



## RECORD OF ACTION

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 7, 2019 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission discussed the following proposal at this meeting:

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1 PID: 273-000867**  
**18-080DPR-SPR Development and Site Plan Reviews with Parking Plan**

Proposal: A six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel and commercial building and associated site improvements.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive.

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

Applicant: James Peltier, EMH&T.

Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, [chusak@dublin.oh.us](mailto:chusak@dublin.oh.us)

Case Information: [www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-080](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-080)

**MOTION #1:** Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded, to approve the Development Plan Review without conditions.

**VOTE:** 5 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Development Plan was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes
Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
William Wilson	Yes

**MOTION #2:** Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Wilson seconded, to approve the 15 Waivers:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height.  
Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high.  
Request: To parapets of .5 feet and 7.5 feet in height.
2. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Expression Lines.  
Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building.  
Request: Expression lines distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and define the top of the parapet.



3. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows, Projecting Sills Required.  
Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one-by-four trim or brick mould casing.  
Request: To permit windows to be recessed into the siding clad facades with no projecting sills.
4. §153.062 – Building Types (N)(4)(a)(5) Vents, Air Conditioners, other Utility Elements  
Vents, air conditioners, and other utility elements are not permitted on street facing facades.  
Request. Permission for PTAC and VTAC units grills/louvers on street facing facades and architectural louvers above restaurant storefront windows for future mechanical systems.
5. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks.  
The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.  
Request. Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve "B" to be setback  $\pm 3.33$  feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.
6. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.  
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.  
Request. Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
7. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.  
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.  
Request: To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
8. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.  
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.  
Request. To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.
9. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments  
Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.  
Request: To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.
10. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane  
Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.  
Request: To permit roof planes of  $\pm 111$  feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.
11. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.  
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.  
Request: To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.





**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1  
18-080DPR-SPR**

**PID: 273-000867  
Development and Site Plan Reviews with Parking Plan**

12. §153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.  
One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.  
Request: To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.
13. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.  
A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.  
Request: 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.
14. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.  
The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.  
Request: Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.
15. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.  
Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.  
Request: Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

**VOTE:** 5 – 0.

**RESULT:** The 15 Waivers were approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes
Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
William Wilson	Yes

**MOTION #3:** Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded, to approve the Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan and eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant evaluate opportunities for provision of required publicly accessible open space;
- 2) That the applicant provide a public access easement to and over the proposed Pocket Park;
- 3) That an on-street van accessible parking space be provided based on the provision of 3 new parking spaces;
- 4) That bicycle parking spaces be provided as required by Code;
- 5) That exterior lighting specifications for all proposed fixtures be submitted with building permits;



**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1  
18-080DPR-SPR**

**PID: 273-000867  
Development and Site Plan Reviews with Parking Plan**

- 6) That exterior lighting be provided in the area of the Pocket Park to meet the minimum foot candle requirements of Code;
- 7) That details and specifications for the proposed vehicular canopy be submitted with building permits; and
- 8) That the applicant verify the proposed height of the retaining walls surrounding the open space along Winder Drive and request any necessary approvals should they exceed Code-permitted height.

**VOTE:** 5 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Site Plan with the Parking Plan was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes
Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
William Wilson	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**



Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner  
Manager of Current Planning



~~being functional. Bringing a design team into this process could improve the architecture and enrich the community.~~

~~Ms. Kennedy stated that she has no concerns with the plan. Although the sign may not meet Code, the design is well integrated with the building. She is an engineer and likes the building. She finds the exterior of the building appealing and simple. She is also happy to see this business locate in the community.~~

~~Mr. Stidhem stated he likes the building and the sign. It is a good fit with the building. He appreciates the ability to convert this building to another purpose in the future. There is a demand for a venue for corporate and wedding events in this community. This is a great location for this service.~~

~~Mr. Newell concurred with Mr. Wilson's comments regarding the articulation of the façade. She would be more concerned if it was a much larger building. Overall, she likes the design of the building. She finds the sign very artistic and well blended into the building. Her only concern is with one building material. The text refers to it as aluminum siding, but aluminum siding is not a permissible material in the West Innovation District. Metal panel siding is permissible. This material is half-way between. It is installed in the same manner as a metal panel screen system would be installed. Therefore, she believes it is more of a metal panel siding. For the record, she wants to clearly state that the Commission was interpreting this material as metal panels, not aluminum siding. This is a very nice project.~~

~~There was no further discussion.~~

~~Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the three (3) Administrative Departures. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.  
Motion passed: 5-0.~~

~~Ms. Stidhem inquired if the applicant is in agreement with the seven conditions.  
Mr. Winkle responded that he is in agreement.~~

~~Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the Site Plan Review with seven (7) conditions. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.  
Motion passed: 5-0.~~

## **2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1, 18-080DPR-SPR, Development and Site Plan Reviews with Parking Plan**

Ms. Newell stated this request is a proposal for review and approval of a Development Plan, Waivers and a Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066, for a proposed six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel and commercial building and associated site improvements, southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive.

Ms. Newell swore in those individuals who wished to present public testimony on this case.

### Background

Ms. Husak stated that this is a development plan and site plan with a parking plan for Building F1 in Bridge Park. On January 17, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) recommended approval of the plat that includes the lot for F1 as well as the private drive. On October 22, 2018, City Council approved the Basic Plan Reviews for Block F and Block G, and appointed PZC as the required reviewing body for all future applications. Tonight's review will be the final step in the development review for Block F. There will be several other buildings, but PZC is reviewing only F1 at this time. When this plan is approved, the applicant will be able to apply for building permits.

### Site

This site within Block F is located on Bridge Park Avenue and is bordered by Mooney Street on the west and Dale Drive on the east. Blocks A through C are completed and Blocks D and H are being completed. Building F1 is an 86,000-square-foot hotel with approximately 9,000 square feet of commercial space. The building has six stories and 145 rooms. The south façade is adjacent to the reserve that was platted and the private drive of Winder Way, and contains a canopy-covered patron drop-off area. On the north façade along Bridge Park Avenue is the primary entrance/exit for pedestrian traffic. Dale Drive on the east side, which is anticipated to be a street similar to Bridge Street, will have some interim conditions. It also has topography changes, which were partially addressed with waivers in the Basic Plan, as there were some areas where the front property line coverage could not be met due to the layout of the existing roadway. On the west side is existing Mooney Street. Directly across from the F1 building on Mooney Street are buildings in B Block and the B Block garage.

### Landscape Plan

The landscape plan for this site includes open space primarily in the area south of the hotel and west of the canopy area. Patrons of the hotel can exit and enjoy the outdoors in a comfortable setting. It is publicly accessible and the applicant is counting that as their open space. This site is slightly short of open space dedication. Overall, the Block will make up all the open-space requirement; however, for this particular site, there is a condition that the open space dedication will be deferred to the development to the south to make up the needed portion. Retaining walls and chairs and lounges are proposed to make a comfortable space. There are also areas for seating to the north along Bridge Park Avenue.

### Elevation

On the northeast east side along Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, a large amount of glass and brick are incorporated into the facades. The signs depicted in the rendering are not part of tonight's application. They will be addressed in a future amendment to the Master Sign Plan, which currently encompasses Blocks A, B, C and D. On the northwest elevation along Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street are located commercial spaces with patios and a more active streetscape, along with higher windows and views into the restaurants. On the southeast elevation is Dale Drive and Winder Drive -- a proposed private street through the block, which has the canopied drop-off area. The applicant is present and can explain the changes that were made to address the direction shared at the previous Council and PZC meetings. The plan has been revised to increase the width of Winder Drive and the inclusion of passenger drop-off spaces and delivery areas. Winder Drive has also been revised to be one-way only.

### ART Recommendations

Three motions are recommended.

- Development Plan with no conditions.
- Waiver Review – Approval of Waivers to permit the following deviations from Code:
  1. **§153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height.**  
Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high.  
**Request:** To parapets of .5 feet and 7.5 feet in height.
  2. **§153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Expression Lines.**  
Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building.  
**Request:** Expression lines distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and define the top of the parapet.
  3. **§153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows, Projecting Sills Required.**  
Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one-by-four trim or brick mould casing.  
**Request:** To permit windows to be recessed into the siding clad facades with no projecting sills.
  4. **§153.062 – Building Types (N)(4)(a)(5) Vents, Air Conditioners, other Utility Elements**  
Vents, air conditioners, and other utility elements are not permitted on street facing facades.  
**Request.** Permission for PTAC and VTAC unit grills/louvers on street facing facades and architectural louvers above restaurant storefront windows for future mechanical systems.
  5. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks.**  
The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.  
**Request.** Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve "B" to be setback  $\pm 3.33$  feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.
  6. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.**  
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.  
**Request.** Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
  7. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.**  
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.  
**Request:** To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
  8. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.**

No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.

**Request:** To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.

9. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments.**

Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.

**Request:** To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.

10. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane**

Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.

**Request:** To permit roof planes of  $\pm 111$  feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.

11. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.**

80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.

**Request:** To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.

12. **§153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.**

One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.

**Request:** To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.

13. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.**

A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.

**Request:** 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.

14. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.**

The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.

**Request:** Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.

15. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.**

Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.

**Request:** Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

- Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan with eight conditions



- 1) That the applicant evaluate opportunities for provision of required publicly accessible open space;
- 2) That the applicant provide a public access easement to and over the proposed Pocket Park;
- 3) That an on-street van accessible parking space be provided based on the provision of 3 new parking spaces;
- 4) That bicycle parking spaces be provided as required by Code;
- 5) That exterior lighting specifications for all proposed fixtures be submitted with building permits;
- 6) That exterior lighting be provided in the area of the Pocket Park to meet the minimum foot candle requirements of Code;
- 7) That details and specifications for the proposed vehicular canopy be submitted with building permits; and
- 8) That the applicant verify the proposed height of the retaining walls surrounding the open space along Winder Drive and request any necessary approvals should they exceed Code-permitted height.

#### Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman inquired if the square footage of the pocket parks was reduced or were they only reoriented.

Ms. Husak responded that the square footage was not reduced, but it is not on a principal frontage street. It is the street orientation that does not meet the Code.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the square footage remains the same as originally intended.

Ms. Husak responded the pocket park size requirement is met. However, the Code has several different open space types, and the space in this plan qualifies as a pocket plaza.

Ms. Kennedy requested clarification. Although F1 does not meet the open space requirements, she asked whether the other buildings in F Block would provide the additional space that was required.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. Overall, the applicant intends for F Block to meet the open space requirements. If the anticipated office space should be unable to provide the additional square footage needed, it will be dealt with that application review.

Mr. Fishman stated that the City does not want payment in lieu.

Ms. Husak stated that with the Basic Plan, the applicant showed where the open space would be provided throughout the block, which met the requirement.

Mr. Wilson stated that it is important that these open spaces are designed to be usable spaces. In the areas that are already designed, the spaces are wider and can be used as gathering spaces. He said what is occurring between Building F2 and Building F4 are hallways or corridors that permit pedestrian traffic instead of being gathering spaces. As the design continues for Building F2 and F4, that should be considered. The spaces should be made into something that the public will remain in for a time and enjoy, not just aisles to move people.

Mr. Wilson asked about construction sequence. He stated he assumes the hotel application is currently being reviewed will be built before the parking lot that will be across the private street.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. The only application currently online is the hotel.

Mr. Wilson stated that he assumes the parking for the hotel would initially be provided by the existing parking structures, but he asked if that will be enough space and sufficiently close for the hotel guests. He inquired whether there is an expectation that F2 garage will be built within a few months.

Ms. Husak stated the applicant would address the timing/phases of this project; however, in terms of the availability of spaces, staff is comfortable with the research and resulting numbers for this parking plan. Code does not require a certain linear distance.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the ownership of the pocket park is changing.

Ms. Husak responded that because the open space parking plaza is located on the hotel property, it is owned by that property owner – either Crawford Hoying or Springhill Suites, not by the City. However, the public will use the open space. Code requires the open space to be owned by the City. A waiver will be needed to permit it to be owned by the hotel.

Mr. Fishman inquired if it would remain open space in perpetuity, and the hotel not be permitted to identify it for hotel use.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman inquired if that understanding would be clearly reflected in a deed or elsewhere.

Ms. Husak stated that the record will reflect the Commission's approval that the space fulfills the City's open space requirement. If the nature of that open space were to change, it would no longer be consistent with the Commission's approval.

Mr. Boggs stated the Condition suggests that with the Waiver, the property owner would provide a public access easement, which would provide public access in perpetuity.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is concerned the hotel might put a kiosk there.

Mr. Boggs responded that would be in violation of the Commission's approval and the City's rights under the easement that would be granted as a Condition of the Commission's approval.

Mr. Fishman stated it is important to ensure projects are providing the required open space and not receive waivers of that requirement or be permitted to pay a fee in lieu.

Ms. Husak stated that only 700 square feet is being waived.

Mr. Fishman stated he is concerned the future project is expected to supply that additional amount but will object that it is not their responsibility.

Ms. Kennedy requested clarification of the bicycle rack requirement for a certain number of spaces.

Ms. Husak responded that it is a Code requirement.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if one of the waivers or conditions was related to that.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. Code requires the provision of bicycle parking spaces. The Condition language is not specific in terms of where these bicycle spaces must be located, so they could be located in the garage or on the site.

Ms. Kennedy stated that because there is no garage in proximity, the bicycle parking spaces will be on the sidewalks.

Ms. Husak responded that there are bicycle parking spaces on Bridge Park Avenue that are in the City right-of-way. There are also spaces in the Block B garage.

Ms. Newell invited the applicant to speak.

James Peltier, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus stated that he would like to address the open space requirement. He pointed out a hatched area on the rendering that indicates that space. Previously, the plan proposed a pool in that area that would be associated with the building. The pool was removed and a wall was pulled back approximately 20 feet to provide more open space here. The F1 Building is required to provide 1800 square feet of open space. The plan provides 1200 square feet, making it 600 square feet short of the requirement. They will be building and providing additional open space across the street; which will be well in excess of the open space requirements.

Mr. Fishman stated that these spaces are not public gathering spots. He asked if the one particular space was for the restaurant.

Ms. Husak responded that it is not for the restaurant, but it likely would be a patio space.

Mr. Peltier clarified the patio space is not for the restaurant. It is intended to be an open space similar to other public open spaces within the area, such as the public space between Buildings C1 and C2, where Cap City Diner is located.

Mr. Peltier summarized the results of the parking analysis, which was included in the Commission packets. The existing B Block garage across Mooney Street has 142 spaces in excess of the City Code requirements. Code requires 187 spaces for the hotel and restaurant. There are 107 spaces in the garage dedicated for B Block office use. On weekends, those spaces are not being utilized. Therefore, during the peak hours for the restaurant and hotel, those unused spaces dedicated for office would be available for hotel and restaurant use.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if there would be signs that identifies those spaces as reserved for office use Monday – Friday during specified hours.

Mr. Peltier responded that no specific spaces are reserved for office.

Mr. Fishman inquired if an additional garage is anticipated.

Mr. Peltier responded affirmatively. It would be south of the F1 Building.

Mr. Fishman inquired the anticipated timeframe for the additional garage.

Don Brogan, Crawford Hoying Development, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated the additional garage is expected to be included with the next office building project. However, the hotel will have sufficient parking with what is available at this time. When the next office building is constructed, the garage will be built, as well.

Mr. Fishman stated the parking garage across the street is a free, self-park structure, and asked if it will remain as such when the hotel is completed.

Mr. Brogan responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman inquired if valet parking of hotel vehicles would not be required.

Mr. Brogan responded that there would be no need for valet parking. The garage is directly across the street.

#### Commission Discussion

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the bike rack design and location.

Mr. Peltier referred to images provided in the Landscape Plans. There are existing bike racks on Mooney Street and Bridge Park Avenue, which are included in the required bicycle parking count. Additional bike racks will be included on this site, as well.

Mr. Stidhem encouraged using interesting bike racks. Throughout the plan, he would like to see interesting features to draw people in along Winder Drive. For the last three years, the Commission has been discussing the use of artistic features that will draw people to this space.

In Hilton Head, for example, the bike racks reflect a "fish" architectural feature. He said there are many interesting features in Bridge Park already, but he asked what, if anything, is planned here.

Ms. Husak responded that the City bike racks utilize the same, circular design. Staff has discussed the need to expand that palette. They can work with the applicant to do so here, and staff can focus on expanding the effort Citywide.

Mr. Peltier stated the bike racks in Bridge Park already show a variety in design. As he understands the conversation, in addition to the bike racks, the Commission is encouraging incorporation of more interesting features within this open space.

Chris Meyers, Meyers & Associates Architects, 232 North Third Street, Columbus, stated the intent is to create charisma throughout the Bridge Park venues through the use of fixed objects and materials. In addition, they have attempted to seek areas in which to add a charisma of activity, such as outdoor musicians. The goal is to create spaces that encourage people to gather and sit. The landscape element next to the hotel is intended to energize the appearance of the front entrance.

Ms. Kennedy stated that, as a resident, she cannot envision wanting to sit down outside a hotel. It does not seem to be a space that will be utilized by the general public. Adding the vibrancy does bring the back side of the building to life.

Mr. Meyers stated it is challenging because it is difficult to differentiate which is the front and which is the back. With all the activity that is planned around this site and what is currently in place, a hotel visitor may exit to the north or the south and interact with the entire development. An additional benefit to Bridge Park will be the new park to the west, which will provide a large outdoor gathering space and amenity for the City. These smaller pocket spaces add to the identity of a particular building. This small space may be utilized more by hotel guests, but it is not exclusive to their use.

Mr. Fishman encouraged the incorporation of artwork, such as sculptures, in the area.

Mr. Meyers stated that the discovery of interactive sculptures adds an unexpected element of surprise. Throughout Bridge Park, there is an effort to look for opportunities to add interactive elements. Likewise, their intent is not to extend buildings to the street, but allow a transitional space between the public right-of-way and the façade for such opportunities.

Mr. Fishman noted that there has been previous discussion about the intent to add sculptures and elements to attract people. He asked if it their intent to do so.

Mr. Meyers responded affirmatively.



Mr. Wilson inquired about the reason the internal road on the site must be private. He asked if the hotel is permitted to block that road and prevent through traffic.

Mr. Peltier responded that it would be treated like a public road, and built to the same standards. There are private roads on Block A, as well, such as Longshore Loop. The intent would not be to block them off or make them inaccessible to the public.

Mr. Boggs stated that at the previous PZC meeting discussion regarding the plat, it was clarified that this area is set forth in the plat as a Reserve for purposes of providing public access into the site.

Ms. Husak responded that it would not be a neighborhood street, which would provide connectivity through the blocks; its primary purpose is to provide access to the hotel and the garage. It is not a through street like the north/south streets.

Mr. Peltier stated the street will meet fire and emergency access requirements.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if the developer would be responsible for the maintenance.

Mr. Peltier responded affirmatively.

Ms. Newell inquired if the cement board siding is prefinished.

Mr. Meyers responded affirmatively. It has a factory prime and one coat finish. In the event that any marks occur to the finish during shipping, a final finish application would be added. There are other examples of this commercial grade product within Bridge Park.

Mr. Stidhem stated that the building is attractive and will be a great addition to the District. He is hopeful that this site will encourage pedestrian traffic in the area. He asked if there is rooftop access for the hotel or restaurant.

Mr. Meyers responded that there is rooftop access only for the maintenance of the mechanical equipment. There will be no interactive public area.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if any environmental sustainability feature would be incorporated.

Mr. Meyers responded that a significant amount of environmental sustainability has been incorporated in the building, which is consistent with Crawford Hoying's standards and is also a requirement of the Marriott brand.

Ms. Newell inquired if any of the mechanical equipment on the roof would be screened, given that waivers are requested to permit parapet heights.

Mr. Meyers responded that all of the mechanicals are positioned out of the sight line and have screening. The conditions for the parapets are related to the form of the building, not to add any visibility. They have considered the potential views from the elevations of the adjacent buildings, and any need for screening has been addressed.

Ms. Newell stated that she appreciates that response, because, in with some of the other buildings in Bridge Park, assurances were made that the mechanical units would be screened. However, they are very visible in certain locations, particularly when there is a change in elevation.

Mr. Meyers noted that the specifications of each of the units was included in the materials.

Mr. Stidhem stated that, whenever possible, he would encourage rooftop access for play, not only for access to mechanical units. The AC Hotel provides evidence of the level of draw that is created. It may not be advisable for this location; however, due to its more limited view.

Mr. Meyers responded that it also is not consistent with the Marriott brand.

Mr. Wilson inquired if street lighting is being provided.

Mr. Peltier responded that a plan for street lighting was included in the materials. Three light poles are proposed along Winder Drive, which are consistent with other street light poles utilized in the District.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the awning for the main entrance would be an open, flat style that would not provide rain protection.

Mr. Meyers responded that the awning would be translucent but it is a solid acrylic panel.

Ms. Newell stated that a waiver has been requested regarding the primary materials on the building. She has a concern about the amount of cement board siding being used, in particular on the Dale Drive/Winder Drive corner. It creates an impression of a very large mass on that corner in comparison to the articulation that is expressed elsewhere on the building. She is uncomfortable with the size of that mass; however, she defers that issue to the Commission. There was no further discussion.

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the Development Plan Review without conditions. Ms. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.  
Motion approved: 5-0.

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the 15 waivers:

1. **§153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height.**

Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high.

**Request:** To parapets of .5 feet and 7.5 feet in height.

2. **§153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Expression Lines.**

Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building.

**Request:** Expression lines distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and define the top of the parapet.

3. **§153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows, Projecting Sills Required.**

Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one-by-four trim or brick mould casing.

**Request:** To permit windows to be recessed into the siding clad facades with no projecting sills.

4. **§153.062 – Building Types (N)(4)(a)(5) Vents, Air Conditioners, other Utility Elements.**

Vents, air conditioners, and other utility elements are not permitted on street facing facades.

**Request.** Permission for PTAC and VTAC unit grills/louvers on street facing facades and architectural louvers above restaurant storefront windows for future mechanical systems.

5. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks.**  
The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.  
**Request.** Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve “B” to be setback  $\pm 3.33$  feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.
6. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.**  
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.  
**Request.** Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
7. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.**  
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.  
**Request:** To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
8. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.**  
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.  
**Request.** To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.
9. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments.**  
Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.  
**Request:** To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.
10. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane.**  
Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.  
**Request:** To permit roof planes of  $\pm 111$  feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.
11. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.**  
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.  
**Request:** To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.
12. **§153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.**  
One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.  
**Request:** To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.
13. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.**  
A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.

**Request:** 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.

14. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.**

The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.

**Request:** Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.

15. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.**

Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.

**Request:** Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.

Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.

Motion approved: 5-0

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the Site Plan Review with Parking Plan with eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant evaluate opportunities for provision of required publicly accessible open space;
- 2) That the applicant provide a public access easement to and over the proposed Pocket Park;
- 3) That an on-street van accessible parking space be provided based on the provision of 3 new parking spaces;
- 4) That bicycle parking spaces be provided as required by Code;
- 5) That exterior lighting specifications for all proposed fixtures be submitted with building permits;
- 6) That exterior lighting be provided in the area of the Pocket Park to meet the minimum foot candle requirements of Code;
- 7) That details and specifications for the proposed vehicular canopy be submitted with building permits; and
- 8) That the applicant verify the proposed height of the retaining walls surrounding the open space along Winder Drive and request any necessary approvals should they exceed Code-permitted height.

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant is in agreement with these conditions.

Mr. Meyers responded that they are in agreement.

Ms. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; yes; Ms. Newell, yes.

Motion approved: 5-0

Mr. Stidhem thanked the applicant for their presentations.