



## MEETING MINUTES

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 4, 2018 | 6:00 pm

## JOINT WORK SESSION -

# Planning & Zoning Commission and Architectural Review Board

Thursday, January 4, 2018 | 6:30 pm

### PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING AGENDA

- 1. Rockin' Jump Dublin** **Shier Rings Road**  
**17-122CU** **Conditional Use (Approved 4 – 0)**

### JOINT SESSION AGENDA

- 1. BSD P – Riverside Crossing Park, Phase I – East Plaza** **Riverside Drive**  
**17-124SP** **Informal - Site Plan (Discussion Only)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Warren Fishman, Bob Miller, and Steve Stidhem. Deborah Mitchell was absent. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Vince Papsidero, Phil Hartmann, Matt Earman, Jane Fox, JM Rayburn, and Flora Rogers.

### Administrative Business

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from November 9, 2017. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated the first case is eligible for the Consent Agenda. She indicated said she would introduce the case since it may be approved by consent and then would welcome a motion.



**1. Rockin' Jump Dublin  
17-122CU**

**Shier Rings Road  
Conditional Use**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a Conditional Use with a modification for a pavement setback for a previously approved 29,000-square-foot indoor recreation facility on the south side of Shier Rings Road, east of Emerald Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.

The Chair noted that no formal presentation is needed.

JM Rayburn posted the four conditions as follows:

- 1) That the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu for any tree not replaced on site and revise the landscape plan accordingly, including providing detail on the plant selection, at the building permitting stage;
- 2) That the applicant revise the plans to provide detail on the lot coverage, at the building permitting stage;
- 3) That the applicant continue working with Engineering to address all technical comments regarding stormwater management and continue to demonstrate all stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 are met; and
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to provide site access to align with the existing, opposing driveway and to provide adequate sight distance.

The Chair asked if the applicant had agreed to the four conditions. Claudia Husak said the City is actually the applicant because the City was at fault for the error in the interpretation of the setbacks.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Conditional Use with four conditions with the alteration from the General Development Standards allowing parking to be within 13 feet of the western property line (Emerald Parkway frontage):

- 1) That the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu for any tree not replaced on site and revise the landscape plan accordingly, including providing detail on the plant selection, at the building permitting stage;
- 2) That the applicant revise the plans to provide detail on the lot coverage, at the building permitting stage;
- 3) That the applicant continue working with Engineering to address all technical comments regarding stormwater management and continue to demonstrate all stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 are met; and
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to provide site access to align with the existing, opposing driveway and to provide adequate sight distance.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair stated the regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at 6:06 pm and the Joint Session with the Architectural Review Board could commence.

Claudia Husak mentioned there is a lot of new Information Technology equipment and requested that there be an allowance of time for training before the next PZC meeting. She said the full benefits are not being utilized this evening but this allows the Board and Commission to get introduced to it.

Ms. Husak said additional ARB members are expected for the Joint Session that starts at 6:30 pm.

Claudia Husak called the Joint Session of the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m. Commission members present were: Victoria Newell - Chair, Warren Fishman, Bob Miller, and Steve Stidhem. Architectural Review Board Members present were: David Rinaldi - Chair, Gary Alexander, and Shannon Stenberg. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Vince Papsidero, Phil Hartmann, Matt Earman, Shawn Krawetzki, Jane Fox, and Flora Rogers.

Ms. Husak explained four microphones can be on at one time for those to speak and this meeting is being recorded.

**1. BSD P – Riverside Crossing Park, Phase I – East Plaza  
17-124SP**

**Riverside Drive  
Informal - Site Plan**

Ms. Husak said the Joint Session is an informal meeting for a proposal for site improvements that include a pavilion, a seating water feature, and paths and landscaping for the first phase of the Riverside Crossing Park, East Plaza located west of Riverside Drive, north of the roundabout with SR 161. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback prior to City Council review of a Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak recalled that a similar Work Session covered the Basic Plan for this site, which City Council ultimately approved in December 2016. At that time, she said Council also appointed themselves to be the required Reviewing Body for all the applications moving forward based on the fact that the park is a large public investment and touching on many different jurisdictional boundaries. She indicated Council values input via questions and discussions between the Board and the Commission. She stated staff will provide Council with that information as this application moves forward for final approval.

Ms. Husak said since the West Plaza is in the jurisdiction of the Architectural Review Board, input was provided on that part of the park, which Council approved in August 2017.

Ms. Husak said she was filling in for Jennifer Rauch, who is the Planner on this case, as she had a schedule conflict.

An aerial view of the site was shown. Ms. Husak said the park is within portions of the vacated Riverside Drive right-of-way when the road was moved east, to open up this park land. She said the City will also eventually bring forward a rezoning application to make sure all the pieces are zoned, including the right-of-way. She presented the proposed site plan and explained this was approved by City Council as part of the Basic Plan that included the first phase of the park development.

Ms. Husak pointed out the details of Phase 1 - East:

- Upper Terrace that will contain the pavilion
- Lower Terrace that will contain a water feature and seating terrace
- The Green
- Pedestrian Underpass
- Overlook
- Pathways and Trails

Also included on this slide:

- The (future) Pedestrian Bridge
- West Plaza Landing
- Pathways and Trails on the West side of the River

Ms. Husak stated more phases will be coming forward in the future and would follow this same process for review and approval. She said discussion questions have been provided, which she will cover after the presentation to help facilitate the meeting for input to City Council.

Matt Earman said this project goes back to 2013 when City Council approved the River Corridor Plan and subsequent to that, the Master Plan for the entire park was created and approved by Council. He said we are here tonight with the Site Plan for the east side of the river. He suggested the east side will offer a variety of different opportunities, some of which are natural but more opportunities will be the result from a man-made type of park design, taking advantage of some of the topography but most of the natural opportunities will come from the west side of the river. He reported staff has been trying to take advantage of some of the natural features as much as they possibly can to capitalize on what is already there, such as the cliff edge of the river and the river itself with the addition of Riverside Drive providing a buffer. The east side of the park, he said, offers the most dynamic and diverse types of activities that can actually be programmed into that park.

Taking into consideration the City as a whole, Mr. Earman said, we probably process about 150 different requests for the use of our properties for different reasons and those are events, activities, tournaments, and things that this Board and Commission are fairly familiar with. He indicated, with the design of this park, staff is anticipating that number to at least double, just for this park alone. He asked the Board and Commission to imagine the enormous variety that this park can offer to the public from a 30,000-foot level. The design in itself, he said, will be more of a blank slate, which exists every single day so that they can change what is going on in that park - not just every season, not just every month, but every day, and every time of day. He said something can be programmed for the morning that will not be there in the afternoon; and something could be programmed in the afternoon that will not be there in the evening. He indicated staff anticipates this to be a very flexible space that will be used for a variety of different opportunities, whether those are food truck rallies, art galleries, snowmen building contests, or use your own creative imagination as this park can accommodate almost anything.

Mr. Earman recalled one of the amenities that staff considered early on was the ability to provide an ice skating rink. When the City got down to the design, the cost, and the labor it takes to operate such a facility, he said, they determined once something is built like that, it is not just something that goes away. Instead, the City has an opportunity to design a space for an ice rink in a way that will accommodate a private sector vendor to come in and build - to be used for three or four months and then it is gone. That way, he said, we do not have to be committed to an ice skating rink until the end of time.

Mr. Earman reported a lot of public input has been gathered along the way from public workshops and public and private meetings to find out what the community wants from this park. He said the City cannot put in certain amenities requested but staff built upon the ideas that were more advantageous to the park. He restated this park will be changing on a daily basis and asked the Board and Commission to keep that in mind for this whole unique side of the park.

Mr. Earman said the east side of this park is not going to have a concession stand built on site. If we want a concession stand, he said, there are whole concessions that staff can get on site that can change all day long. Putting a permanent concession stand on site, he explained, limits us for the use of that

square footage and that geography. He said staff recommends we do not build a concession stand and go with flexibility and programming as the public also wants something that may accommodate every age group and that can be achieved through programming.

Mr. Earman indicated the design of the amenities is something of a stagnate nature and those amenities stay still in time, whereas, if we think of the programming opportunity with the design, it allows us to move amenities forward as this whole Bridge Park area evolves. He noted the amount of energy and time commitment that MKSK and their enormous team put into this project has been stellar and staff has really enjoyed working with them through this project.

Chris Kimbrel, Sr., Associate with MKSK, 462 S. Ludlow Alley, Columbus, Ohio, said he has been the project manager for this project, working with Darren Meyer since late 2012 and also worked on a lot of other facets in the BSD, which is pretty much all the public work that has occurred.

Mr. Kimbrel presented the Master Plan that was approved by City Council in May of 2016 that reflected an older iteration of the park, an older Plaza configuration, potential for an expanded park on the west side, and part of the park that is in a future scope. He explained it also shows the (future) John Shields Parkway extension and a potential Plaza that can occur there. In late 2016, he said, they came with a Basic Site Plan for input. He pointed out the areas that they are focused on tonight, which is what Ms. Husak presented. He zoomed in and said the intent is to carry the quality of natural material and the integrity of those natural materials into this park as seen used throughout the BSD already to create both a quality space and a space with a lot of longevity that will also reduce maintenance.

Mr. Kimbrel noted the upper terrace where they are proposing the same brick that is seen on the sidewalks inside the BSD today; it is an Endicott Brick – a blend of dark brick and dark red brick. In the lower terrace and Plaza, he said, they are proposing a cut granite with varying thermal finishes to provide texture. In the areas of the stairs, he said, they are proposing granite stair treads. He explained the reason for the large retaining walls are due to the abutment and grade changes from Riverside Drive to the edge of the riverbank and the elevation where the (future) Pedestrian Bridge comes in creates significant grade changes so there will be a fairly substantial walls on that side but the more traditional, Dublin-type limestone veneer is proposed. He said they proposed cast-stone lawn terraces as an additional unique way to traverse the terrain in the park and provide a new, additional, interesting way to get down into the Great Lawn space and also provide a place to rest with views of the (future) Pedestrian Bridge.

Mr. Kimbrel pointed out where a more robust water feature would be placed; the feature will be an improvement over what was shown in 2016 and attract more age groups that will serve as an amenity to the Plaza. He pointed out the pavilion foot print and recalled some of the feedback received from this group in 2016; the Pavilion was positioned too far to the north and interfering with views to the bridge from Bridge Park Avenue - more than what was desirable. As a result, they expanded the footprint of this Plaza to the south to allow a shift of the pavilion south. In the northern portion of this phase, they are proposing an existing stormwater outfall. He said there is a natural spring there that has a pipe that had been inserted at some point. Additionally, he said, there is a ravine that creates an opportunity for an Overlook providing quality views across the river to the western park and to Bridge Park West.

Mr. Kimbrel pointed out the one opportunity to provide access down to the river as the bank is extremely steep on this side. He recalled at one point they proposed a fairly massive staircase down but they have revised this to be more of a natural, metro park style access. He said one might be able to pull a kayak down there but it is probably more feasible on the west side.

The pedestrian tunnel, Mr. Kimbrel said, is anticipated to be extended about 40 feet when the John Shields Parkway Bridge comes online with an opportunity to create another plaza space. In the interim, he explained the City is just providing a temporary connection to that tunnel so people moving west along John Shields Parkway or coming up/down Riverside Drive will be able to get onto the trail system from the tunnel. There will be a path to bring pedestrians up to street level, which he noted on the graphic.

Mr. Kimbrel noted they proposed a continuous wall along Riverside Drive in the Master Plan, which would allow them to depress the grade in the park somewhat and lesson the slope so the green space is at an acceptable slope to be usable. He said they maintained that proposal but some of the staff is concerned that people would have difficulty getting up and down from the park for food trucks that might be staged during an event along Riverside Drive. As a result, he explained that in this iteration, they have proposed terraced amphitheater-style seating intermittently along the wall, flanked by stairs on either side at a typical height to facilitate that access back and forth between Riverside Drive and the park. He referred to a rendering that was included in the packet.

Dan Hanes, The Columbus Architectural Studio, 405 N Front St, Columbus, OH 43215, said he would like to state the overall architectural character they were trying to create with this is playing off the second node to the primary node of the (future) Pedestrian Bridge. He said they tried to make sure the roofs are low but still maintain enough space underneath and ensure the primary focus is the bridge tower and the bridge itself. He said they tried to define small comfort areas inside of this piece, putting in some additional glass. He said the materials for the pavilion are comprised of a wood siding and glass.

Bob Miller inquired about the roofing material on the pavilion. Mr. Hanes answered it is a ballast roof but the trim is metal to ensure the views from above will be nice, too. He showed an exterior fireplace, interior comfort facilities and family toilet. He said there is a programmable exterior patio space. There are two architectural components, the pavilion up top, the exterior fireplace, the restroom facilities, and a preparation area for events. He said they have some mechanical storage space, space for maintenance equipment, space for fountains, and storage of vehicles useable to employees of Parks and Recreation Department, all under cover. He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Kimbrel, restated that the feedback on the water feature was that it should be a little more robust. He presented a bird's-eye view, looking towards the river, and noted the (future) Pedestrian Bridge, the shelter, the lower terrace, and on the side of the planter, it is being encircled with water. He said it is not dissimilar from what was shared for the Basic Site Plan. He described it as a low wall with water shooting over the top of it, about seawall height and falling into a grill below. To achieve robustness, he said they introduced a larger water wall, which will be a feature when viewed coming towards the Pavilion on the (future) Pedestrian Bridge. He presented the larger water wall view from the lawn terraces, looking toward the Pavilion in the lower terrace as well as venturing down to the Great Lawn.

Mr. Kimbrel reported they have been working with staff on designing this in such a manner that it does not unduly encourage access to the top of the water. He shared another option they are continuing to develop – introducing a secondary planter, which would separate that but something in this vane could address some of the concerns heard from staff. He presented a view from the opposite side where the wall is slightly higher than the seating height, which will just provide visual interest and white noise within the plaza. He presented a view approaching Bridge Park East as a pedestrian, just stepping off of the (future) Pedestrian Bridge. He said the fireplace will be on one side and the water wall on the other to create a threshold into Bridge Park East from the (future) Pedestrian Bridge.

Mr. Kimbrel said the lawn terraces are visible in some of the renderings but he wanted to give a notion of what they are thinking with those. He said if anyone has been to the public square in Cleveland, Ohio, since it has been renovated, and seen the cast stone planters and seating that occurs throughout there, it has an organic flowy kind of feel to it; that is where they want to go with the terraces here and what they want to convey. He said there are many different options and configurations that would provide seating opportunities for lounge seating. He focused on the seating for the retaining wall on Riverside Drive. He noted the four locations that will keep the slope of the park usable. He pointed out the area to be used for the underground storage space and mechanicals for the fountains, under the Plaza. He said the nine-foot clearance under the bridge will allow cyclists to easily pass through there as well as small maintenance vehicles. He explained there are accessible routes down from the Plaza and all of the paths are under 5% so they do not require railings, but they will provide them along the primary path and locations that are close to steep drop offs. He pointed out an area to pull up a kayak or canoe and a series of stairs that will allow folks to get up to park level from the river.

In terms of the planting plan, Mr. Kimbrel said, the concept behind this park has always been to let the river do the 'heavy lifting' and use the natural beauty that exists. He indicated they intend to clear selective views, which he pointed out to the Board and Commission. In the planter areas, he said, they are proposing a mix of ground cover and shrubs. He said the remainder of the park will be turf and they are not investing a lot of money in terms of planting for the Great Lawn.

Mr. Kimbrel said for lighting on the paths, they are proposing to use the same fixtures as used along John Shields Parkway and for the perimeter of the lower Plaza, proposing more modern lights that play well with the forms in the Plaza itself. Within the walls, he said there will be accent lighting as well as up lighting for the trees in the Plaza.

Mr. Kimbrel suggested the upper Plaza is an opportunity for pop-up shops, food, projected art, events, meetings, and a change in seasonal décor. He said the lower Plaza could lend itself to yoga & fitness classes, lounge chairs, a water feature, roaming art exhibits, and a temporary ice rink – should that be desirable in the future. He noted, along Riverside Drive they envision staging food trucks, festivals, ice sculptures and different winter interest opportunities. The Great Lawn, he said, could be used for movies in the park, fitness classes, kite flying, concerts, and snow sculptures; at the core of the park, along the river – opportunities for kayaking, fishing, bird watching, and biking. This concluded his presentation.

Ms. Husak said staff wanted to guide the discussion by presenting the Discussion Questions:

- 1) Does the design and layout of the Plaza provide safe and efficient circulation?
- 2) Does the Pavilion design complement and integrate with the surrounding building and context?
- 3) Does the proposed design and layout provide appropriate seating, amenities and design elements? What other elements should be provided?
- 4) Are there other considerations by the Commission or the Board?

Victoria Newell asked what height the lights were Mr. Kimbrel answered it is a 16-foot pole and the luminaire sits at the top so it is about 18 feet total in height. He said that is important because what they understand from facilities is that they need that height in order to accommodate the Wi-Fi access throughout the park.

Ms. Newell asked about the curved light. Mr. Kimbrel answered that comes in different heights and it would not need to be as high as the others. Typically, he said, they are a 12 – 16-foot pole for a pedestrian height and that will probably be closer to the 14 to 16-foot range.

Ms. Newell asked about lighting for the water feature and possible up lighting around the trees. She asked if night time lighting is associated with the water features. Mr. Kimbrel said they would want to up light the water feature so as the water cascades down the wall, the intent is to have a fractured surface so there is a lot of movement and light for dramatics.

Ms. Newell said it is nice that there was some care put into the roof of the pavilion but she hoped it would have a vegetated roof just like what was done on The Exchange. She indicated that turned out really nice on that structure. She said when one is coming down the hill they would see this park element. She said it would not change the design of the Pavilion substantially other than maybe the height. She said everyone is going to see those structures and this is a great opportunity for sustainable design. Overall, she stated she really likes the park design and elements. She said she is not a huge lighting person so will have to just deal with this tall lighting.

Mr. Earman said they struggle with the lighting proposed because typically, the parks are closed at dusk unless they are programmed otherwise and this is one of those parks that is going to be open probably 18 hours a day, if not more.

Shannon Stenberg asked what the final lighting decision was for the (future) Pedestrian Bridge. Mr. Earman answered the bridge will be lit but more ambient lighting will be used and the tower will have up lighting to show it off.

Warren Fishman said the applicant mentioned wood. Mr. Kimbrel presented the pavilion. Mr. Hanes said there is a combination of wood, glass, and stone. Mr. Fishman said wood gets abused in a shelter if it is exposed to the outside as far as graffiti and weathering. He asked if more stone could be used. Mr. Hanes said graffiti is much easier to replace when the material is wood but he does not expect that to be an issue. Mr. Fishman said stone can be washed off and added stone would show much less wear and tear. Mr. Hanes said the feedback received was that everyone preferred the warmth of wood.

David Rinaldi said he likes the warmth of the wood and the contrast as there is already a lot of stone used in the park, as a whole. He said he likes the idea of a vegetative roof, if that is something that could be worked in but noted it will require additional maintenance. He asked if there was any consideration to enclosing this structure for special events. Mr. Earman said they went back and forth on that as well. He said he could not recall the criteria that led them to keeping it open other than potential vandalism and from a programming standpoint; they do not anticipate renting this facility out as it will be used for permitted use for an event only. He said this is a public space that will have a lot of fluent pedestrian traffic through it that will be coming in from three different directions.

Mr. Rinaldi thanked the applicant for putting in the river access on this side.

Steve Stidhem said the applicant has done an awesome job listening to public feedback and making revisions as a result. He said he likes the idea of the steps going up instead having people try to climb a wall. He said he has seen steps used a lot on the west coast and believes it will work out very well to get people back up to street level. He said he is a fan of lighting and likes the idea of a vegetative roof for the Pavilion. He said he likes the option of the water feature with a planter as it creates a little bit of separation that will be worthwhile. He said he likes the wood and is a fan of wood as it brings warmth and it can be one of those materials that if it does not work after four or five years, then Mr. Earman will do something about it. He said he is surprised to hear there will not be a rentable space in the park. He suggested there is going to be a lot of demand for hosting events from businesses across the street. He encouraged the applicant to consider the needs of the tenants across the street. He said he works close by and cannot wait for this to be open, as he thinks it will be awesome.

Bob Miller inquired about bike parking coming off of the (future) Pedestrian Bridge. He thought there were to be bike racks across from the Pavilion; he asked how many bikes it would accommodate. Mr. Kimbrel answered 25 – 30 bicycles. Mr. Miller said he is anticipating bike traffic on and off of that bridge. He asked how that amount of traffic is going to move through that plaza area and up towards Riverside Drive. He wanted to know how that congestion could actually function. Mr. Kimbrel said from a safety perspective, people should probably dismount and walk their bikes through there because there is not a designated cycle track like what is on John Shields Parkway. Mr. Miller said, as he looks at that design, the reality is someone his age is probably going to walk their bike but most people are going to come ripping through there up towards Riverside Drive or down towards the bridge and then it is a question of safety. Mr. Kimbrel said that is one reason that this center core was left wide open, which is a pretty generous space in anticipation of that kind of congestion. He anticipates the bottleneck would occur at the bridge, itself.

Mr. Miller asked if there a bollards between that plaza and Riverside Drive or if the grade is high enough to prevent a vehicle from driving into the plaza. Mr. Kimbrel said it is a little hard to see, but there are bollards there and they have also contemplated if it makes sense to pull them out and carry them off across to protect the building.

Mr. Miller asked how we are going to get people safely across Riverside Drive. He asked if traffic that is not that far from the roundabout that is moving 45 – 50 mph would be stopped in some way. Mr. Papsidero said Public Works is in the process of getting the 40 mph limit lowered. He said the expectation with all the on-street parking, as well as traffic signals, that traffic will naturally slow down. With all the visual clutter, it will start to change the behavior of the drivers we are seeing today. Mr. Miller said that makes sense but asked if there is going to be a signifying crosswalk there. Mr. Papsidero answered there is today. Mr. Miller asked if it would have the blinking lights. Ms. Husak clarified there is a red light there. Ms. Newell said there is a light there but she does not think people are using the light and she has witnessed people running across Riverside Drive.

Mr. Miller concluded he loves the design of the park. In terms of the materials, he said he likes the wood but to Mr. Fishman's point, the maintenance that may be needed is a concern. He asked if pavers are going to be a lot of work 5 – 7 years from now as opposed to stamped concrete. He said the granite looks great but he is not a fan of the granite curbs because they ate one of his wheels. Mr. Earman said if anything is not constructed properly, it is going to be a maintenance nightmare. If constructed correctly, which we plan to ensure, then maintenance will not be any more than usual. He said they will have to power wash and do the superficial routine maintenance that they would not have to normally do with a different material. He said he envisions with the traffic and the amount of use this area is going to get, the pavers and granite will need to be cleaned on a daily basis. He indicated routine wise it is going to be a maintenance challenge and that is why they put a permanent Maintenance Facility under the Plaza so they can hide all the equipment and staff from the public.

Mr. Stidhem asked the same question of why stamped concrete is not used instead of pavers. Mr. Kimbrel said that is a discussion that goes back to the very beginning of the BSD as they considered the quality and integrity of materials. He said the choice for brick is not just for aesthetics or because it is the applicant's preference, it is because it is a material that has a lot of longevity; its life cycle easily exceeds stamped concrete. He said stamped concrete is extremely hard to maintain beyond 10 years. As the color fades and it cracks, it cannot just be patched because it would never match and when it completely fails, the entire Plaza would have to be torn out. He said brick is a reusable material. He said one of the examples he shared with staff when making decisions on selections of material was the Arena District in downtown Columbus, which has been in place for approximately 20 years. He said they even went to them and asked about the maintenance of that material.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if anyone considered selling the bricks and have names put on as revenue for the City. Mr. Earman answered affirmatively.

Gary Alexander said he really liked the planning of the park, particularly the north and south stratification and it shows up most obviously in the grading as the grading changes so dramatically to the south and how the functions change moving north. He said there are a lot of positives he likes about the park. He asked why the Pavilion does not reflect that difference in size a little more. He said he understands the inflective roof towards the north, but there is such a difference between north and south on the site. He said he likes conceptually, the design of the Pavilion as it is a box with a cantilever roof and masonry walls, clearly wanting the roof to read. Even under that roof, he asked why the functional things do not shift more to the south so the two walkways are identical, even though the amount of people using the one on the north is far greater. He said he is not sure a vegetative slab can be added to a cantilever roof. Ms. Newell said from a structural standpoint that should be achievable.

Mr. Alexander asked if some of the seating can be brought down along the north edge. He said maybe the building and the glass changes from north to south because clearly environmental conditions are different. He said he liked the design but it just seems like there is this is a very symmetrical building, beginning to acknowledge the difference between north/south, and wishes the applicant could do it a little bit more.

Mr. Hanes said that makes sense. Additionally, he said, they are considering a variation of pattern on the Pavilion glass. Mr. Alexander clarified he was requesting a difference in inflection between the two sides, not necessarily breaking the form. He added the functional ability to bring some of the seating a little bit further down and closer to the street might help to draw people in when they can see activities are occurring. Ms. Newell said she was glad to hear that the applicant is researching patterns to be added on the glass because birds are not going to like that glass. Mr. Earman then added he will not like kid's fingerprints on the glass.

Mr. Rinaldi said the ARB had discussions for the west side for subtly ensuring the park does not become a skate park as there will be all these low walls, whether there is recesses cast in or whatever, we obviously do not want to come back and see the stainless steel plates every four feet or whatever as a retro fit. He encouraged the applicants to design something into the plan to diminish the likelihood of skateboarders. Mr. Kimbrel indicated this has been a challenge on every single project because skateboarders can skate just about anywhere. Mr. Rinaldi said he understands it may not be easily solved. Mr. Kimbrel said it is not reading great in here but they are proposing granite cobble along these walls in the Plaza because it would make the dismount for the skateboarder difficult, which is just as effective as making the mounting difficult for them. He said recessed notches can be used but that only stops one sort of skateboarder.

Mr. Rinaldi noted what is already happening down at the Columbus Commons during events and wants to ensure this park does not become a dog park but admits he does not have the solution. He said residents can already be seen over there walking their dogs and leaving their deposits. He indicated that is not a design issue, but more of a City maintenance issue.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the applicant plans to do anything with that wall that goes under the overpass of SR161. He said that concrete wall is hideous and even if there was a cast-in pattern on that wall, it would make it a lot better than it is now. He said it is unfortunate that we have this beautiful park and the transition and then you have a connector going further south. Mr. Kimbrel reported they proposed veneering that wall but due to the nature of the ODOT regulations, in that particular scenario, it makes that very difficult to do because it is directly adjacent to the shoulder and any kind of projection is a

snag. Ultimately, he said, the City decided the frequent repairs that would likely occur because of it being impacted so much, made it not viable from their perspective. He said he does not disagree with that decision and thinks it would get hit constantly. He said there have been discussions about the brightness of it. He said that is the curing compound that will fade over the next year or so. He reiterated it is not an easy fix because of all the requirements for that wall to protect cyclists and to deflect and redirect cars. Mr. Rinaldi asked about a timber guardrail bolted to the concrete in addition to doing more to the concrete itself. Mr. Kimbrel said that might be a possibility. He said it has been quite a few years since those discussions occurred so he would have to go back and talk to the Engineers.

Mr. Fishman said that wall was one of his complaints. He said as soon as that wall went up he inquired about it and was told "it is what it is". He said that used to be one of his favorite places; he drives that way every day to his office. He asked why that wall was built so close to the road. Mr. Kimbrel answered because the slope is immediately on the other side of the bike path. Mr. Fishman said he liked Mr. Rinaldi's wood idea as it would soften the wall, too.

Ms. Stenberg inquired about programming and directional signage. Mr. Kimbrel answered they have not activated their wayfinding consultant at this time because they wanted to get through this phase to understand the geometry of the park before they started to add signs. He indicated they have plans to work with the City's consultants in designing the signage throughout the BSD. Mr. Earman said this is something that they have been discussing. He said the signs in the current parks need to be standardized but that is a challenge in itself because what works at Avery Park may not work here. He indicated the challenge would be exactly the same with even the park entrance signs. He asked if that is something we want to reconsider here, too. He said we need to decide if we want the sign for the park to better match its surroundings.

Ms. Newell asked if dogs will be permitted to walk through the park to which Mr. Earman answered affirmatively. He said he does not know of anything that would permit the City to prohibit that as there are ordinances requiring leashes and to pick up after your pet. Ms. Newell suggested doggie bag stations. She said Arizona is a highly dog-friendly community, and it took her awhile to get used to the dogs in the grocery store. She reported it is really nice that they have dog stations in all their parks along the walkways, fairly frequently, so it encourages dog owners to pick up the deposits. She said people are fined really heavily if they are caught not picking up after their dogs.

Ms. Newell said she listened to the presentation and heard all the programming with different activities, and the desire to have that pavilion portion completely open on the one side. The weather in the summer months is very nice she said but if we consider doing some winterfest-type activities and things like that, it might be nice if there was some thought put on how some temporary canvas could be anchored across portions of that opening to keep out the weather. She suggested the same things they have done on some of the outside park places; a really nice material or a clear material could be used that was trimmed nicely that the City owned that could be put up for a special event, just to break some wind to make that space usable associated with it.

Mr. Fishman inquired again about the bike parking device. He asked how long the (future) Pedestrian Bridge will be. Mr. Kimbrel answered 650 feet with 500 feet of it, fully suspended. Mr. Fishman said he is a biker and he cannot fathom people getting off their bike and walking it 650 feet. He said he thinks most people are going to ride across it and he wonders about safety. He asked why the bike racks have to be clustered all in one place because this is a big park. Mr. Kimbrel said they will definitely want to locate more bike racks in other locations but did not think that far ahead at this stage. Mr. Fishman suggested if there is not a bike rack available, people might just chain their bike to a tree. He concluded he is excited about this project and echoes what everybody else said; he said this is fabulous and the applicant did an

unbelievable job. Mr. Earman said when Mr. Fishman asked about bikers dismounting their bikes to walk them, he said he thinks the environment will dictate that. He said if there are just a few people to contend with you could bike across but if there are wall to wall people across that bridge, you are not going to be able to navigate that bridge on you bike without either running people over or putting your foot down so it may be different depending on the time of day or what is going on in the area. Mr. Kimbrel presented a rendering showing an average day; there are just a few bikers in there, he said, it is pretty robust. To repeat what Mr. Earman said, he concluded it is going to depend on what is happening down there.

Mr. Fishman said he has ridden his bike in Washington DC and New York Central Park and people just weave on their bikes right around the pedestrians. He explained that on a Sunday in Central Park it can be jammed and bikers do not get off their bike. Mr. Kimbrel said it is like the Oval at The Ohio State University. First they put up signs stating people should dismount their bikes and then later, they started enforcing it. Mr. Fishman said signs might be something to consider.

Mr. Stidhem suggested the bike rack designs be more creative. Mr. Earman said staff can look at all kinds of options. He indicated he received feedback about how all the bike racks in the BSD are all the same and diversity might help to make it fun. Ms. Newell said the City needs the whimsical signage that we cannot get. Ms. Stenberg asked if underground bike storage was considered like they do in Japan and Europe. Mr. Earman answered an underground storage would certainly not be in the budget. He noted the bike racks in the parking garages. Ms. Newell indicated there are bike vaults that sit above ground, which she would not necessarily recommend for the park area but if there are a lot of bikers riding to and from work, it may be better not to have them scattered all along the roadway all day. Mr. Papsidero confirmed there are bike facilities in the parking garages.

Mr. Earman said, the way this park is designed, as we learn how it is being used and see the challenges we face - whether it is bicycles, dogs, or whatever the case might be, we will adapt to it. He said he likes the 'campus theory' - wait for the students to come and create the paths before we pave them.

## **Communications**

In terms of moving forward, Ms. Husak said this will require final review and approval by City Council and they will receive all of this input by way of the minutes.

Ms. Husak said staff would like to have the PZC meet at 6:00 pm on their next regularly scheduled meeting on January 18, 2018, to provide any necessary training on the monitors that the members will be allowed to access. She said the ARB's next meeting is scheduled for January 24, 2018, so ideally we would do the same thing by having the Board Members arrive early for any technology training needed.

Ms. Husak said the Commission will only have one case to review on January 18<sup>th</sup>, which is the previously postponed request for a Stealth Wireless Communications Facility on the St. John's Lutheran Church property. She alerted the Commissioners to an email they will receive regarding the legal aspects of the case, prior to the meeting.

Ms. Husak adjourned the meeting at 8:06 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on February 15, 2017.