



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 17, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the July 17, 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, Jason Deschler, Dan Garvin, Kathy Harter, Kim Way
Commission members absent: Jamey Chinnock
Staff members present: Thaddeus Boggs, Jenny Rauch, Bassem Bitar, Tammy Noble, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Heidi Rose
Also in attendance: Dan Phillabaum, AICP, RLA, Landplan Studios, LLC

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the June 5, 2025 and June 12, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission minutes.

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

[Motion carried 6-0.]

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.

CONSENT CASE

Ms. Call noted that there was one case eligible for the Consent Agenda.

Case #25-027AFDP-CU

NW Presbyterian Church – Amended Final Development Plan and Conditional Use Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan and Conditional Use to allow a 5,598 square-foot addition to an existing religious facility. The 11.5-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District: Morse/Mast and R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District and is located at 6400 Post Road.

Ms. Call asked if any member wished to have the case removed from the consent agenda. There was no request to remove the item from the consent agenda.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the consent agenda.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

CASE REVIEW

Ms. Call noted that because the following four 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 #25-055FDP, 25-056PP, 25-057FP, and 25-066CU

Bridge Park, Block J – Final Development Plan, Preliminary Plat, Final Plat, and Conditional Use

Request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan and recommendation of approval of a Preliminary/Final Plat to allow a new mixed-use development, and a request for review and approval of a Conditional Use for COTA Park & Ride located in a new parking structure. 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, thanked staff for working with them on the quick turnaround of this application. One of the things that makes Bridge Park special is the green spaces. The space on this site has potential to be something that does not exist yet. It has enough hardscape for events without feeling like Longshore Drive. The Crawford Hoying events team is excited about the potential of this site. The terminal vista is the tower on the side of the parking garage. Visitors and restaurant goers will use this as their beacon. Green Street points south directly at it.

Jeff Pongonis, MKSK, 462 South Ludlow Alley, Columbus, stated that the heart of the plan is the open/common space. It is about ½ acre and is the location of what was previously a waterway. They wanted to pay homage to its history. It has a more natural character and slopes down from east to west. There are edge of woods experiences there to create an immersive environment

different than along Longshore Drive or inside Bridge Park. On the furthest west end is the lowest part of the open space filled with meadow grass. It has a slight undulation in grading and will not feel like an engineered detention basin. The east end is a more manicured version of the natural open space. It has mown lawn framed by natural landscape. There are two activators in the space. One is a bridge that cuts through the center to allow people to be a part of the natural space. Further east along Green Street is a wooden deck for spending time outside/social space. They are relocating ten Sycamore trees from the site to the south. Those trees are approximately 8 inches in caliper and will make the space feel like it has some age to it. It will anchor this green space from the outset. The idea of Green Street is to provide opportunity for delivery, garage access, and rideshare access. Automobile travel will be generally discouraged. The intent is for it to be a great pedestrian corridor. There is a loose assemblage of landscape islands, large trees, furniture and boulders. It is a curbsless street. The edge of curb and boulders work together to define the curb line. It is a standard-width street. It will be safe for pedestrians. It will have a curb made of landscape islands and boulders instead of a traditional street curb.

Dan Pease, MA Architects, 775 Yard Street, Suite 325, Columbus, highlighted the changes to the office building and garage. The high-pressure laminate (HPL) was eliminated from the office building. They changed from the blue color to a light copper color on the north elevation to help the building feel more continuous all the way around. On the south and west sides, there is a darker copper color. The west elevation was changed to add more charcoal brick while leaving light gray brick on the corner as a pop-out frame around that element. Along the south elevation, they changed from the horizontality of that design to a vertical design on the structural bays. They have used lighting to make that elevation stand out. On the garage, the element they want to call attention to is the stair tower. Another frame of charcoal metal panel has been added as well as a series of shading fins in front of the frosted glass. They wanted to create visual interest during the day as well as the evening. The fins stick out approximately one foot and are aluminum. There are three colors of fins that will blend with the office palette. The exposed corners of the garage now have a metal wrap on the column and the cast stone lines continue at the floor lines to help the corners blend into the rest of the garage design. They struggled with the open-air requirement for the garage. They are restricted on the north side and the south side because of the scrim. That is another reason the corners are left open. They were asked to study how to increase the pedestrian experience at the street level near the garage. They elected to do that through landscape and pulling the landscaping away from the building. They are excited about the final product.

Matt Lytle, Sullivan Bruk Architects, 8 South Grant Avenue, Columbus, stated that they added ground floor entries for the three units along Bridge Park Avenue. Those will function much like those along the street to the east. The cladding material for balcony surrounds has been changed to black, which now blends in with the other black materials, like the metal guardrails for balconies and windows. They are using a pallet of dark and light masonry to complement the masonry of the garage and office building. He expressed appreciation for the Commission's suggestions and feedback.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that there are multiple applications before the Commission. PZC has final authority on the Final Development Plan (FDP) and the Conditional Use. The Final Plat and Preliminary Plat require a recommendation to City Council. The FDP covers the final details including necessary waivers to construct the project. A future Phase Two will come forward for the

redevelopment of the COTA Park & Ride site. This site is located in the Scioto River Neighborhood in the Bridge Street District (BSD). The BSD Code provides recommendations about the mix of uses as well as ensuring residential is a key component of the plan to help complement the uses. The walkable network is an important part of the recommendations. As highlighted by the applicant, this project was before the Commission with a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) for the site in May. The Commission highlighted building materials, garage façade treatment, the terminal vista, Green Street design and circulation, and the COTA Park & Ride. The updated site plan shows changes since last time such as the revised parking plan, the street network and streetscape. The City will continue to work with the applicant to ensure the right allocation of space for public street improvements. There are waivers required related to the proportion of the public green space and access that staff feels are appropriate given the uniqueness of this particular open space. There are conditions of approval related to lighting and screening of mechanicals. Green Street is intended to be a one-way private street through the development. The intent of the Bridge Street District is to have additional connections to aid in distributing traffic and providing access for all modes of transportation. Staff has worked with the Fire Department regarding the width of the street connection and the importance of making sure there is access to all the buildings. The comments from the Commission at the PDP have been incorporated and staff is supportive of the changes made. There are a number of waivers and departures though most are straightforward. Staff feels they are appropriate and help elevate the design. Regarding the parking garage, staff continues to have concerns about the exposed concrete and pedestrian entrances at the corners. Staff has recommended conditions of approval that they continue to work with staff on those details.

The Code requires a Conditional Use to permit the future location of a COTA Park and Ride on this particular site. It is proposed in the garage. The Park and Ride lot will be relocated, allowing one hundred reserve spaces in the garage to accommodate the four users on site. The bus stop would be along Banker Drive with a shelter at the southwest corner of the structure. The goal is to be able to park in the garage and access the Park and Ride along Banker Drive. A future Conditional Use will come before the Commission for a temporary location for the Park and Ride while the garage is under construction. The Preliminary Plat and Final Plat create two lots within this area in addition to the reserves for Green Street and the large open space. Banker Drive and the future public street (informally called Dave Thomas Boulevard) will become public streets. Staff has recommended minor conditions related to stormwater and utilities, ensuring the plans include necessary details as it moves through the permitting process. Ms. Rauch summarized by stating that five actions are requested:

1. Administrative Departure Review for the office building
2. 17 Waivers
3. Final Development Plan with 13 conditions
4. Conditional Use
5. Preliminary and Final Plat with one condition.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin referenced the COTA Park and Ride and asked if staff felt the parking was sufficient. Ms. Rauch stated staff feels there are adequate spaces in the garage and on street. People may be parking in other garages and coming to this space. The garage will primarily be used by residents of the condos and office building users.

Mr. Garvin asked why the cranberry color on the condo building was changed. Mr. Lytle stated that the Crawford Hoying sales team wanted more neutral colors. Mr. Garvin sought confirmation that there was no change in material. Mr. Lytle responded affirmatively.

Mr. Deschler asked how many waivers are typical on blocks with mixed use development. Ms. Rauch stated that it is not atypical for there to be as many as are requested with this application given the number of buildings. Mr. Deschler asked how much discussion was held with the applicant on how to avoid waivers on some of these items. Ms. Rauch stated that the goal is always for people to meet the Code requirements, but waivers can allow for a better or more unique design. She shared the example of the open space – this unique open space is desirable but cannot meet the Code requirements because it is unique to this site. Ms. Call stated that the application for Block G had 30 waivers. Mr. Deschler asked the applicant for more information on the discussions about the waivers using the example of the inability to get the vertical transitions. Mr. Hunter stated that it is difficult to design to Code, especially when you want to do something different. They first try to do what they believe is right and then apply that as best as possible to the site and the applicable Code. Sometimes it is impossible to meet Code requirements, especially on sites with a lot of grade change. On the south façade, the design team was trying to create something softer that put more focus on the open space. They always try to meet Code as best they can. Mr. Deschler asked about Green Street and delivery/service trucks. Mr. Hunter stated that there are pull-offs for each building so trucks do not block the path. Mr. Deschler referenced the change in materials and thin brick as a primary material. He stated that he understood that the desire was for the look of brick but the building cannot handle the weight of full depth brick. Ms. Rauch agreed that staff was comfortable with thin brick at this installation. She stated that staff worked with Mark Ford, consultant, to make sure it was in line with the Commission's desire as previously discussed. Mr. Deschler asked for elaboration on staff's concerns regarding the garage. Ms. Rauch stated that the applicant minimized some of the exposed concrete but there are still some areas where exposed concrete is shown. Staff's concern was that does not meet the overall aesthetic of the garage and they may need to pay more attention to that. The other piece of that was concerning the pedestrian entrances at the corner. The current design does not signify entrance at the pedestrian level, and staff believed more attention should be given to that. Mr. Deschler asked for the applicant's thoughts on how they could address those concerns. Mr. Hunter stated that his team considered cladding the concrete but the reason not to is that it lessens the shadow lines. The exposed concrete gives the opportunity to have that further back than the brick allowing for more depth. They also liked the different texture of the exposed concrete. It has been used sparingly in the district. Regarding the pedestrian entrance, they have a placeholder there now because they are still working with COTA on what exactly they want there. It will be a tenant improvement that COTA will want to do and will come back to staff or PZC.

Mr. Alexander stated in previous applications where a private street is proposed, staff has not viewed that favorably. Ms. Rauch stated in solely residential developments, private streets pose problems from a long-term maintenance standpoint as that cost is borne by those individual homeowners. For context, there are two others in Bridge Park. Mr. Alexander asked if there is a maximum number of primary materials. Ms. Rauch stated that there is not a maximum number, but the goal is to get to 80% primary materials. Mr. Alexander stated that the goal is to have the same amount of solidity on each building. He asked if the intent was for there to be multiple primary materials because the language in the Code suggests continuity. Ms. Rauch stated that the intent was more about sticking to the "tried and true" materials listed in Code; continuity was secondary. Mr. Alexander asked if the applicant is confident the leaders coming down the building in the courtyard (5-story downspouts) can maintain a straight and continuous edge. Those could be tucked around a corner. Mr. Lytle stated that was done deliberately for stormwater to be routed and drain the roof effectively and economically. The offsets on some areas are not as great as they

might appear and having the leaders coming through balconies would be a design conundrum. They chose to highlight them as an organizing piece. Mr. Alexander asked about parking on Green Street. Mr. Pongonis stated that across from the garage, there is a bank of on-street parking. Mr. Alexander stated that the elevations on the office building make connections at the corners with one another but there is not continuity for the building. The grid order that organizes one side of the building does not continue around to organize or integrate other parts of the building. He asked why the elevations on this building are so different. Mr. Pease stated that was an intentional design move. Each piece has a specific goal. They wanted to give a better variety of pieces for a different experience as a pedestrian goes around the building. It is similar to the G1 building. It was intentional with some elevations meant to address the park, a view, or a corner.

Mr. Way referenced the Phase Two site on the illustrative site plan and asked for more details. Mr. Hunter stated that construction of the Phase Two condo building will take place 12 months after they begin construction of the other buildings with the intention that the core and shell of that building will largely be done when the other buildings are occupied so the block will look complete. They are not yet done with negotiations with COTA. Mr. Way stated that it will likely not be a grass field at all. Mr. Hunter agreed. Mr. Way stated that the landscape on the south edge of the open space looks minimal. If that is going to be a surface parking lot for a while, there should be some screening. Maybe in Phase Two there will be another look at that edge. While the Commission is approving what is shown, he is anticipating there will be another layer of landscape in Phase Two. Mr. Hunter stated that is correct.

Mr. Way referenced Green Street and stated that this will be the first woonerf in Dublin. He asked why it was designed one-way south as opposed to one-way north. Mr. Hunter stated that Bridge Park Avenue is a more driven street than Banker Drive. Deliveries are more likely to come off Bridge Park Avenue. The idea was to get them off Bridge Park Avenue quickly instead of them parking in the middle of it like they do now. Another reason was so upon leaving the garage, no one could go through the space. Mr. Way asked if they considered making the southern end of Green Street two-way.

James Peltier, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated that they did study the two-way movement south of the western entrance and decided against that because the main entrance people will use is the east entrance. The western entrance only accesses the lower level of the garage. Mr. Hunter stated Public Street A is on the thoroughfare plan and Green Street is not.

Ms. Call asked if all levels of the garage can be accessed from the western side. Mr. Hunter answered affirmatively.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, New Albany, stated that the majority of people using this garage will be residents or office users. It is easier to access all parking spaces by entering from the east side. Mr. Way stated that if both entrances are accessible from the south, it may reduce trips through Green Street.

Mr. Way asked if there would be bollards on both ends. Mr. Hunter answered affirmatively. Mr. Way stated that the service lane/parking area on the north side does not look big enough for service or delivery trucks. Mr. Hunter stated that it is their intent to move delivery and service vehicles off of Bridge Park Avenue. Mr. Way referenced the accessible route through the open space, and suggested adding seating there as people may want a spot to rest. Mr. Pongonis stated that they hesitate to put furniture on a 5% slope. There are some other furnishings nested inside the park, but they will consider additional seating.

Mr. Way asked about stormwater storage indicated in the submitted materials. Mr. Quackenbush explained that there is a series of 10-foot diameter corrugated metal pipes that will serve as the main storage for site. The bio retention at the low point the open space is solely management for the open space itself. All stormwater management for the site is occurring in those pipes with a dedicated outlet pipe that goes to the storm outlet in Dale Drive.

Mr. Way stated that transformers stand out prominently. He asked what is planned for screening those. Mr. Pongonis stated there is nice topography by the pool holding up the pool courtyard. On the south side of that access the transformers are nested in the grade change and landscape. There are six-foot gates behind the landscape. They will have a wall around them and a gate.

Ms. Harter asked about the exposed concrete in the garage and if it could be a different color. Mr. Hunter stated that it would be very difficult to stain the concrete and he does not think they would be happy with the results. It would be easier to clad it. She asked for more information on what the tower looks like during the day. Mr. Pease stated that there is a pop of color and texture during the day with a random pattern of metal shading fins. At night, there will be LED lights behind the screen to enhance it further. Mr. Hunter stated that they have complete control over the colors. The opacity is different in upper panes and lower panes for additional visibility. Ms. Harter asked about landscaping on the residential site. Mr. Pongonis stated that it is a robust landscape plan. Ms. Harter asked if staff has any concerns about the safety of Green Street. Ms. Rauch stated that staff's findings are that the design slows traffic and staff has no initial concerns. Ms. Harter asked if the Commission will review the signage. Ms. Rauch stated that roadway signs are not in PZC's purview. Ms. Harter stated that children will likely plan on the boulders. She asked about the safety aspect of the boulders. Ms. Rauch stated that they are being used to help delineate the street edge. Mr. Hunter stated it is possible that children will play on them but there is a difference between the boulders at the street edge and those embedded in the landscape. They have considered those concerns and have tried to take all necessary precautions.

Ms. Call asked if metal cladding on exposed concrete on the garage would allow the depth to show. Mr. Pease stated that cladding would take the shadow line from six inches down to four inches. Ms. Call asked if there is space to add in curbs and landscaping if the boulders should not work for traffic delineation. Mr. Hunter answered affirmatively. Ms. Call referenced the condo building and asked if additional details like a cantilevered awning were considered in the recessed vertical element. Mr. Lytle stated that it would add some interest, but he was viewing that as a secondary element.

Mr. Way stated that he is concerned about the boulders. He asked if there is a backup plan if the boulders prove to be an issue. Mr. Hunter stated that part of the intent was to visually call attention to the open space so then this space feels different and could be used differently in placemaking and activations. Mr. Way asked what the letter "V" indicates on the legend. Mr. Pongonis stated that it is an elevation change, not a material.

Ms. Harter asked if the Dublin Arts Council (DAC) timeline allows for reasonable review of the scrim. Ms. Rauch stated that they have a monthly meeting.

Mr. Deschler asked about drainage from the other buildings. Mr. Quackenbush stated that the stormwater management pipes will be located under the lawn area of the open space. There are 5 rows of them placed 10 feet deep. The roof drains from the office building, garage and both

condominiums will go into the pipe system. The system is sized for future phases. All of the roof drainage from those buildings, the surface drainage on Green Street, and any drainage from the open space goes into a storm sewer that goes into these pipes. There will be water quality devices before the water goes into the system. Those details will be worked through with the City's engineering department during the private site improvement plan review. They will review stormwater calculations and quality requirements for the Ohio EPA permit. Ms. Rauch stated that with this site, the applicants will have to meet quality and quantity requirements. That is reviewed by engineering as part of the building permit review process.

Mr. Way stated that the BSD Code encourages public art in parks. He asked if the applicant had considered public art. Mr. Hunter stated that they have already spoken to DAC about this block, beginning with the scrim. They continue to have conversations about more than just this block. There are many opportunities to seize.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Garvin stated that he had already supported the through street and is supportive of the design that has been decided upon for the woonerf. The green space feels a little tight and could use expansion in Phase Two. He would prefer the bolder colors but understands the reason behind the change. He does not have a problem with the exposed concrete and feels it echoes the North Market garage.

Mr. Deschler stated that he appreciates the changes made. He is supportive of Green Street being one-way southbound. He likes the boulders. He agreed that the bold colors on the buildings were fun but understands the practicality from a sales perspective. He is generally supportive of all waivers and conditions. He asked if the Commission needs to opine on signage for private streets. Ms. Waszkiewicz stated that per the Ohio Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the private entity is required to use the same standards as the State. It is their responsibility to manufacture and install the signs but they must follow the same rules as the City of Dublin, which are the State standards.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is comfortable with the garage including the exposed concrete. He will not support waivers for the office building because the elevations are not unified. The condo building is the perfect example of having variation but unified elevations. Continuity creates a unified image to market the location. His concern is not the locations, entrances, or organization. He just does not see it as a unified composition. The overall site plan is great.

Mr. Way stated that he is supportive of the overall plan. He is excited about the woonerf. He does have trepidation about the boulders. There are many different people that drive and have different abilities. He is supportive of the approach to paving but is concerned about tire wear over time. He looked at other woonerfs around the world and many of them are more about pedestrians and bicycles and cars are secondary. As this is the road access to the garage, this might get more traffic than is typically seen with other woonerfs. There are some details that could help like public art and benches along the ADA path.

Ms. Harter agreed with her colleagues. She is supportive of the exposed concrete on the garage. She is concerned about the safety of the boulders. Children will play on them. She likes the focus on walkability. She suggested the applicant think about lighting aesthetics.

Ms. Call stated that this project has come a long way. She thanked the applicant for persevering. She does have some concern about the boulders. She appreciates the effort made to connect the belt through the site on two different sides. The vertical element on the condo building looks unfinished to her. She would like to make sure that if the boulders do not work, that there is room for planters should they be necessary.

Ms. Call stated that she would like to consider adding language to Condition #8 that encourages the applicant to look for opportunities on the garage. On #7, she would propose to add language regarding the recessed window awning or alternate treatment. She would pose adding "Green Street with consideration of the boulders," to Condition #1.

Ms. Call referenced the cohesiveness of the mixed-use building and posed the topic for discussion by the Commission.

Mr. Way stated that another way to look at this is there is a building that fronts on the street and a building that fronts on the park and they could have a different expression because the environment they are framing is different.

Ms. Call added that it is a building that has multiple identities because it is a mixed-use building.

Mr. Alexander stated that the condo building has possibly the best elevations he has seen in Bridge Park, because the elevations change as the circumstances change for the units so it is addressing different unit types and different unit conditions. He does not disagree with the points made but is looking for some way to create greater unity in the building.

Ms. Harter stated that we could be moving away from traditional office buildings in this area. She sees the general direction of change of each elevation and is in support of keeping it as presented.

Mr. Way stated that there is a playfulness to the way the colors work around the building and there is a different emphasis and prominence on different sides. He expressed his support for the building as proposed.

Mr. Deschler stated that he is supportive of the building as presented.

Mr. Garvin agreed with the premise that it is not cohesive. He likes the repeating element of the colors and even though the fenestration is not all the same, it does repeat some elements so he is supportive of the proposed design.

Ms. Call stated that she likes the colors on the other buildings but would prefer there to be something on the concrete on the garage. Ms. Call stated that she finds the south elevation of the mixed-use building to be repetitive.

Case #25-055FDP

A Bridge Park, Block J – Final Development Plan

Request for review and approval of a Final 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.

Mr. Garvin moved, Mr. Way seconded to approve the following Administrative Departures:

1. *Section 153.062(O)(5)(d)(4) – Façade Divisions – Vertical Increments Required* to allow a vertical increment of approximately 47 feet on the south elevation where a maximum of 45 is permitted.
2. *153.062(O)(5)(d)(4) – Façade Divisions – Required Change in Roof Plane or Type* to allow an approximately 84-foot continuous roof plane at the northwest corner of the building where a maximum of 80 feet is permitted.

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

[Motion carried 5-1]

Mr. Garvin moved, Mr. Deschler seconded to approve the following waivers:

1. *153.064(G)(1)(b) – Open Space Proportion* to allow a ratio of approximately 3.875:1 for the proposed public green where a maximum of 3:1 is permitted.
2. *153.064(G)(2)(a) – Open Space Access* to allow the proposed green to not be 100% perimeter along public streets or buildings where that is required.
3. *153.062(E)(2)(a) – Façade Material Transitions* to allow vertical façade material transitions to not occur at the inside corners on the north, south, and west elevations where thin brick piers abut metal panels over storefront window where it is required.
4. *153.062(O)(5)(a)(1) – Front Property Line Coverage* to allow approximately 76% front property line coverage along Bridge Park Avenue and 0% along Dale Drive where a minimum of 95% is required.
5. *153.062(O)(5)(a)(1) – Front Required Build Zone* to allow a minimum front required build zone of approximately 43 feet along Dale Drive where 0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 10-20 feet is permitted.
6. *153.062(O)(5)(b) – Upper Story Height* to allow the 5th floor of the building to be approximately 16 feet where a maximum of 14 feet is permitted.
7. *153.062(O)(5)(d)(4) – Façade Divisions – Vertical Increments Required* to allow a vertical increment of approximately 66 feet on the east elevation, approximately 79 feet on the north elevation, and approximately 66 feet on the west elevation when a maximum of 45 feet is permitted.
8. *153.062(E)(2)(a) – Façade Material Transitions* to allow vertical façade material transitions to not occur at the inside corners throughout on balconies where thin brick and metal singles meet where it is required.
9. *153.062(O)(3)(a)(1) – Front Required Build Zone* to allow a minimum front required build zone of approximately 3 feet along Bridge Park Avenue where 5-20 feet are required.
10. *153.062(O)(3)(a)(2) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage* to allow a maximum impervious lot coverage of approximately 86%, which includes the parking structure building type where 70 percent is permitted.
11. *153.062(O)(3)(d)(4) – Façade Divisions – Vertical Increments Required* to allow a vertical increment of approximately 74 feet on the south elevation, and approximately 49 feet on the north courtyard elevation where a maximum of 40 feet is permitted.
12. *153.062(O)(3)(d)(5) – Permitted Primary Materials* to permit thin brick as a primary material for the building where permitted materials are stone, brick, and glass.
13. *153.062(O)(3)(d)(5) – Primary Façade Materials* to allow a minimum of approximately 59 percent primary materials on the east elevation, approximately 44 percent on the north elevation, approximately 46 percent on the west elevation, approximately 58 percent on the south elevation, and approximately 26 percent on the north courtyard elevation

(includes thin brick as a primary material) where a minimum of 80% primary façade materials is required.

14. *153.062(O)(12)(a)(2) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage* to allow a maximum impervious lot coverage of approximately 86%, which includes the apartment building type where 80% (70% maximum per shared lot with an apartment building type) is permitted.
15. *153.062(O)(12)(d)(3) – Street Facades - Number of Pedestrian Entrances Required* to allow two entrances where three are required on the east elevation (Street A) and south elevation (Banker Drive).
16. *153.062(O)(12)(d)(4) – Garage Floors* to allow a parking ramp facing the Banker Drive frontage where horizontal floors are required.
17. *153.065(B)(5)(a)(1) - Entry / Exit Lanes* to allow two exit lanes where three are required.

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

[Motion carried 5-1]

Mr. Deschler moved, Ms. Harter seconded to approve the Final Development Plan with the following conditions:

1. The applicant continues to work with Staff on the final streetscape design of Bridge Park Avenue and Green Street regarding the consideration of the boulders, subject to Staff approval;
2. The applicant works with Staff on the dedication of right-of-way on the east side of Dale Drive;
3. The applicant works with Staff to finalize the parking space and drive aisle designs to align with the requirements listed in Code, subject to Staff approval;
4. The applicant works with Staff to meet the bicycle parking requirements and add the necessary spaces throughout the development, subject to Staff approval;
5. The applicant continues to work with Staff on the final design of the pocket park, subject to Staff approval;
6. The applicant obtains a right-of-way encroachment permit through the Engineering department;
7. The applicant provides window details and wall sections of the entire condominium building to ensure the windows are not flush-mounted and additional architectural details above the five vertical windows along the northern elevation, with the submittal of building permits;
8. Should COTA not occupy the space, the applicant continues to work with Staff on the exterior elevations of the proposed garage building;
9. The applicant coordinates with the Public Art Board to determine the artwork for the proposed garage scrim and any additional art within the open spaces;
10. The applicant works with Engineering Staff on final civil plan details at the Site Permit submittal stage and adhere to all of the City's regulations and design requirements;
11. The applicant provides Staff with screening details for the mechanicals as part of the site permit, subject to Staff approval;
12. The applicant submits an updated photometric plan with their site permits, subject to Staff approval.; and,
13. The applicant submits additional specifications for all decorative lighting proposed on the site, subject to Staff approval.

14. The applicant continue to work with staff to incorporate seating in the central open space along the accessible path, subject to Staff approval.

Ms. Call asked for input from the applicant. Mr. Hunter stated that condition #2 may not be necessary. Ms. Rauch stated that they have worked with the applicant; would prefer to keep it, if it is not required, then that condition is satisfied.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

Case #25-066CU

Bridge Park, Block J – Conditional Use

Request for review and approval of a Conditional Use for COTA Park & Ride located in a new parking structure. 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.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Garvin seconded to approve the Conditional Use for COTA Park & Ride.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

Case #25-056PP & #25-057FP

Bridge Park, Block J – Preliminary Plat & Final Plat

Request for review and approval of a Preliminary Plat and Final Plat 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.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded a recommendation to City Council for approval of the combined Preliminary and Final Plat with the following condition:

1. Prior to submitting to City Council, the applicant will be required to update the Preliminary and Final Plats to reflect all necessary changes to the plan made with the Final Development Plan, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch shared the following:

- APA Ohio training is available in Toledo, Ohio September 24-26, 2025; commission members were advised to let staff know if interested in attending.
- The annual joint training will be held Tuesday, July 22; dinner begins at 6:00 and the meeting will begin at 6:30 p.m. at 5200 Emerald Parkway.

- There continues to be conversation regarding the West Innovation District; additional Code modifications will come before the Commission by the end of the year.

Ms. Call stated that SportsOhio will be hosting a a walk through tomorrow (July 18, 2025) at 11:00 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Deputy Clerk of Council