculation toward the block length or perimeter. It still achieves much of the goals of the Bridge Street District to break the blocks down into smaller, more urban blocks that are walkable while providing safe vehicular circulation. The block layout is also consistent with the street network map approved with the area-wide rezoning. There are some items that could be waivers, but staff would like to continue to work with the applicant to mitigate some of the potential concerns. Staff is seeking clarification on the front property line and lot coverage. The applicant is looking for feedback on the panels. That would require a waiver at FDP. Staff has been working with the applicant on breaking up the south elevation. Staff is supportive of all requested waivers. The applicant is requesting feedback on the brick material (thin or NewBrick). A memo from the architectural consultant was provided regarding the NewBrick material. A waiver is requested to allow increased height from four and a half stories to five on the condo building. What is allowed for a four and a half story building is about 56 feet measured from the tallest elevation. This building is still 56 feet so it is not getting any taller. City Council, PZC, and staff made comments about the treatment of the garage and making it more complementary with what is currently in the District. There is some significant grade change moving from Dale Drive east and even with that grade change, the height of the condo building is still relatively similar as measure from sea level.

Staff is recommending approval of the 18 waivers, the PDP with parking plan, and the Conditional Use.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock asked if Dublin had control over what the Phase 2 site will look like until constructed. Mr. Hounshell stated that construction staging is handled through Building Standards. There are specific requirements that speak to staging, stockpiling, etc. That is something staff can bring back at FDP.

Mr. Chinnock stated that there is no precedent for the art panels of that size/scale. Mr. Hounshell stated that this was done by the applicant on Block G. Mr. Hunter stated that they are similar in size but internal to the block. Mr. Chinnock asked if it is considered signage. Mr. Hounshell stated that it is art installation but considered as a building material. It is a perforated metal scrim and that would contribute to transparency considerations. Mr. Hunter stated that they met with the Dublin Arts Council. They are considering a national request for quotes process. The Dublin Arts Council would manage that process and then assist the applicant in the procurement of the piece.

Mr. Chinnock asked for more information on Green Street. Mr. Hunter stated that they have studied it both ways – as a connected street and not. Both City Engineering staff and Fire/Safety had concerns about it not going through for access to buildings interior on the block. From the applicant's perspective, the grade forces all services to be placed on the east side of that building on that section of Green Street. If that street did not go through, smaller trucks would have to pull in and back out. Should they have to create an area for a three point turn, it would make the area feel worse with more asphalt and the buildings further apart. They would be recreating the problem of service trucks on Bridge Park Avenue. In this section, Bridge Park Avenue is two lanes

instead of three, which makes the issue worse. On the southern end of the site, they need two egress points for the garage. Because the grade falls east to west, entries to the garage need to be placed on the east and west façade of the garage. Mr. Chinnock asked about limited access. Mr. Hunter stated that it will come down to how operationally that is used. There is one restaurant in that building.

Mr. Chinnock asked if the vision is for the park to be connected to Bridge Park. As designed, it feels very isolated. Mr. Hunter stated that it is for public use. The space is interesting because it opens to Dale Drive and passersby get a peek from Bridge Park Avenue creating a path of discovery. It is an urban place surrounded by buildings that is large enough to be effective in a way the other pocket parks are not, but it is very different from Riverside Crossing Park. Mr. Chinnock asked if there was a way to activate it more, like allowing outdoor seating to spill out into the park. Mr. Hunter stated that the issue is the grade for ADA access on that sidewalk. Mr. Chinnock asked if there was consideration given to stepping the building to mitigate the long façade of the condo and garage. Mr. Hunter stated that the buildings on this block are, on average, a full story shorter than other buildings. There was thought about how that will continue to transition. If this is all successful, the future use across Dave Thomas Boulevard will not be a parking lot at some point.

Ms. Harter asked about the colors on the building. Mr. Lytle stated that the lighter taupe color is the thin brick or NewBrick material. The darker brown is an interlocking metal panel. The charcoal is full-depth masonry. The reddish/burgundy is a metal panel that encapsulates some of the balconies.

Ms. Harter stated that the frosted glass on the garage could be an opportunity for an additional art installation.

Ms. Harter asked about the mesh on the south side below the scrim. Mr. Keys stated that they are still discussing whether they want the foliage to grow up the mesh. If they decide they do not, they will thicken the mesh so that it will screen the interior of the garage at grade. Ms. Harter asked if the mesh on the library garage covered the full height of the garage. Mr. Pease stated that it is only on the first level. The mesh on this plan is below the scrim on first level only, going down to grade.

Ms. Harter stated across Bridge Park Avenue the landscaping is thick. She asked if there has been thought given to whether this project needs more. Ms. Wolfe stated that their property line goes to the multi-use path and it was their intention to leave that as is. The planting on that buffer on the other side is an asset to separate the blocks.

Ms. Harter asked if there have been conversations with Sycamore Ridge. Mr. Hunter answered no; most of that area is City property.

Mr. Way stated that moving east to west through Bridge Park, through Winder Street to Dale Drive, is a connection of a whole series of open space alleyways. Connectivity to this open space would be logical. He asked if there is hope of a pedestrian connection across Dale Drive at Winder Street. Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that there is mid-block crossing within Bridge Park so that could be explored. They would have to configure curb ramps to allow ADA access there. Mr. Way stated that in the last proposal, there was discussion about the service access to the office building on Green Street being a back-in loading dock. Now trucks are stopping in a two-lane road. It could be disruptive if that is a through street. Mr. Hunter stated that there will be trash trucks. There are several of those areas along Longshore Drive. That was meant to act as a service alley that became something more. There might be opportunity for some additional width along the office building. The question then becomes, once they make the turn, where they go.

The residential building is serviced in the garage. Mr. Way stated that Green Street is still unresolved. What has been done to the streetscape is beautiful but he is still looking for the functional side.

Mr. Way asked if there is an intent to provide amenities for the COTA bus stop on the south side of the garage. Mr. Hunter answered affirmatively. More details will come forward with the FDP.

Mr. Alexander stated that from conversations about thin brick, he senses a reluctance to use thin brick. He asked if the PZC has approved thin-cut stone or cultured stone. Ms. Call stated that the Commission has treated primary and secondary materials very differently. Mr. Alexander stated that the depth of cultured stone or thin-cut stone veneer is not much different than thin brick. If there has been past approval of those materials, disapproval of thin brick seems inconsistent. Ms. Call stated that the Commission has absolutely been against including thin brick as a permitted material in the Bridge Street District. Mr. Alexander asked if staff's comment about excessive block length was referring to the development size along Bridge Park Avenue or the buildings along Bridge Park Avenue. Mr. Hounshell stated that block length is measured along the public right of way from corner property to corner property at the edge of intersections of public streets. In this case, measurements were taken from Dale Drive to Dave Thomas Boulevard. That exceeds the maximum length expected for newly created blocks.

Mr. Alexander asked if thought was given to changing the articulation of the plan centered on the pool to emphasize its important location in the development. Mr. Lytle stated that he wanted to emphasize the light-colored masonry while not diminishing the courtyard. Mr. Alexander stated that it feels like a missed opportunity. Mr. Lytle stated that the backbone of the design is the two over two punched opening material. He wanted to create a hierarchy between the lighter material and the charcoal full deck masonry.

Mr. Alexander asked about the relationship between the south elevation and the elevation that faces the street. Mr. Pease stated that they did not want a monotonous design. They began with the Bridge Park Avenue side creating a module that culminates in the balconies. They wanted simplicity on the south side even though there are a lot of regulating lines.

Mr. Alexander asked if they have used the high pressure laminate (HPL) panels. Mr. Pease stated that he has not but it was recommended by their supplier. Mr. Hounshell stated that staff can bring those details back at FDP.

Mr. Deschler referenced the condo building and stated that the Commission will not consider thin brick. Mr. Hounshell stated what is shown is thin brick but the applicant is looking for feedback regarding NewBrick. Thin brick is not considered a primary or secondary material but it was approved in multiple buildings in Bridge Park, Towns on the Parkway, and a few other buildings. Ms. Call stated that former commissions do not tie the hands of sitting commissions. Thin brick is not a permitted material in Bridge Park. It has been approved on a case-by-case basis. Staff can bring back case histories where it has been approved. Several years ago, there were specific concerns. At least one hotel in the City had thin brick that started popping off. That was before Mr. Ford was on retainer. Mr. Deschler asked about NewBrick. Mr. Hounshell stated that staff shared the NewBrick with the consultant. Their feedback is that it is a relatively new material. It is innovative. It has been used in similar climates in Dayton, Ohio. The warranty is 25 years. The main questions raised were on longevity. Mr. Hunter stated that they are limited to height on wood structures. They have been looking at alternative ways to make sure they do not have Hardie panel or some other metal panel on the top of every single building. They made a conscious decision that because thin brick has been approved that it was a safer alternative than a product no one has used before. They are aware this is an issue that needs solved.

Mr. Deschler asked about security measures for pool access. Mr. Lytle stated that the pool itself by Code must have its own fence and can have an electronic lock with a key fob that only residents will have. The pool is encased in a fence. Mr. Lytle stated that the two sets of steps delineate public and private. There is also a significant elevation change between the street level and the courtyard. Mr. Deschler stated that people in the lower area traversing up there could infringe upon the privacy of the condo residents. Mr. Hunter stated it will be gated. The Waddell building is in a similar situation and they have heard no complaints. The public is not going past the upper end of the stairs.

Mr. Deschler referenced the interplay between the garage and condo. He asked if it is the applicant's expectation that residents of the condo have to exit all the way through the garage, then go out a different access to the condominium building. Mr. Lytle stated that every floor level has direct access to the garage. There is a condo lobby that is on Bridge Park Avenue. Mr. Hunter stated that it remains to be seen how the resident parking will work out because the garage is public. He noted that condo owners in G Block do not have reserved parking spaces.

Mr. Deschler stated that he would not support Green Street being made a pass through. He asked staff if it was accurate to state that City Council would prefer it be pedestrian only. Mr. Hounshell stated that their comments were more about how to connect the open spaces. They wanted to ensure a consistent flow across the open spaces. He would not say they wanted it to be pedestrian only. Mr. Deschler stated that he thinks the amount of traffic on that street is being underestimated. He asked if there were other considerations like a cul-de-sac. Mr. Hunter stated that the minimum diameter for a cul-de-sac would be 96 feet. Mr. Hounshell stated that within the Bridge Street District the intent is to break down a lot of what would be done in a typical suburban city. That is why the block dimensions and lots were created. This would be considered an alley or service street, which is expected for very low capacity, low speed streets located near the rear of lots. It is intended for parking, providing services for parking facilities, loading facilities, and service areas for refuse utility. Given the location of this street and the fact that it does not carry on a consistent path like Banker Drive or Longshore Street, staff is not overly concerned with vehicular traffic. A cul-de-sac or cutoff would not be recommended because it goes against the flow of vehicular as well as pedestrian traffic. This Green Street also represents midblock pedestrian way so it contributes to the pedestrian scale while getting vehicles safely through. The City would want to see this as a through street. Capacities would not be expected to be similar to Dave Thomas Boulevard, Banker Drive or Dale Drive. Mr. Hunter stated that it takes over 90 feet for a regular box truck to make a circle and that is nearly twice the width between the office and condo buildings. Mr. Deschler stated that the City is wrong and woefully underestimating the amount of vehicular traffic expected.

Mr. Garvin stated that he is supportive of the through street. He asked if any consideration was given to making it one way. Mr. Hunter stated that they have not studied that.

Mr. Garvin asked if there was any thought given toward an actual arboretum. A variety of trees could be labeled, giving the area placemaking appeal. Ms. Wolfe stated that is something that could be considered, especially with the mature trees there already. Mr. Hunter stated that an arboretum has a specific definition that likely could not be met but the idea of having different varieties of trees could be part of making this area feel mature and lush.

Mr. Garvin referenced the garage and asked if there has been thought regarding colored light or something more dynamic around the screen. Mr. Pease stated that they have not gotten to those details yet, but they could do something more dynamic through lighting or pattern on the glass. Mr. Garvin asked about the material and lifespan of the scrim. Mr. Pease stated that it is a PVC mesh scrim. Any image can be added as a silkscreen to the scrim. It has a 10-year warranty.

Ms. Call stated that the lots and blocks maximum is 500 feet and 1,750 feet on the perimeter. She asked if the lot and block had been measured if the street is private. Mr. Hunter stated that the measurements are 340 feet from the intersection of Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue to Green Street and Bridge Park Avenue. Ms. Call stated that with the perimeter at 1,950 for the entirety of the site, if it is bisected, it would fall under the 1,750-foot requirement. Mr. Hunter confirmed.

Ms. Call stated that this applicant has done projects with Dublin before, and there have been areas where private open space is segmented but immediately adjacent to public open space. She asked if he had received any calls where that has not worked. Mr. Hunter answered that he has received no calls or concerns.

Ms. Call asked about the voids on the garage. Mr. Pease stated that they modeled it after the North Market Garage where there is also exposed concrete between the materials. They use the splits along the building and then emphasize it at the corner. Ms. Call asked if there was thought given to incorporating features to make this look less like a garage. Mr. Hunter stated that repetitive 30-foot-wide horizontal openings read garage. Here they changed those proportions to make it look more vertical. The openings are eight or ten feet wide to appear as windows. When deciding what to put in those openings, they have done different things in Bridge Park. Metal cables are used to protect cars and leave it as open as possible. Creating something too similar to the garage across the street did not feel like the correct solution. They will ensure the concrete is finished to a certain level in order for it to look good.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that he is excited about the project. The park is great. The road needs to be resolved. College campuses could be used as examples where they have sidewalks that are accessible by service vehicles only. He agrees that there will be much more traffic than is predicted. He is in favor of some of the waivers, but there are a lot of questions remaining on the towers, architectural articulation and façade materials. He likes the design of the office and is overall in favor of the project.

Ms. Harter thanked the applicants for coming and agreed with Mr. Chinnock. She thinks the color brings warmth. She suggested the applicant work with staff on the brick and bring that back. She also suggested the applicant continue thinking outside the box with vegetation on the garages. She advised the applicants to always think about the walkability of the site. She is in favor of the art opportunity. The more the applicant connects with the public, the more people will buy into this and see it as part of this community.

Mr. Way stated that he likes most of this project. The green space has become wonderful. There is an east-west spine through Bridge Park that ends here but does not have a terminal because it moves from the public environment to a private environment without a cue. He would suggest it be made a place. It needs something else; instead of tiered wall garden, maybe there is a waterfall or the road could be split and something put in the center. The loading issues need to be resolved, and the terminal place needs to be thought through more.

Mr. Alexander stated that in an urban setting the site plan is important, but elevations define the space. The south elevation of the office building needs some help. It is so different from the northern elevation. It is very horizontal. The apartment building is divided nicely into a series of smaller scale vertical components building from the individual unit. He would not support HPL. It is a laminate product with a five- to fifteen-year warranty. Issues with it are delamination, color fading, heat sensitivity, difficulty of repair and environmental concerns due to the use of formaldehyde. Metal panels as used on the other building are an excellent choice with a long track record. Regarding the street, he referenced European spaces where there is a large public space where vehicles are accommodated at times. He suggested an alley of trees terminating in a fountain that is in some way linked to the pool above. The hierarchy is the people in the space.

Mr. Deschler stated that since a decision is requested this evening, he would suggest more conditions.

Ms. Call sought the applicant's desire for a decision based on the late hour. Mr. Hunter stated that tabling would be problematic. He has not heard anything that could not be worked through between PDP and FDP. They would work very hard to move this forward however necessary.

Mr. Deschler stated that he is not in favor of the material on the office building but is supportive of waivers on the garage and condo building with the condition that a decision must be made regarding the brick façade. He is supportive of the coloring of those buildings as long as it complies with the material requirement. It is a significant concern if nothing is decided upon that the Phase 2 piece cannot remain dirt, gravel, construction materials, etc. His last concern is adding a condition requiring the applicant to work with staff to address Green Street. He will not support the project if that is not resolved at FDP.

Mr. Garvin stated that he is supportive of the colors but not the HPL. He finds it difficult to grant a waiver for façade materials without knowing what they would be. He is supportive of Green Street connecting all the way through. It could be a wunerf with pop-up bollards. He is against dead ending either side as it creates logistical issues. The visual of that park's expanse up to the pool is more important than actually getting to the other side of the street. It is important that it visually connects. He is supportive of the application but seeking resolution on the façade materials.

Ms. Call stated that the midblock street meets the criteria for lots and blocks, and that was one of the items to which City Council and this commission paid specific attention. Circulation is needed in the Bridge Street District. Keeping service vehicles off main arterials is the preferred method. She agreed with the terminal vista comment and added that the solid building essentially creates a terminus on that side. She is not a fan of thin brick. She is not comfortable with the garage voids as they make it appear that the walls stopped. Overall, the design is what Dublin has asked for. She is not opposed to the height, especially given the height of five stories is the height of what would be seen at four and a half stories. She shares concerns with the NewBrick material. The Commission usually does not support things that are not proven. Warrantees are only as good as the companies that support the warranties. Even if a new material were supported, she would want to see it as a secondary material, then if they withstand criteria, it could be elevated to a primary material. She is also not supportive of the HPL material. Regarding the Phase 2 site,

Ms. Call reminded the applicant that they are not exempt from Code Enforcement requirements because they are building a building next door.

Ms. Call summarized that the Commission has a concern with the office building waiver 2 regarding materials.

Mr. Boggs stated for the waivers that are not addressed tonight, they will be coming back at FDP and the applicant can request waivers then with more information. Procedurally, the Commission could remove waivers from their determination where there are open questions.

Discussion continued clarifying whether the waivers covered the Commission's concerns.

Mr. Hunter stated if they cannot use thin brick or NewBrick, then the condo building cannot be built as drawn because they cannot put full-depth brick up that high on a wood frame structure without adding steel inside the building, which is difficult and has shown to leak. There are at least 8 buildings in Bridge Park that use thin brick in some capacity successfully. Ms. Call stated that the Commission has approved thin brick in the past. She has been one who has voted yes, though she still does not like thin brick.

Mr. Garvin stated that his top concerns are HPL and not feeling qualified to make a determination on NewBrick. It is very important that it be installed correctly.

Mr. Deschler asked how much of the thin brick is being proposed. Mr. Hounshell stated that it is used only on the second story and above. Everything at ground level is masonry. Mr. Deschler stated that the percentage of thin brick is 36%. The brick base is 30% and metal is 33%. Mr. Deschler asked for the consultants' opinion on thin brick. Staff will bring that to the Commission with the FDP.

Mr. Deschler moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of waivers to the following Code sections:

- 1) 153.060(C)(2)(a) – Maximum Block Size to allow a maximum block length of ± 640 feet and a maximum block perimeter of $\pm 1,950$ feet for block J where 500 feet of length and perimeter of 1,750 feet are required.

Office Building

- 2) 153.062(N)(4)(a)(3) – Blank Walls to allow for the middle portion of the north façade to be a blank wall where blank walls are prohibited.

- 3) 153.062(O)(6)(b) – Ground Story Minimum Height to allow a 14-foot-tall ground story height on the easter half of the building where a minimum height of 16 feet is required.

- 4) 153.062(O)(6)(b) – Ground Story Maximum Height to allow a 25-foot-tall ground story height for the restaurant space located on the west end of the building where 24 feet is the maximum.

- 5) 153.062(O)(6)(d)(3) – Street Facades: Number of Entrances to allow two entrances on the north façade where four are required; and to allow two entrances on the south façade where four are required.

- 6) 153.062(O)(6)(d)(4) – Horizontal Façade Divisions to allow no horizontal façade division on the north and east facades where horizontal façade divisions are required within three feet of the top of the ground story.

Condo Building

- 7) 153.062(O)(3)(b) – Maximum Height of Building to allow a five-story apartment building where 4.5 stories is the maximum.
- 8) 153.062(O)(3)(b) – Maximum Height of Stories to allow a first-floor story height of 17 feet 2 inches on the northwest corner of the building where 14 feet is the maximum.
- 9) 153.062(O)(3)(b) – Minimum Finished Floor Elevation to allow a finished floor level of 1.1 feet on the east façade of the building adjacent to the sidewalk where a minimum of 2.5 feet above the adjacent sidewalk façade is required.
- 10) 153.062(O)(3)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments to allow the north, east and west facades of the building to exceed the maximum 40 feet for vertical increments.
- 11) 153.062(O)(3)(d)(4) – Required Change in Roof Plane or Type to allow a change in roof plane no greater than ± 117 feet on the north façade and ± 98 feet on the east façade where a change is required no greater than every 80 feet.

Garage Building

- 12) 153.062(D)(4)(a) – Tower Quantity to allow two towers for the parking structure where one is permitted.
- 13) 153.062(D)(4)(b) – Tower Height to allow the northwest tower to be ± 18 feet tall and ± 29 feet wide, and the southeast tower to be ± 23 feet wide. Code requires tower height to be no 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.
- 14) 153.062(E)(1)(a) – Primary Façade Materials to allow 30% primary materials on the south façade where 80% exclusive of windows and doors is required.
- 15) 153.062(O)(11)(d)(3) – Street Facades: Number of Entrances to allow two entrances on the south, east and west facades where three are required.
- 16) 153.062(O)(11)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments to allow the east and west facades of the building to exceed the maximum 30 feet for vertical increments.
- 17) 153.062(O)(11)(d)(6) – Tower Locations to allow a tower in the southeast corner of the garage where they are permitted on facades only at terminal vistas, corners at two principal frontage streets, and/or adjacent to an open space type.

Vote: Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Chinnock, no; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.

[Motion carried: 6-1]

Mr. Garvin moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant continues to work with Staff to address the streetscape design of Bridge Park Avenue and Green Street at the FDP.
- 2) The applicant continues to work with Staff to provide streetscape improvements as required by the City Engineer.
- 3) The applicant continues to work with Staff on the design of the pocket park at the intersection of Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue to create a more seamless transition between the streetscape and the office building.

- 4) The applicant update the plans to accurately represent lot coverage and front property line coverage.
- 5) The applicant work with Staff to address the façade recommendations of the office building as outlined in the report.
- 6) The applicant work with Staff to provide a connection between residential units and Bridge Park Avenue with the condominium building;
- 7) The applicant work with Staff to address concerns about the façade treatment of the garage and condo building as outlined in the report and Commission discussion; and,
- 8) The applicant continue to work with the Engineering Staff on final civil plan details with the Final Development Plan.
- 9) The applicant enhance terminal vista opportunities on the site within and adjacent to the public green.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Chinnock, no; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

[Motion carried: 6-1]

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded approval of the Conditional Use with the following condition:

- 1) The applicant continue to work with Staff to address concerns about the façade treatment of the garage as outlined in the report.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, no; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.

[Motion carried: 6-1]

COMMUNICATIONS

Staff reminded the Commission that the May 15 regular meeting is cancelled and of the June 2 annual board and commission recognition reception.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Deputy Clerk of Council