



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, Dan Phillabaum

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 curbless 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 play 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 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

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 1, 2025 | 6:30 p.m.

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

3. Bridge Park, Block J

24-157PDP Preliminary Development Plan and Parking Plan

Proposal:	New mixed-use development on a 5.37-acre site zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood.
Request:	Review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan and Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
Location:	South of Bridge Park Avenue between Dale Drive and Dave Thomas Boulevard.
Planning Contact:	Zach Hounshell, Planner II
Contact Information:	614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/24-157

MOTION 1: 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 1,950 feet for Block J where 500 feet of length and perimeter of 1,750 feet are required.

Office Building (Mixed-Use Building Type)

- 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 Façade: 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.



Community Planning and Development



5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43017



614.410.4600
dublinohiousa.gov

Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

- 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.

Condominium Building (Apartment Building Type)

- 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 allow the north, east and west façade 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(O)(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 principle frontage streets, and/or adjacent to an open space type.

VOTE: 6-1

RESULT: The Waivers were approved.



Community Planning and Development



5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43017



614.410.4600
dublinohiousa.gov

Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

RECORDED VOTES:

Rebecca Call	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	No
Gary Alexander	Yes
Jason Deschler	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Garvin moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Preliminary Development Plan and Parking 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 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: 6-1

RESULT: The Preliminary Development Plan and Parking Plan were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Rebecca Call	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	No
Gary Alexander	Yes
Jason Deschler	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes

**Community Planning and Development**

5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43017



614.410.4600
dublinohiousa.gov

Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 1, 2025 | 6:30 p.m.

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

4. Bridge Park, Block J 25-037CU

Conditional Use

Proposal:	New mixed-use development on a 5.37-acre site zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood.
Request:	Review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
Location:	South of Bridge Park Avenue between Dale Drive and Dave Thomas Boulevard.
Planning Contact:	Zach Hounshell, Planner II
Contact Information:	614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/25-037

MOTION: Mr. Way moved, Ms. Harter 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: 6-1

RESULT: The Conditional Use request was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Rebecca Call	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	No
Gary Alexander	Yes
Jason Deschler	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Zach Hounshell
Planner II



Community Planning and Development



5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43017



614.410.4600
dublinohiousa.gov

Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

- ~~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. Wawzkiewicz 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 wunnerf 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~~



SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 12, 2024, 6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: ~~Rebecca Call, Kathy Harter, Jason Deschler, Dan Garvin, Jamey Chinnock, Kim Way, Gary Alexander~~

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

~~MOTION CARRIED 7-0 TO ACCEPT THE DOCUMENTS INTO THE RECORD AND APPROVE THE 11-07-24 AND 11-14-24 MEETING MINUTES~~

CONSENT CASES

- ~~24-138CU – Central Irrigation Supply, 6091 Enterprise Court, Conditional Use~~

~~Request for review and approval of a Conditional Use to allow a wholesale and distribution use in an existing building. The 3.33-acre site is zoned TF, Technology Flex and is located northeast of the intersection of Innovation Drive and Enterprise Court.~~

- ~~24-146AFDP – Mount Carmel, 4105 Emerald Parkway, Amended Final Development Plan~~

~~Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan to modify previously approved signs and add new chapel building uplighting. The ±34.5-acre site is zoned PUD: Mount Carmel Hospital Northwest and is located northwest of the 1-270 and Sawmill Road interchange.~~

~~MOTION CARRIED 7-0 TO APPROVE THE 2 CONSENT CASES~~

CASE REVIEWS

- ~~24-141CP – Bridge Park, Block J – Concept Plan~~

~~Request for review and recommendation of approval of a Concept Plan for the development of an office building, condominiums and parking garage. The 5.37-acre site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood and is located southeast of the intersection of Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue.~~

~~MOTION CARRIED 7-0 TO RECOMMEND CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL WITH 3 CONDITIONS:~~

- ~~1) The applicant continues to work with staff on the conversion of Banker Drive and Street B (Dave Thomas Boulevard) to public streets;~~
- ~~2) The applicant submits a Conditional Use Permit with the submission of the Preliminary Development Plan; and~~
- ~~3) The applicant continue to work with staff to explore alternative designs for Street A, based on the comments provided by the Commission.~~

Public comment was provided.

Next Steps: Concept Plan will be forwarded to City Council for determination in combination with a future Development Agreement

- ~~24-136 INF – MAG – Volvo, 6335 Perimeter Loop~~

~~Informal review and feedback on proposed building modifications and new signs. The 15.52-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD), Midwestern Auto Group, and is located southeast of the intersection of Perimeter Drive and Perimeter Loop Road.~~

~~*NON-BINDING FEEDBACK PROVIDED*~~

~~No public comment was provided.~~

~~The Commission was not supportive of the architectural details and sign changes as proposed. The members shared that the proposed amendments do not align with the architectural design of the overall campus and are inconsistent with the previously approved sign allowances.~~

~~Next Steps: Submission of a Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan and Amended Final Development Plan.~~

DISCUSSION ITEM

- ~~PROPOSED 2025 PZC MEETING DATES~~

~~*MOTION CARRIED 7-0 TO APPROVE THE 2025 MEETING DATES*~~

COMMUNICATIONS

- ~~Staff shared the change to the meeting packet delivery software to OnBoard for the second January PZC meeting and the upcoming OnBoard training.~~
- ~~The next regular PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 9, 2024.~~

ADJOURNMENT

~~The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.~~

- ~~24-138CU – Central Irrigation Supply, 6091 Enterprise Court, Conditional Use~~

~~Request for review and approval of a Conditional Use to allow a wholesale and distribution use in an existing building. The 3.33-acre site is zoned TF, Technology Flex and is located northeast of the intersection of Innovation Drive and Enterprise Court.~~

- ~~24-146AFDP – Mount Carmel, 4105 Emerald Parkway, Amended Final Development Plan~~

~~Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan to modify previously approved signs and add new chapel building uplighting. The ±34.5-acre site is zoned PUD: Mount Carmel Hospital Northwest and is located northwest of the 1-270 and Sawmill Road interchange.~~

~~Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Consent Cases:~~

~~24-138CU – approval of the Conditional Use with no conditions;~~

~~24-146AFDP – approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions~~

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

~~[Motion carried 7-0.]~~

CASE REVIEW

- **24-141CP – Bridge Park, Block J – Concept Plan**

Request for review and recommendation of approval of a Concept Plan for the development of an office building, condominiums and parking garage. The 5.37-acre site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood, and is located southeast of the intersection of Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue.

Applicant Presentation

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, provided an overview of their Concept Plan proposal for an additional expansion of Bridge Park. Cenovus Energy will be their lead tenant, taking half of the office space in a new office building. Although the office market is not flourishing in the City of Columbus, it remains resilient in Dublin. He believes it's a testament to the work of Crawford Hoying, the City and the Planning and Zoning Commission. They continue to create spaces that people want to be in. The development will also include two condominium buildings, one in Phase 1 and the other in Phase 2 on the existing COTA lot. Phase 2 condominiums will be similar to The Theodore condominiums in G Block; Phase 1 condominiums will be somewhat larger. Crawford Hoying is presently in discussions with COTA regarding a permanent solution for the existing Park and Ride and associated spaces, but also a temporary solution while the site is under construction. Their open spaces in the various block developments have been somewhat similar – urban and dense, but they have the opportunity to do something different on this site. Although there is an existing tree grove, the arborists have determined that few of the trees are worth saving. On the COTA lot, however, there are wonderful tree specimens that could be relocated elsewhere in the development and hopefully, create an urban arboretum. He invited MKSK to provide more details.

Jeffrey Pongonis, MKSK, landscape architect and planner, 462 S. Ludlow Street, Columbus, provided a slide overview of the site and the proposed development. They have the advantage of a larger site area than they had with the earlier blocks in Bridge Park. The framework of this development will be wrapped around an east-west open space. The open space will have less hardscape and be more natural in character. Due to the grade change on the site, their plan is to terrace the landscaping. They will be moving stormwater through the site with a bioswale or similar feature that is integrated into the landscape. The boundaries of the project will be Street B, Banker Drive, Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive. The edges will be streetscape, but some existing trees will be relocated in the interior of the open space, supplemented with other natural materials. In regard to streetscape – on the interior of the block, there will be a service drive or alley, which will provide opportunity to access the garage and opportunity for ride share and site circulation. They will attempt to amenitize the streetscape at the center of the block for pedestrians.

Dan Pease, MA Design, 775 Yard Street, Suite 325, Columbus stated that their intent is to have a distinctive, simplistic architecture with a lot of rhythm and rich in materials. He showed inspirational images of buildings, which will engage the street with patio space. The north and south elevations of the office building will be quite different. The south elevation will address the natural park. They have chosen an earth-tone, woodgrain color construction panel. In addition to a lot of glass, the primary building material will be a gray brick. There will be screening in front of the parking garage, and a scrim will be used. [Inspirational images of the proposed buildings shown.]

Matthew Lytle, Sullivan Bruck Architects, 8 South Grant Avenue, Columbus, described the condominium structure in Phase 1. He noted that although they have no inspirational images to show for the Concept Plan, there is a new material that they are requesting to use as a primary material. NewBrick is a thin brick alternative, a light-weight, insulated brick made by Dryvit. The condominium building will have 84 units that will be larger than those in The Theodore but smaller than those in The Warren with the same quality of finish. All ground-floor units along Bridge Park Avenue and Street B to the east will have direct access to a sidewalk, and the condominium units on all floors will have direct access to the parking garage.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that the combined ±5.37-acre site is zoned BSD, Bridge Street District – Scioto River Neighborhood, with primary frontages on Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, public streets. There will be accessory frontage on Banker Drive and Dale Thomas Boulevard, both of which are privately owned and are essentially drive aisles. The site consists of 5 properties containing an existing COTA Park and Ride lot, a vacant daycare facility, parking for Wendy's property, and the staging area for The Bailey development to the west. The site features significant grade change from the northwest corner to Dave Thomas Boulevard and the southwest corner. An abandoned stream bed is located centrally on the site, with mature vegetation lining the bed. Block J is the 8th block of Bridge Park East. A Concept Plan, which is the first formal step of the development process, establishes the general outline of the proposed development's scope, character, and nature. All new developments within the Bridge Street District are required to receive approval for a Concept Plan followed by Preliminary (PDP) and Final Development Plan (FDP) approvals. This particular development will be accompanied by a development agreement, which involves a separate process between the applicant and City Council. A development agreement requires City Council to make the final determination on the Concept Plan. Although PZC is not the determining body, it must make a recommendation on the proposal to City Council. The BSD-SRN Neighborhood

District provides a significant opportunity for a well-planned and designed neighborhood with a balanced mix of land uses. Predominant land uses include a residential presence to complement and support a strong mix of uses, including office and supporting service and commercial uses. A comfortable, walkable street network connects these diverse but complementary land uses. With a Concept Plan, specific details are not provided.

Mr. Hounshell reviewed the proposed street network. The development is expected to have frontage on five streets: Dale Drive (Public/Principal Frontage Street), Bridge Park Avenue (Public/Principal Frontage Street), Banker Drive (currently Private/to be Public), Street A (to be Private), and Street B (to be Public). Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue are currently not built to Bridge Street streetscape standards but will be updated with the development of this site. Banker Drive is presently a private street owned by Cadillac to the south. The proposal currently shows the portion of the Banker Drive streetscape on the proposed site to be updated to meet the streetscape standards. However, additional discussions between the City and the applicant are necessary to determine the future of the street with the development of this site. Street B (Dave Thomas Boulevard) is also a private access drive expected to provide public access to the proposed garage on the site's east side. Additional discussions between the City, the applicant, and Wendy's are necessary to determine how the street should be approached to accommodate the new development and the needs of Wendy's operations to the east.

The primary public open space is centrally located between the office building and the Phase 2 condominium building. The intention for the design of this public open space is a greener and more natural environment, including a proposed revitalization of an existing stream bed to assist in the site's stormwater management strategy. It would be supplemented by benches, decking/boardwalk and additional greenspace with pedestrian facilities throughout the center of the site. The applicant has not identified the open space type at this time but will be required to provide an analysis of the open space requirements with the PDP. Open space requirements within the Bridge Street District are dictated by the uses in the development. One square foot of open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial development, and 200 square feet of open space is required for each dwelling unit. For a mixed-use scenario, the requirements for open spaces are individually calculated. Based on the conceptual square footage of the development, ± 1.10 acres of open space are required. This acreage includes the anticipated Phase 2 development of the condominium building. The applicant has not indicated the proposed amount of open space for the development. Should the open space be less than the required acreage, the Commission would need to consider whether a waiver would be supported based on the design and quality of the open space.

Mr. Hounshell indicated that the condominium building is proposed to be an Apartment building type. This building is five stories tall and will include ± 89 residential units at approximately 145,000 square feet. The building will have frontage on one principal frontage street (Bridge Park Avenue), which will serve as the primary street frontage. An amenity deck with a swimming pool is proposed at the center of the building, which will open up to Street A and the public open space. The south side of the building connects to the garage, allowing residents to have direct access. Renderings of the building have not yet been provided, but the applicant is requesting feedback on a potential building material called NewBrick. This brick-clay veneer is anticipated to be used on upper stories only. Approval of a waiver to use this material would be required at the PDP stage.

Apartment building types with a maximum height of 4.5 stories are permitted in the Bridge Street District. A waiver would be needed to allow the building to exceed this height. The Commission should consider whether this future waiver request would be appropriate to allow a habitable 5th

story. Alternatively, the applicant may pursue a different building type that allows five stories but has different transparency, siting, and façade requirements.

The garage is proposed to be a Parking Structure building type, which is compatible as an accessory to the Apartment building type. The garage is five stories in height with 534 parking spaces within a total of 200,000 square feet. The garage is expected to have rooftop parking, which would require the addition of an enclosed stairway and elevator in the northwest corner of the garage. This enclosed space will be six stories in height, which also would require a waiver. Parking structures are permitted to include parking on the roof, consistent with other parking garages in Bridge Park. Parking structures that are completely lined by space available for occupancy along a public or private street frontage and parking structures located on the interior of blocks with other building types situated between the parking structure and the street are considered Permitted Uses. However, all other parking structures are considered Conditional Uses. The applicant must submit a Conditional Use application for the standalone garage with the PDP.

Staff has reviewed the Concept Plan against the applicable criteria and recommends the Commission's recommendation of approval to City Council with two conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin stated that the staff report indicated that Planning staff did not believe that shopping was an appropriate use. Is that because of the Sycamore Ridge apartments on the other side, or is it due to the grade of the land?

Mr. Hounshell responded the Code requires at least one shopping corridor in the District, and that is provided along Longshore Drive, a north-south street. Staff believes that is adequate for the neighborhood, and that the City would not extend the shopping corridor along Bridge Park Avenue.

Mr. Garvin inquired if negotiations were to be successful with Wendy's and the daycare but failed with COTA if the applicant would still anticipate moving forward with Phase 1.

Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively. They and the City already have a signed agreement with Cynovus Energy, so they are anxious to complete the process. They are already negotiating with Wendy's for a number of items, not the least of which is a 70-foot section of their property that is an existing unused parking lot; Crawford Hoying will be purchasing that property. There also have been many discussions regarding how best to address the public street. It will make a significant change to Wendy's property. Wendy's does not object, but there is a timing issue based on how long it will take to get through the process and ensure we can deliver to Cynovus, while we continue to work with Wendy's and with Cadillac, the other property owner.

Mr. Garvin stated that the Phase 2 units appear to be denser; how do they compare to the size of The Warren units?

Mr. Hunter responded that the Phase 2 units are identical to The Theodore (G Block). The Phase 1 units are larger. The Warren units are larger, 1,800–1,900 SF; however, the intent is that the Phase 1 units will be 1,300–1,400 SF. The Theodore units are smaller than that.

Mr. Garvin stated that if both phases advance, the proposed parking garage does not appear to meet the parking space requirements. Is there any parking plan to meet the anticipated parking space needs?

Mr. Hunter responded that they are working on ways to achieve more parking spaces from the parking garage. It might mean that the anticipated building size is increased by two feet, which

would provide an additional 12 spaces per floor. The parking will be addressed as part of their PDP proposal. He noted that they anticipate meeting the open space requirements.

Mr. Garvin stated that as he understands the LinkUs project, there needs to be a significant COTA location there. Do they anticipate that solution being achieved from additional land or property currently under their control?

Mr. Hunter stated that they have been discussing LinkUs with COTA for many years. Their intention is that Bridge Park will be the temporary most northwestern location until the route is extended further west. Crawford Hoying is attempting to hold some space for them on the ground floor that would accommodate restrooms, driver break rooms and waiting space in the event that transit route would end at this parking garage. They do not know how many parking spaces that will require, which is one of the reasons they have not yet determined how many parking spaces will be needed. There currently are 86 spaces on that lot right now, but how many are utilized today or will be utilized in the future is undetermined.

Mr. Deschler requested clarification of the permitted condominium building height.

Mr. Hounshell responded that every building developed in Bridge Park must align with a specific building type. The condominium building is the Apartment building type, which has a maximum height of 4.5 stories. The applicant is proposing 5 stories, so a waiver approval would be necessary to allow the additional .5 story. However, if the applicant should choose to pursue a Mixed-Use or Loft building type, the 5 stories would be permitted. However, the requirements, such as transparency and where the residential use may be located, may change with a different building type.

Mr. Deschler requested clarification of the Garage building type transparency requirements.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the Parking Structure is a permitted building type that is permitted if there is a liner building fronting the street and separating the garage from the public street. That is a condition that exists with a few other garages in Bridge Park. However, when a garage fronts a public street, it is considered a Conditional Use, and there is specific criteria that must be met. The Conditional Use is a separate application, but it accompanies the PDP process.

Mr. Deschler inquired if that is because the proposed garage fronts the private streets.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Deschler inquired if Street A is proposed to be a public street.

Mr. Hounshell responded that Street A would be a private street. The intent is that Banker Drive and Street B will have public access and must meet public street standards.

Mr. Deschler inquired if there currently are any other private streets in Bridge Park.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively. Longshore Loop, which is behind the AC Hotel in Block A, and Winder Drive, between The Baily and the Spring Hill Hotel, are private streets.

Mr. Deschler inquired if the owner of the private streets is responsible for the street maintenance.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the Commission could discuss the proposed brick material at the Concept Plan stage.

Ms. Call responded that building material is a Final Development Plan (FDP) discussion item. She asked staff if the consultant had reviewed the proposed material.

Mr. Hounshell responded that he had shared the material with the consultant, who indicated that they are familiar with the material, but would be visiting the projects to evaluate how the material has held up. He has not yet received that follow-up information from the consultant. He anticipates providing that material with the PDP rather than the FDP, because it would potentially require a waiver. The applicant has provided a material sample tonight to place it before the Commission early in the process. Providing it early gives them the ability to revise their material proposal, if necessary.

Ms. Call stated that preliminary feedback on the proposed building material would be acceptable tonight, but it will be discussed in a later development review stage. She requested the Law Director's feedback regarding the discussion not being germane to the Concept Plan decision.

Mr. Boggs responded that is correct. Material specifications are not part of the criteria for a Concept Plan review and determination.

Ms. Call stated that initial feedback on the material is permitted, however.

Mr. Alexander stated that the office and condominium buildings and adjacent sidewalks are not aligned in the site plan. Is there collaboration to create some uniformity between the two buildings?

Mr. Lytle responded affirmatively. The color of the materials used on the building facades is complementary. He proposes use of a dark gray brick at the base of the condominium building; the architect for the office building is using a dark gray brick, as well. There are some other tones that they are attempting to make complementary.

Mr. Way stated that he has some structural questions. Street A is not a required street. How does Street A serve the development?

Mr. Hunter stated that there has been significant debate regarding that street. There are a couple of purposes for the street; one is to provide a secondary vehicular egress from the garage. The grade of the site changes east-to-west but not north-to-south. It will be difficult to achieve an egress from the garage on the south elevation. The second purpose is that in an urban environment, service is needed, such as trash rooms. They do not want the trash room for the office building to be located on the Bridge Park Avenue elevation, and the garage is too far away. Initially, they considered making Street A a pedestrianway; however, that would not align with the needed operations.

Mr. Way stated that it would be possible to service just the end elevations of the office and condominium buildings instead of having a through road.

Mr. Hunter responded that they studied that option, as well; however, it would not have matched what has been done in the rest of Bridge Park, i.e. a street actually takes you somewhere. The intent is to utilize materials that change the feel of the street, so that the connection from the urban arboretum on the west to the condominium amenity space feels the same. The space should feel like cars "can" be there, but probably "shouldn't" be. A car on Bridge Park Avenue heading toward the garage but misses Dave Thomas Boulevard would still have an opportunity to access it. Essentially, this street design feels more correct.

Mr. Way stated that he is enthusiastic about the proposed open space because it is different than everything else in Bridge Park. There is an opportunity here to do something unique. That is the reason that he has questioned having a road cut through that space. If it isn't necessary, eliminating it would provide more open space and more pedestrian access, which is consistent with the street goals of the newly adopted Community Plan. He is supportive of the wider sidewalks, which include seating opportunities. It would be better if either the road wasn't there or it was a road that had some type of operational aspect that permitted it to be closed down for day or evening events, making it a pedestrianway. If the concrete were extended across the area

in a plaza-like manner, it would appear more like cars really shouldn't be there. Mr. Way referred to the "blue line," denoting a historical drainage line that runs through the open space. Are they exploring opportunities to engage water with the space?

Mr. Hunter responded that they are considering potential opportunities, such as aesthetic, stormwater and educational features.

Mr. Way inquired about the east-west walkway that runs south of the office building. It is both wide and is located on a slope. Is there a purpose other than connection?

Mr. Pease responded that there is a transition in the site north-to-south between the formal landscaping adjacent to the office building, incorporating a plaza-like entry area, and the less public entry for the condominium building to the south.

Mr. Way stated that the east elevation of the garage was not shown in the site plan. Will it be the same as the south elevation and have another scrim?

Mr. Pease responded that the east elevation will be very similar to the west elevation.

Mr. Way inquired if the scrim would be only on the south side.

Mr. Pease responded affirmatively, noting that it faces SR161.

Mr. Way inquired about the proposed parking spaces.

Mr. Hunter responded that there are 534 parking spaces right now. This information is not typically required with the Concept Plan. The difficulty they are having with working out this item is the COTA need.

Ms. Harter stated that she recalls an earlier meeting about this area and the need for COTA in this area. Could the City pull that earlier meeting discussion so we can assess how that discussion evolved?

Ms. Rauch inquired if she is interested in pulling the background discussion concerning having a COTA site in this area. Ms. Harter responded affirmatively. Ms. Rauch stated that the records would be searched for that discussion.

Ms. Harter requested clarification of the intent with the proposed balconies on the office building.

Mr. Hunter responded that the current office users really appreciate the balcony spaces, so they are interested in incorporating them where possible. The northwest corner of the building adjacent to the open space that will be created would be one obvious choice. There may be additional balconies on the building, as the design advances.

Ms. Harter inquired if they would be usable spaces, with the intent of enhancing the open space opportunity.

Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively. Additionally, there will be patio spaces at the ground level of the building, which will overlook the open space. There is almost a full story of elevation change from the intersection up to those patios; another full story of elevation change at the end of the office building; and yet another full story at the end of the condominium building.

Ms. Harter stated that the garage seems to be located far from the restaurant. Are the restaurant users anticipated to park in the garage or along the street?

Mr. Hunter responded that it is difficult to predict, but in previous blocks, the parking was over-built. This block is more removed. The placement of the garage honors Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive as the primary streets. The patrons of any restaurants that develop on the western elevation of the building likely will park within the Bridge Park area. The new garage in this block

will likely be used by the office and condominium users. The distance from the garage exit to the office building entrance is only approximately 100 feet.

Ms. Harter inquired about plans to enhance the walkability from this area to the shopping area across SR161, including the Wendy's restaurant.

Ms. Call stated that the walkability of that area falls more within the City's responsibility than the applicant's. She invited Ms. Rauch to share any comments.

Ms. Rauch stated that this issue was raised during discussions concerning a different block in Bridge Park. The City has been studying how to transform the streetscape of SR161/Dublin-Granville Road. Pedestrian activity is desired on the street, not over the street. The desire is to improve the walkability, particularly at the roundabout. The City is studying potential design solutions. A potential over-the-street feature was discussed with the earlier Y block consideration. Because of the grade, that option would be difficult to achieve and extremely costly.

Mr. Chinnock referred to Banker Drive and Street B, which will need to be widened consistent with public street standards. What is the reason that the additional widening space would be taken from adjacent sites, not this site?

Mr. Hounshell responded that the goal is for the centerline of Street B to be the same as the current centerline of Dave Thomas Boulevard. The site plan provides half of the space needed to widen the streetscape for Street B. The applicant will build Street B and Banker Drive to meet the necessary streetscape standards. The issue is what to do about the other side of Street B so that a cohesive street design is achieved.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the needed street improvement space would come from the properties on both sides of the street.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the graphics of the proposed garage scrim would not be considered signage.

Mr. Hounshell responded that in the past, it has been considered art.

Mr. Hunter noted that they worked with the Dublin Arts Council on the existing scrim on the garage in Block G.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the anticipated timeframe for the future condominium development. What would occur on that site, while the buildings in this phase are in use?

Mr. Hunter responded that they should be constructed at approximately the same time. Although they will not open simultaneously, construction will be seen on both sites.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the green space opportunity on this site is unique. How will it connect to the adjacent F Block to the west?

Mr. Hunter responded that Banker Drive and Bridge Park Avenue align. Winder Drive will continue to evolve. A crosswalk is not possible due to its proximity to the intersection. There will be continued landscape and design development to ensure connectivity.

Mr. Deschler inquired if there would be no onstreet parking on Dale Drive. Would onstreet parking be present only on Banker Drive and Bridge Park Avenue?

Mr. Hounshell responded that discussion would continue with the City Street and Mobility Division to determine if onstreet parking would be desired on Dale Drive, as well.

Mr. Deschler inquired the size of the restaurant space on the first floor of the office building.
Mr. Hunter responded that it would be approximately 10,000 SF.

Mr. Alexander referred to the 6-story building in Bridge Park west of this site. Is that reflective of the building type that was selected for that site?

Mr. Hounshell inquired if he was referring to the Spring Hill Hotel or The Bailey.

Mr. Alexander responded that it would be the Spring Hill extended-stay building.

Mr. Hounshell responded that he believes it is either a loft or mixed-use building type, but he is unsure if a height waiver was approved for the building. He could provide that information in the next development step.

Ms. Call inquired what is the vision for separating the public open space from the private, condominium open space.

Mr. Hunter responded that the grade of the site is in their favor, particularly in Phase 1. The site would incorporate a gentle staircase as well as landscaping that would separate the public from the private realm. He anticipates something similar in Phase 2. This is effectively achieved in D block, where a fountain is included.

Mr. Way stated that earlier in the discussion, the applicant mentioned that if a couple of feet were added to the parking garage, they could achieve a certain number of additional parking spaces per level. He is concerned that it will require a bigger parking garage to achieve the needed parking spaces. Is that anticipated?

Mr. Hunter responded that he would hope not as if the garage extends further north, it would sacrifice private space in this phase; if it extends further to the west, it sacrifices Phase 2 private space. They do need more parking spaces, but they anticipate submitting a shared parking plan for consideration. Currently, the parking is overbuilt in some blocks.

Mr. Way stated that the staff report indicates 662 parking spaces are needed; they have 534 parking spaces. Therefore, 128 spaces are needed. This could have a significant impact on the proposed plan.

Ms. Call stated that there currently are 5 separate parking areas that are equidistant to the existing parking garage. When submitted, the proposed shared parking plan should clarify the totality of the parking arrangement.

Public Comment

Scott Haring, 3280 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin, stated that there is no rezoning involved, so the project will be built to the established standards. He is hopeful that the proposed height and size of the buildings will comply with those rules. In the discussion tonight, there was reference to another project in Bridge Park that may have been granted a height waiver, and there may be consideration of a parking waiver. The Concept Plan proposal is for a 5-story garage. There was a statement that the rules allow a 4.5-story condominium. He recalls an application for a residential garage expansion in his neighborhood that was denied a few years ago. The denial was based on the assessment that the garage would look massive relative to the house. His question now is if a 5-story parking garage next to a 4.5-story condominium would look out of place. Additionally, many times in the past, the Commission has said that it did not want to consider projects in phases, but instead, see the overall plan. That makes this application seem peculiar, especially at this point, where the City has not yet acquired all the parcels intended for the project, i.e. the COTA site. He

recalls the review several years ago of the location of COTA to this site. An alternative prospect was to move COTA all the way out to a Bright Road/Emerald Parkway site. There was a large attendance and much testimony for that earlier COTA project. Is the intent now to kick COTA out of this location?

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that he believes the proposal is headed in a good direction. He has some concerns about the east elevation – a mass next to a parking lot. The architecture is currently lacking; more articulation and interest is needed. It will be important to identify what we really want with the private Street A connection. It is difficult to provide full support due to the level of unknowns at this point.

Ms. Harter stated that it will be essential to identify another COTA location. She is concerned about proposed waivers; the parking garage size; the trees that would be removed; and the proposed color of the materials for the office building. She believes the open space plan is moving in the right direction. She appreciates the plans to enhance the appearance of the parking garage. The parking plan details will be important to this proposal.

Mr. Way stated that the proposal is a very good use of this block. He likes the mix of uses – office and condominiums. The organization of the site is appropriate and responsive to the Bridge Street Corridor plan. The open space will make this block unique. He is very supportive of the application.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is supportive, as well. From an urban perspective, the application makes sense. He likes the way the plan reinforces the street wall and feels like the fabric of Bridge Park is being moved back. However, the fabric changes to the north. In the future, when we see the proposed facades, how will the applicant address the dramatically different scale across the street? There was some articulation of the office building façade, breaking it up into smaller volumes. With condominiums, there is a 4-story layer and a taller building behind that layer. This site is in a unique location, where it needs to address Bridge Park but still address the fabric of the sites in the other directions. He has no objection to the proposed building heights, due to the grade and important connections.

Mr. Deschler requested clarification of the stand-alone garage, which appears to be attached to the condominium building.

Mr. Hounshell responded that it is stand-alone in the sense that it is its own building type, attached to a different building type. That building type is conditionally permitted based on the fact that it does not have a liner building.

Mr. Deschler inquired if every floor of the parking garage is attached to the condominium building.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the parking garage is a separate building, but it is connected on all floors.

Mr. Deschler referred to proposed Street A and stated that he is not supportive of the proposed cut-through. He inquired Mr. Way's alternative suggestion.

Ms. Call noted that subject would be PDP discussion item. However, early discussion of items can be valuable to the applicant. She inquired if the applicant would like to have additional discussion from the Commission on that particular plan element at this earlier phase.

Mr. Hunter stated that if there are additional comments, they would like to hear them. At this point, they are not entirely sure that they know what the correct design is; there is further design to be done. However, it is possible that if the cut-through street there is not included, additional waivers would be required due to the block length.

Mr. Way stated that the discussion has opened up some ideas that could be explored, and the Commission would like to see more exploration. The applicant has been made aware that a cut-through road is not well supported by the Commission. Perhaps there could be a street that is paved in a different manner and that provides opportunity for closure for different purposes or different times of the day.

Mr. Deschler stated that if the proposal comes back and the street remains unchanged, the plan will not have his approval. He is hopeful that the Commission's feedback tonight will encourage a new idea regarding the street.

Ms. Call inquired if Mr. Deschler would like to explain his objection.

Mr. Deschler indicated that his intent was for the Commission to enter into a discussion about that item during the prescribed time for deliberations. The applicant is supposed to gather their ideas from the Commission's discussion and reactions to various elements of the proposal. At this point, he does not know what he wants to see, but he does know that he does not like what he sees. He does not believe there should be a cut-through street, because it creates the impression of two blocks. It is non-sequitur, not connected. Vehicles will use that street and travel through that area, exactly as Mr. Way has pointed out. He is generally supportive of the rest of the application. He is hopeful that the applicant can reach a resolution with Wendy's and COTA. He likes the ideas for the office building and the parking garage. He believes there needs to be on-street parking on Dale Drive.

Mr. Garvin stated that he believes the trees will be an important element of the open space area. The height is difficult to visualize due to the grade of the site. At the next stage of the development process, it would be helpful if the applicant provided some visual references to enable the Commission to envision the proposed heights against the skyline. Meeting the required parking spaces will be a challenge; we do not want the parking garage to become too large, nor to have a deficiency in needed parking spaces. The parking garage on the other end of Winder Drive may be the solution for achieving the needed spaces. Although some other Commission members may not agree, he likes the cut-through street. He believes additional issues could be created on either side by incorporating a dead-end street. Generally, he is supportive of the plan. He agrees that the greenspace will contribute to giving this block an interesting and viable block design.

Ms. Call stated that at the Concept Plan stage, the application meets the vision of Bridge Park. The building types are acceptable. The use and layout are generally acceptable. She likes the additional ingress/egress public safety service street, although she does wish that it did not come at the cost of the greenspace. Perhaps there are ways to address that, such as changing the material type through the belt, so that it evolves from concrete or asphalt to brick or another material to give the feel that it is not a preferred vehicle route. The Commission would appreciate it being addressed in a manner other than a public street. A parking proposal with a shared-use agreement is anticipated at the next step. The architectural materials of the office building and the condominium do not need to match but be complementary. The parking garage in the drawing looks too plain, but at this point, we did not see the scrim. At the next step of the development process, visual images of the proposed scrim would be helpful.

There was no additional discussion.

Mr. Way requested that a third condition be added, which is that the applicant will explore some alternatives with Street A in terms of making it more pedestrian-friendly, based on the discussion. Mr. Hunter indicated that he had no objection to the additional condition.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Garvin seconded a recommendation of Council approval of the Concept Plan with 3 conditions:

- 1) The applicant continues to work with staff on the conversion of Banker Drive and Street B (Dave Thomas Boulevard) to public streets;
- 2) The applicant submits a Conditional Use Permit with the submission of the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP); and
- 3) The applicant continue to work with staff to explore alternative designs for Street A, based on the comments provided by the Commission.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

• ~~24-136INF – MAG – Volvo, 6335 Perimeter Loop~~

~~Informal review and feedback on proposed building modifications and new signs. The 15.52-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD), Midwestern Auto Group and is located southeast of the intersection of Perimeter Drive and Perimeter Loop Road.~~

Applicant Presentation

~~Brad Parish, Archall Architects, 49 E. 3rd Avenue, Columbus, stated that this application is related to the Volvo portion of the primary MAG building. The proposal is to update the exterior façade with brand elements. The Volvo brand imaging division recently updated its brand, which includes the following key items: replacing the showroom storefront with a frosted glass; introduction of a blue metal panel with the Volvo signage; display windows into the showroom; a metal entry portal with a wood texture; updating the uplighting for the vehicle display areas. The request also included 3 new signs – 2 wall signs and one service sign. They are seeking the Commission's feedback before filing a formal application.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for an Informal Review in a Planned Unit Development (PUD). An Informal Review provides the applicant with non-binding feedback from the PZC on a development concept. Following an INF, the applicant may submit an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) application for formal review by PZC, which is required when any changes to a previously approved FDP are requested. The 15.5-acre site is located southeast of Perimeter Drive and Perimeter Loop Road, with a shared access drive off Perimeter Loop Road and two additional access drives off Venture Drive. It includes the Ferrari, Porsche, and main MAG dealership (including Volvo) buildings, outdoor display areas along the front of the buildings, associated parking, and pedestrian facilities along Venture Drive, Perimeter Loop Road, and Perimeter Drive. In March 2018, City Council approved an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) for a MAG campus comprehensive sign plan, including an inventory of all existing and proposed signs. This~~