



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 7, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D** **PID: 273-012703**
18-007SPR/DP/CU **Site Plan Review (Approved 7 – 0)**
Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)
Conditional Use (Approve 7– 0)
- 2. PUD, Midwestern Auto Group – Jaguar & Land Rover Signs** **5775 Venture Drive**
18-031AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)**
- 3. BSD SRN - Bridge Park East, Section 6 (Block D)** **PID: 273-012703**
18-038FP **Final Plat (Recommended for Approval 7 – 0)**
- 4. Dublin Corporate Area Plan** **Administrative Request**
17-093ADM **Community Plan Amendment (Recommended for Approval 7 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Jane Fox, Council Representative; Steve Stidhem, Bob Miller, Warren Fishman, Kristina Kennedy, and William Wilson. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Phillip Hartmann, Lori Burchett, Devayani Puranik, Aaron Stanford Tammy Noble, Logan Stang, Sierra Saumenig 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: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from April 19, 2018, meeting minutes and April 19, 2018, Joint Work Session minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)



The Chair explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the following cases may be approved by consent if staff, the applicant, and the Commission agree on all of the conditions: Midwestern Auto Group – Jaguar and Land Rover Signs; and Bridge Park East, Section 6 (Block D). She pulled the Bridge Park East case from the Consent Agenda as Commissioners wanted to hear that case in its entirety. She determined the Consent case would be heard first, followed by the remaining cases in the order they were published on the agenda.

1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D PID: 273-012703
18-007SPR/DP/CU Site Plan Review/Development Plan/Conditional Use

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for development of four mixed-use buildings in Block D of the Bridge Park Development, including approximately 120,000 square feet of office space, 45,000 square feet of retail space, 35,000 square feet of restaurant space, 186 residential units and 671 garage parking spaces on 5.3 acres zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. She stated this is a request for a review and approval of Waivers, Development and Site Plans with a Parking Plan and a Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space under provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.026. She said the Commission has final authority on this application so witnesses will have to be sworn in. She said in total, there will be five motions/votes for this case.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site as well as the overall Bridge Park Site Plan that has been reviewed over the course of development, which included blocks A, B, C, D, F, G, and H.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed development plan, with Block D highlighted within the entire development. She presented each of the four buildings proposed as part of this site plan. She said building D1 is proposed as a six-story corridor building with commercial on the ground floor, office on the second floor, and 43 residential units on floors three through six. She said the building fronts Riverside Drive with primary access to the building from Longshore Street. She presented a rendering of the west elevation of building D1 from Riverside Drive to show the architectural character. She said the materials include brick with a limestone base with metal and fiber cement panel details; the window mullion pattern is similar to building B2 in the Bridge Park Development.

Ms. Burchett said building D2 is proposed as a six-story corridor building with commercial on the first floor and office on floors two through six. She noted the northwest corner of the building is at the pedestrian tunnel and terminus of the John Shields Parkway Greenway. She presented a rendering of the west elevation of building D2 on Riverside Drive with building D1 to the south and building D3 to the east to show the architectural character and in context with the adjacent buildings.

Ms. Burchett stated building D3 is proposed as a five-story corridor building with commercial on the first floor and residential units on floors two through six. She said the north façade fronts the John Shields Parkway Greenway. She noted there is an elevated plaza associated with this building on the south façade on Larimer Street. She presented a rendering of the west elevation of building D3 at the intersection of Larimer and Longshore Streets to understand the architectural character that is being proposed. She pointed out the pedestrian bridge that crosses Larimer Street to connect building D3 with building D4/D5.

Ms. Burchett highlighted building D4/D5 within the proposed site plan and explained it is a six-story, lined parking garage with commercial on the first floor with residential units on floors one through five with parking on floors two through six. She stated approval of a Conditional Use is requested as part of this application to allow for the two garage elevations that are unlined on Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive. She presented a rendering of the west elevation of the building at the intersection of Longshore and Larimer Streets to again show the architectural character. She described it as a contemporary design with contrasting brick colors and aluminum tiles that is a new material proposed within this development.

Ms. Burchett stated the applicant is requesting 33 Waivers that encompass all four buildings in the entire block. She briefly reviewed each of the Waivers with images to help illustrate the requests. As part of the Administrative Review Team (ART) review on May 31, 2018, she reported the ART recommended approval of all 33 Waivers and also approved nine Administrative Departures that were all within 10% of the requirements, which is permitted. She said they included the following: tower width, front property line coverage, front required building zone, façade requirements, vertical increments, primary facade materials, ground story height, and upper story transparency.

The 33 Site Plan Waivers requested are as follows:

1. Parapet Wrapping: To allow parapet not to be wrapped on all sides to achieve that contemporary, clean line look for Building D4/D5.
2. Horizontal Shadow Lines: To allow no expression lines to distinguish parapet from upper story, again for that continuous clean appearance.
3. Tower Quantity: To allow three towers on Building D4/D5 to provide interior access stairways and elevators.
4. Tower Height: To allow all towers to be more than 18 feet in height.
5. Tower Location: To allow all towers to be located on a terminal vista, principal frontage street, or adjacent to open space.
6. Permitted Primary Façade Materials: To allow for a secondary material to be used for an entire façade.
7. Vertical Transitions: To allow fiber cement and aluminum tile transitions.
8. Multiple Vertical Materials: To allow a lighter material above a heavier material. On building D4/D5, wood siding is proposed below the brick.
9. Transitions of Same Material: To allow brick color transitions on the same plane.
10. Entrance Design: To allow for the principal entrance of building D3 not to be prominently articulated.
11. Window Type: To allow for composite frame windows.
12. Windows: To allow for no trim or casing in fiber cement walls.
13. Windows: To allow for no projecting sills in fiber cement walls.
14. Ground Story, Street-Facing Transparency: To allow for reduced transparency on multiple building elevations throughout this block, but no less than 21% on any elevation.
15. Upper Story Transparency: To allow for reduced transparency on the upper story of the residential building.
16. Vertical Increments: To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet on multiple building elevations.
17. Principal Entrance Location: To allow principal entrances not to be located on a principal street façade on buildings D2, D3, D4, D5.
18. To allow a reduced number of entrances on buildings D3, D5 to provide consolidated entry.
19. To allow no Horizontal Façade Divisions on multiple elevations for buildings D2, D3, D4
20. To allow less than 80% of primary materials on buildings D2, D3, and D4
21. To allow canopy right-of-way encroachment for building D5
22. To allow for blank walls for street facades for buildings D3, D4, D5
23. To allow for blank walls for non-street facades for buildings D3, D4, D5

Ms. Burchett explained the rest of the Waivers all refer to ones that are specific to the site plan and also to the parking garage.

24. To allow front property line coverage to be 44% for buildings D1 and D2
25. Front Required Building Zone: To allow three feet for building D5
26. To allow landscaping for the required build zone treatment
27. Corner Side Required Building Zone: To allow 0.07 feet for building D5
28. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage: To allow no more than 98% for building D4/D5 and 96% for buildings D1 and D2, and 93% for building D3
29. To allow no loading spaces directly adjacent to building D1 because this building is primarily a residential use.
30. To allow for parking entry on a front façade for building D5
31. To allow access for parking from a street and not an alley
32. To allow the width of the south entrance of building D5 to be 56 feet on the curb cut area
33. To allow two entrance and exit lanes on Tuller Ridge Drive consolidating the access points to that street

Ms. Burchett said the project requires a minimum of 0.94-acres of Open Space to be dedicated. She said the applicant is proposing 0.38 acres on site and is requesting approval for a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space for the remaining 0.56 acres that are provided by the John Shields Parkway Greenway and Riverside Crossing Park. She explained the request is being driven by the Code requirement for residential units as a flat 200 square feet per unit and with the mix of unit sizes, to apply the requirement would be disproportional as there is a range in size of the units from three-bedroom units down to micro-units.

Ms. Burchett reported Staff and the ART have reviewed this application against the Conditional Use Criteria and found the criteria had been met.

Ms. Burchett reported Staff and the ART have reviewed this application against the Development Plan Review Criteria and found the criteria had been met or met with conditions.

Ms. Burchett reported Staff and the ART have reviewed this application against the Site Plan Review Criteria and found the criteria had been met or met with conditions.

Ms. Burchett said the ART is recommending approval to the PZC for 33 Waivers.

Ms. Burchett said the ART is also recommending approval for the Conditional Use with no conditions.

Ms. Burchett said the ART is recommending approval for the Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to the PZC for the Development Plan Review with no conditions.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to the PZC for the Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan to allow for 735 parking spaces where 1,087 spaces would be required and eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant not use highly reflective glass, spandrel, or heavily tinted glass to meet the minimum transparency requirements;
- 2) That if gated entries are proposed, the applicant will work with staff to provide the required stacking spaces without encroaching the public right-of-way;

- 3) That the applicant work with staff to ensure that all off-street loading spaces shall be at least 12 feet wide and meet the minimum requirements;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to provide required building foundation landscaping along all sides of a building not otherwise occupied by entrances, sidewalk, parking, loading areas, or similar areas;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to ensure ground-mounted mechanical equipment is properly screened and is consistent with the design throughout the development;
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to include lighting within the pedestrianways;
- 7) That the applicant record an easement for the encroachment of the bridges to the satisfaction of the City Engineer; and
- 8) That the applicant revises the building plan to ensure all door-swing areas will not encroach into the public right-of-way to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(5)(b)(4).

Ms. Burchett concluded her presentation by offering to answer any questions and also stated the applicant's team is present as well to answer specific questions.

Kristina Kennedy asked if the intent for having more towers was to help people move more effectively through the space because she was not clear about the tower quantity. Ms. Burchett said the towers provide access to all of the levels and the roof area. Ms. Kennedy asked if the number of towers had any correlation to the content of the building. Ms. Burchett answered building D4/D5 is residential combined with a parking structure so she assumed they have different requirements for access but she would defer to the applicant to provide additional detail.

Bob Miller restated 1,087 parking spaces would be required and the proposal is for 671 spaces. He recalled there have been discussions about the abundance of parking within the development already. He asked how staff wrestles the difference of 416 parking spaces and if that was setting the City up for a problem. Ms. Burchett reported staff requested the applicant to complete an overall parking study that would show usage in peak hours, what would be the highest utilization rate for the development at one time, and how many parking spaces could be accessed for Block D. As a result, she said, the applicant was showing at their peak usage, there would be ±87 spaces still available if all of the uses were being occupied at one time, which is not necessarily anticipated. Staff concluded, based on this study, there would be ample parking. She indicated the applicant can also report on what they have observed so far in the development. Mr. Miller emphasized that was a big reduction in parking.

Mr. Miller inquired about the construction type used under and above the balconies on all the buildings. He asked if they were open joists underneath the balcony. Ms. Burchett answered she would defer to the architects.

Mr. Miller asked if the pedestrian bridges are the same as what was used on the other buildings and Ms. Burchett answered affirmatively.

Mr. Miller asked if there would be lighting in the pedestrian tunnel. Claudia Husak confirmed there will be lighting.

Mr. Miller asked about the color of the metal used on building D2. The Chair said the answer will come from the architect a little later.

Mr. Miller asked if there were any changes made to the public pocket park with the Bocce Ball Court between the Commission's Informal Review and their packet for tonight's meeting. Ms. Burchett answered she did not note any changes.

Steve Stidhem asked how much time was spent conversing with the applicant on this project. Ms. Burchett answered there were several conversations. She added staff has seen the project move forward through the ART reviews, several iterations where staff worked with the applicant to fine tune details early on, and after the PZC's Informal Reviews and feedback, etc. She concluded there has been a lot of back and forth with this project.

Mr. Stidhem asked for confirmation on the 0.38 acres of Open Space - if it was truly public open space because there was a private open space area in there as well. Ms. Burchett said the private was not counted towards the requirement.

Warren Fishman said he also had concerns about the parking. Ms. Burchett explained that part of this assessment is considering that not every person will be parking solely in Block D. She said when Staff first reviewed the parking, many spaces were designated for retail use, which is a lower requirement than a restaurant use. Staff asked the applicant to consider a higher parking count and do the study based on that, to account for the potential for more restaurant use. She concluded Staff was requesting the worst case scenario for their parking study.

Mr. Fishman indicated that he has been to a couple of events and he had to park at the top of the parking garage because the valets were also using those garages and they were restricting parking in certain places. He said his concern is also for future tenant changes and all the restaurants spaces are full. He emphasized the original design was to ensure there was plenty of parking for everybody and now it is being cut in half. He said he has seen the parking garages getting full already. He suggested that real life does not always equate to the numbers.

William Wilson inquired about the Waivers. He asked if these Waivers are all reflected in the renderings. Ms. Burchett answered the Waivers would allow the buildings to be constructed as shown in the materials. To achieve some of those finer details, she explained, the Waivers allow for variation from the code in order for the structure to be constructed as presented.

Victoria Newell asked for a more detailed explanation of the impervious area Waiver. Ms. Burchett explained the maximum impervious lot coverage would be no more than 98% for building D4/D5 and this is due to the block development, being able to achieve the parking garage circulation and then also to accommodate the liners. She said the applicant is maximizing the lot in order to accommodate a mix of uses for that particular building. She said 96% lot coverage is being requested for D1, and D2, and that would be for that entire single lot while the greenway would be separated out as a single lot. She added Building D3 would allow for no more than 93%, and accepting out that greenway as a separate lot. Greenspace is directly adjacent to D3. The building was formed and designed along the street network. Ms. Newell said that answered her question perfectly.

Ms. Newell said when it comes to mechanical units being screened, hindsight is 20/20. She said we are seeing more and more mechanical units on top of the buildings in Block D and there have been Waivers for parapet heights on the other structures which is concerning. She asked if that was something Staff looked at when plans were reviewed to see if the mechanicals were truly being screened. She said she can see the mechanicals more prevalently here than in other areas. Ms. Burchett said it is part of Staff's review and how it is being addressed to ensure the aesthetic is complimentary to the other buildings as more are constructed. She said a couple of areas have been raised to ensure that requirement is being met. Ms. Newell asked Ms. Burchett if she was comfortable that the units that are screened in this instance with the parapet Waivers. Ms. Burchett said Staff would be comfortable because of the location

of the units and where the mechanicals could be visible from other buildings. She said the applicant has demonstrated they have been responsive to that issue.

Ms. Fox had a question about Waiver #10 – Entrance Design. She asked Ms. Burchett to refer to building D3. She indicated she was confused because it is primarily for residential use rather than highlight the entrance, the applicant has designed a cohesive aesthetic. Ms. Burchett explained that part of the design is to make a similar entrance and not necessarily call it out like a commercial type entrance. She said the intent was for purposes of private residential use but the applicant can speak directly to the entrance design choice.

There were no more questions for Staff so the Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Brian Sell, Moody Nolan, 9093 Riverside Drive and Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, 2501 Bristol Road.

Mr. Sell said their presentation was the same that was shared with the Commission at the last meeting but they have since updated the renderings and added one drawing. He said he did not want to waste too much time going through each slide but would prefer to address what was stated at the last meeting, what they took to heart, and the changes they made after that meeting.

Mr. Sell presented the program site plan that highlighted the usages and street frontages. He used the next slide illustrates the undulations of the buildings and the scale of which that happens because some members thought the facades appeared too flat at the last meeting. He said the double doors can be seen or man doors swinging out, knowing those are six feet wide and stick out three feet so there are four-foot deep recesses, which is all glass; he also noted the texture. He focused on building D2 where they opened it up and created more public space while bringing the façade out to the street. He noted where they improved the patio on the southwest corner by wrapping it around to the public pocket park, which also changes the geometry and face of that building. He focused next on the Riverside Drive façade to show how they created larger openings at the corners of the building to allow for ease of pedestrian movement. He said there was a very subtle refinement to the top of this building to make it elegant. He presented the material samples they are proposing for the building. He described the materials as a brick with an orange-type color with some character to it, a black brick that is a metallic and has a sheen, and a medium dark gray metal panel and mullions. He said the top appears lighter in the rendering but that is just to show the reflectivity from the sun hitting it. He presented a rendering of the pocket park with the opened up corner.

Mr. Gonzalez said building D1 does not have any real changes and presented a rendering. He presented the proposed material samples that consist of fiber cement board, a limestone base, red brick, and black brick for the Longshore Street side that breaks the building into discreet bays.

Mr. Gonzalez said on building D3, they also had one slight change. He said they added a wood element to the underside of the balconies to soften the look and make it a special corner and this material is also used on the pedestrian entry canopies. He presented the proposed material samples that included the hardwood, which is in the Mahogany family. He said the other change they made was to the southwest corner where they pushed it back to make it more pedestrian-friendly, to flow better, and give the building more depth. Mr. Sell mentioned the wood element is used on the soffits on building D2 as well; they have splashed this product throughout to bring more warmth to the block.

Mr. Miller said he really liked the project but struggled with the D3 elevation facing John Shields Parkway. As he has stated in the past, much of this building seems flat and appears sterile. He indicated the northwest corner is fine but it is the other end of the building that will be prominent from John Shields

Parkway. Mr. Gonzalez said there is a bend to the building and again, this is where the metal tile is introduced as well. He explained the changes in the three bays.

Mr. Fishman said he had concerns with the wood material. He read the description – a reddish, brown color that turns silver if allowed to weather. He questioned how it would look in a few years as it is shown to be used for residential and will be weathered and he is not certain he wants the weathered look on an office building. Mr. Gonzalez said they do not intend to let the wood weather; they will seal it with a stain to retain the brownish color and it will have a lot of texture as well as variability of color. Mr. Fishman said the stain will not last forever. Mr. Gonzalez agreed the material would require maintenance. Mr. Fishman said he is concerned about using wood on an office building. Mr. Sell explained the product is a lot like teak in that if it is oiled, it has a waterproof element to it and because the material would be used in the soffit, they anticipate minimal exposure.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, said he thought the wood material would require maintenance, not unlike paint, for example. He said as those apartments turn over, they would make sure the balcony area looked the way it is supposed to as part of addressing anything else that would need maintenance at that time.

Mr. Wilson felt assured the wood used for the soffits will be sealed to help protect the wood and would be well taken care of. He said having the warmth there is a plus and maybe considered a luxury item. He indicated if the material was used on a wall, he would be concerned but since it will be used as the soffit, the wood will be protected. Mr. Gonzalez said the selection of the wood was deliberate; as a hard wood, it is durable.

Ms. Newell noted all the fiber cement used on the buildings will have to be painted at some time, too, as part of maintenance.

Phil Hartmann said a condition of approval could be added that stated the applicant is to keep the wood material sealed for protection. Mr. Fishman said he would feel better with that condition and does not anticipate the applicant would oppose it.

Mr. Wilson inquired about the railings used on the balconies. Mr. Gonzalez answered a powder-coated aluminum railing is proposed.

Mr. Miller asked the applicant to address his parking concerns that he had asked of staff, earlier. Mr. Sell suggested going through the presentation for that building D4/D5 so they can explain the changes they made and how the parking makes sense.

Mr. Gonzalez presented a rendering of building D4. He said they had originally considered metal tile and possibly taking that material all the way down to the ground. He said since a market will be on that ground floor, they wanted to have a warmer material so they chose the wood but they raised it above grade by using stone with a corduroy type texture up \pm two feet. He said the stone is used again at the entry of the market to mark it clearly He said they changed the awnings to be trellises at the openings. He said they changed the fiber cement to the brick element at the top and opened up the corner.

Mr. Wilson asked if the same wood product is being used on this building as was used for the soffits of the balconies. Mr. Gonzalez answered it was the same wood but they were using it as a rain screen in this instance and it addresses concerns about moisture. Mr. Wilson indicated whenever a wood is used at the pedestrian level, there will be problems such as people scratching in their names or graffiti into it. Mr. Gonzalez said this is an incredibly hard wood and he would be happy to provide more information on the materials as well as samples. He added that random length boards will be installed with ¼-inch between

so single discreet pieces of board can be removed and replaced. Mr. Wilson emphasized he has not seen wood used on the base of buildings in big cities or where there are a lot of restaurants and pedestrians and believes this will be a maintenance problem. He suggested using tile that looked like wood instead to bring that warmth desired. Mr. Gonzalez noted the market is quite open so the amount of wood that is actually available to be tactile, is essentially the width of a pier; the rest of the façade is glass or open, given the nature of that market so it is being used in a fairly limited amount.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, said from a design perspective, they wanted the north by north market to feel like a market to the passerby on the street; it will feel different for someone walking down Longshore Street. He said wood was used on the Cap City Diner, lining almost the entire façade and seems to work really well for them there. He reported that Moody Nolan shared wood samples with them and it is extremely, tight-grained and heavy and the grain lines are hardly visible. He restated they thought it was a cool way to get warmth on the street. He added there are garage doors that roll up to open up the market; the florist will be in there as well as the fresh food guys, etc. and this would be a neat way to set the tone. He explained they started with this material going all the way down to the grade but raised it up to ensure it did not get wet as the area would get cleaned. He said they started with tile and then really fell in love with this from a design perspective understanding there could be some maintenance issues but they are committed to making sure it looks good. He said tile that looks like wood, would not have the same warmth and would not look authentic when there is a wood crate sitting next to it filled with fresh fruit, etc. Again, he said, it was a very conscious design decision and would like to stick with it if they can and will accept whatever conditions that come with it to make people comfortable.

James Peltier, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, referred to the Shared-Use, Parking Study that took into consideration the hours of operation, cars that are already captured, persons per car, ride sharing, and walking the site. He explained how the Zoning Code requirements are applied to the various uses and how they calculated those uses based on hours – examples cited included: office use will have parking from 8 – 5 but not at other times of the day, Monday through Friday but not on weekends; the market will need more parking on the weekends, and for restaurants they took into consideration the different times of the day as well as different days, which was also considered for all other uses as well.

Mr. Yoder added the Code cannot contemplate how to truly codify the blending of all of these uses. He explained that in Block D, they have 112,000 square feet of office space that is going to be empty nights and weekends when the Market is being used more heavily; 112,000 square feet is a ton of office space. The Urban Land Institute study analyzes all the data during 24/7 periods and is one of the tools that they can use to study to make sure the amount of parking they are providing makes sense. He said they have mentioned before they are over-parked on Block C, and each space costs \$20,000 so to build extra spaces just because, is not feasible, especially in a world where parking spaces may no longer be required in 15 years. He indicated that large institutions like The Ohio State University are no longer building parking structures at their outpatient facilities because they believe before too long, those structures will be like dinosaurs. He said they have a really good balance here because they have actual results happening at Bridge Park where they are cross parking and it is working so he concluded they feel good about the amount of parking spaces they are proposing.

Ms. Kennedy said she has never driven to Bridge Park, she said she has always car-pooled or used Uber as her mode of transportation. She asked if ride-share overlays in this study. Mr. Nelson said that is probably contributing to them feeling like they are over-parked in Blocks B & C as there is an increase in ride-share. He said with the mix of uses, one might park in one area and walk to another. He said Crawford Hoying Development Partners are recognizing a lot of the office workers at the restaurants, to

which they are walking. He concluded Bridge Park is functioning like a community like the applicant had hoped it would.

Ms. Fox stated she loved the wood proposed and she appreciated the change to some of the ground level spaces to interact better with pedestrians while also creating more interest. She also complimented the applicant on the market on the corner with the big, open design. She suggested we should not be so worried about parking because it is a walkable community. She said she was concerned about bicycle parking. She asked how the applicant is accommodating someone that has a scooter as people are not always going to be walking or riding a bike; there are other alternatives out there now. She reported she has a foldable, electric scooter. Mr. Nelson said they will be flexible as modes change. He said there are bicycle storage rooms where there are residential units so scooters could be stored there and they are not visible to the public. He said there is a bike parking requirement in the Code that they met. He said one or many scooters could be parked in a parking space and it will be interesting over time to see cars that start parking themselves and doors that do not have to open. He said they have a wide open bay of parking where the columns are every 30 feet whereas some parking garages have columns everywhere. He said they are trying to be as flexible as they can be. She asked him to build in whatever flexibility they can for any type of transit that might come along in the next 20 or 30 years.

Ms. Kennedy said she has seen the Lime Bikes appearing all over the City and asked if there were dedicated parking spaces for those. Ms. Burchett explained the Lime Bike is provided by a private operator within the City that has a MOU with them to operate. She said the dock less shares do not have specific dedicated parking stations; and Staff worked closely with Lime Bike to identify some preferred areas for people to be able to place the bikes. The City also created some temporary pavement markings to show preferred areas for Lime Bike parking and those are all within the public right-of-way and at a bike rack, currently. She said the Lime Bike company can actually offer a 'good behavior incentive' so if the bike is returned in a preferred area, then an incentive is provided (possibly more time added). She said the benefit and the downfall of the dock less share is the bikes do not have to be returned to a specific area but Staff is trying to provide education to ensure people are using the bikes responsibly.

Mr. Stidhem reported when he was in San Francisco, CA, the Lime Bike Company offered Lime Scooters and they were all over the city. He said to Ms. Fox's point, we could see more of these alternative modes of transportation. Mr. Hunter said he also wanted to talk about the Lime Bikes. He indicated they knew they were coming as they were planning but they did not know the extent to which they would be successful so they have been asked to provide more at Bridge Park; he said they are taking up all of the bike racks. He said he has noticed that for people that have ridden their own bikes to Bridge Park, there is nowhere for them to lock them up because all of the bike racks are being taken up by the Lime Bikes, even though the Lime Bikes do not need to actually be on a bike rack because they are not locked up. He suggested this is something we need to continue to communicate, just to make sure we are using all of the resources the best way we can. Ms. Burchett added Lime Bikes is a pilot program to which Mr. Hunter said is successful and that is wonderful.

Ms. Fox indicated success then becomes street clutter, if we are not careful. She asked if the enclosure shown in the Bocce Ball area was a trash enclosure. Mr. Hunter answered it is a transformer enclosure not for trash.

Ms. Fox noted that building D1 will have some commercial, restaurant, and retail but she does not see any loading areas. She asked about the loading zones and the impact that they will have on traffic, pedestrians, etc.

Mr. Hunter said she had inquired earlier about the lack of street parking on Larimer Street among other items he noted and wanted to address. He explained Larimer Street is an extremely steep street so that is why the upper portion of it (eastern) there is no on-street parking. He said they leveled the street as it approached Longshore Street and put the loading zones there, specifically for move-in/move-outs within the residential units that are in both D4 and D3. He indicated someone on the Commission suggested having those zones timed and he agreed; that is something they could and absolutely should do. He said there is not always going to be someone there moving in; there would not be a Ryder Truck there, 24 hours per day. He said he would hate to see those spaces go completely unused. He said it is easy for our property management to communicate when people are moving in, put the cones out, and make sure that all works.

Mr. Hunter said this is an urban community and the Code dictates that the applicant design four-sided buildings so they do not have “the back of the building” with a garage entry and it has presented interesting design challenges but it gave them a much better project. He said they do not have areas where people do not want to be because it is too dark or too dirty. He admits there will be times when there are trucks in the way but that would be found in any urban environment and that is part of what makes this development authentic.

Within D Block, Mr. Hunter noted they have purposely marked more spaces than in B or C blocks specifically for FedEx, UPS trucks, and similar vehicles. He said they have found these types of trucks are there typically from 11 am to 2 pm so they could manage that with timed postings. He said construction traffic is a huge part of this issue right now and the applicant is constantly monitoring it. He indicated it is no longer the applicant’s construction trucks but it is the equipment for the build-outs of the individual tenants coming in. He said it is improving on Block C because all of the office tenants are complete; there are only two restaurants left under construction so Longshore Street along there is getting better but Block B still has a way to go. He said there is a lot of construction traffic at Tuller Ridge Drive and Mooney Street but that will fix itself. He concluded thinking through how the on-street spaces are used is much better than creating more negative space that is only used for loading/unloading as they appear empty when not being used.

Ms. Fox asked if Mr. Hunter is happy with the width of the streets and sidewalks. She asked if he learned anything from the street layout and if there is anything to be improved upon. Mr. Hunter answered he thought the street widths are perfect, in terms of the actual street aisles and the parallel parking spaces. He said it all works really well - again, for an urban environment. He said he thinks some of the sidewalks are too big but that is okay because it provides a different experience in different areas of the development. He said there is a different street character along Bridge Park Avenue as opposed to Longshore Street or Larimer Street. He recalled numerous conversations about the width of Bridge Park Avenue as he kept saying it was too wide and Staff was saying the opposite. He found it is okay because it offers a different experience and gives us the space to do events like Fore Fest. He said there was room enough for a stage and all of those people and it worked out beautifully. He said in general, everything feels like it is supposed to.

Ms. Fox said she has a real problem with allowing a “Fee-in-Lieu” of Open Space. She said part of building a community is making sure we have these active places like the Bocce Ball Court. She said greenways are nice but they are not useable for anything other than to sit on the grass and watch people go by. She encouraged the applicant, when they do these amenity spaces for private that they are done in the same manner for the public. Mr. Hunter stated they have provided both; it is no different than a front yard or a backyard and a lot of people have fences around their backyard. He said the tenants we have moving here are used to having more private space so that is what they are providing. He said the Code stipulates 200 square feet of open space for a 400-square-foot apartment, which does not make a

lot of sense so they are dealing with that the best way they can, which is with the Fee-in-Lieu. He said they stepped back and looked at 30,000 square feet and realized they are already surrounded by open space, not only with the greenway but with the immense Riverside Crossing Park and the investments the City is doing there. In this case, he said the Fee-in-Lieu makes a lot of sense and Block C was a great example where, if they built the actual amount of open space that would have been required per Code, it would have been a third of the entire block. He concluded it is a balancing act.

Ms. Fox suggested green walls could be incorporated. Mr. Hunter said that has been discussed with previous Commissions. He said the issues with the green walls and especially as they get really tall, they only look good certain months of the year and extraordinarily hard to maintain to look good for those few months.

Ms. Newell said vegetative roofs work out really well and a great way to add green space in a practical way. Mr. Hunter agreed and said when one travels westbound on SR 161, the green roof on the Event Center is visible. Ms. Newell affirmed that roof is doing well and through all seasons.

Ms. Newell said she has an issue with composite windows just like she has with vinyl windows as the Commission does not have a way to regulate the quality. She said the windows are very prominent on the residential building but in reality, she does not believe they are going to be that prominent when that building is built because she anticipates much smaller profiles. Other than that, she said she really liked the buildings as really nice quality materials were used and from the brick samples, she can see that they are very high end so she does not have the perception that the applicant plans to cheat on the materials but hopes they understand her point. She said she has to be fair to everyone and in the past the Commission has said no to vinyl and composite windows. She said she is concerned with what she is seeing in the renderings is what the end product will be. Mr. Gonzalez said what is shown in the renderings has been modeled to the specifications of a composite window so it does have that depth of profile. Ms. Newell asked if the composite windows they are proposing can withstand hurricane forces.

Mr. Yoder said, as an architect, you know how this process goes, shopping during the review process, the windows have to meet Code requirements, hurricane requirements, and everything else. He said there might be a misunderstanding about what type of windows they are proposing. He said originally, when they went through blocks B & C, they were trying to work with the idea of doing vinyl windows on that project but was not acceptable to the Commission; they made the change and went to a different type submittal on that block. Since then, he reported, they have been educated about other materials out there that could work that have a different width to them and they are not metal or wood.

Mr. Yoder said the Anderson Series 100 windows that were approved for the Casto project and they have been installed in their 420 units up the hill. He said that same exact line was used at Riviera on the half-million dollar or so homes so that is the type of window they are specifying. He said they have to be generic just to preserve bidding and competition out there in the world. He said all of Block H has this same type of window. He said they are not trying to take a step back to vinyl but be where they are in Block H and as they were used by Casto in Tuller Flats. He recalled the presentation that Joe Sullivan gave about these same windows to be used at Tuller Flats, which the Commission accepted. He said they just have to be careful in their bid documents so they use an open-ended description. He said they have seen actions by suppliers in their other projects in Dublin where they were accidentally too specific about a product and then the suppliers got greedy because they knew it was Dublin and they knew there was a plan with no substitutions permitted. Ms. Newell said she fully understood. Mr. Yoder said if there needs to be a condition to ensure a similar quality product is used compared to what was already approved, that would work for them. That way, he affirmed, they are not being specific about the product but rather being specific about the quality level. Ms. Newell stated she had some trust and thanked him.

Ms. Fox inquired about lighting and if they were similar from one building to another and if they are selecting a lighting fixture that is timeless. She said lighting can create character on the street as well. Mr. Gonzalez said the lighting is in the same general character as what has been used but they have selected different fixtures for each building so each has its own specific character. As far as the actual design, he said, the packet shows that these are for the most part, very simple and clean so he believes they have that sort of timelessness. He said they have the upper level up/down wash and a retail level.

Mr. Fishman restated he was concerned about the parking. He said he assumed when the Code was developed, some experts determined what kind of parking was needed and the applicant is proposing almost half of that. He said when the study uses different times and those variables. He said in 15 to 20 years, we do not know what amount of parking will be needed but he was concerned with now and asked if anyone else on the Commission had issues with parking because the applicant really reduced the numbers from what the consultants recommended originally and he thought they took into consideration the same variables.

Ms. Newell said she thought it was a new issue that Dublin has not faced before. She said it is true, if the buildings are separated, and all you are looking at is that site and you are going to put in a restaurant, you understand the amount of parking that is needed. She indicated she does not pretend that she is even remotely an expert, but one of the planning seminars she attended was on urban parking because she anticipated the Commission was going to have this conversation in this district at some point. She said what the applicant presented is exactly what is done in urban settings so if parking was being studied for Seattle, WA, they have to pay attention to their parking counts and analyze it in this manner. She said she has gone down to Bridge Park enough and never had trouble finding a parking space and is comfortable with the numbers proposed. She said the City has the ability to monitor that so as more development comes in, if it becomes a bigger issue, then the City may have to up those counts. She suggested the Commission have a leap of faith as the applicant has done their due diligence.

Mr. Stidhem said he thinks there too much parking in several cases. With the parallel parking, he said it is hard to see cars coming from one direction or the other and he would be supportive of taking out some of the on-street parking spaces, especially the ones near the intersections. He agreed parking can be monitored. He said when there was a festival, he did not have trouble with parking. He said he could not park right where the festival was taking place but that was okay because when walking to a destination within the block or block and a half, something new might be seen such a new business opening and that is exactly the point. He restated he has an issue with on-street parking, blocking visibility.

Mr. Yoder agreed; on-street parking close to an intersection can be dangerous. He suggested eliminating those spaces by striping them off or possibly turning them into bicycle parking. He said when contractors park their giant trucks there, it makes it worse. He suggested if there are any spaces in D Block that need to be eliminated, he is definitely open to the idea. He said he would work with Staff and review the parking.

Mr. Fishman said if parking is eliminated, it needs to be added somewhere else. Ms. Newell said there may only be five spaces that would be eliminated for Block D. Ms. Burchett added the Parking Plan is similar to a Waiver where a specific number is given and proposed options. She said the current mix of uses needs to be considered because that is going to impact the parking requirements. She explained that at this point, the applicant is trying to assume what the tenant spaces will be used for in Block D but it is too early to accurately determine the uses. If they get more retail or a different type of use, a lower number of spaces would be required.

Mr. Stidhem recalled there have been discussions about getting the speed on Riverside Drive reduced. He asked what the progress was on that issue. Ms. Burchett indicated they are still in the study phase that ODOT requires to analyze a large amount of data.

The Chair invited the public to speak on this case. [Hearing none.] She asked if anyone else wanted to continue the discussion and if not, she called for a motion.

Ms. Fox asked if a condition is being added pertaining the loading zones times need to be posted. Ms. Burchett said the timing for the loading zones is part of the parking management study so that is in progress.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there was a condition added to treat the wood used on the soffits of the balconies. Mr. Fishman clarified it should pertain to any wood used on the buildings to be treated to maintain the same color. Ms. Burchett said she added a condition in terms of the wood product under the Site Plan Review. The Chair confirmed the applicant already agreed to that condition to which Mr. Hunter answered affirmatively.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Wilson seconded, to approve 33 Site Plan Waivers:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(b) – Parapet Wrapping
Parapets shall wrap all sides of the building.
Request: To allow parapet not to be wrapped on all sides of Building D4/D5.
2. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Shadow Lines.
Parapets shall wrap all sides of the building.
Request: Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and to define the top of the parapet Buildings D1, D3, and D4/D5.
3. §153.062 (D)(4)(a) Roof Type Requirements - Tower Quantity.
Only one tower is allowed per building.
Request. Allow for three towers for Building D4/D5.
4. §153.062 (D)(4)(a) Roof Type Requirements and 153.062 (O)(5)(g)(12) - Tower Height.
Maximum height shall not exceed the height of an additional upper floor of the building to which the tower is applied. Maximum of 14 feet.
Request. Allow for north tower to be ±18 feet in height on Building D4/D5.
5. §153.062 (D)(4)(b) Roof Type Requirements. Tower Location.
Permitted on facades only at terminal vistas, corners at two principal frontage streets, and/or adjacent to an open space type.
Request. Allow for Building D4/D5 towers to not be located at a terminal vista Principal Frontage Street, or adjacent to an open space.
6. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(5) – Permitted Primary Façade Materials.
Facades not visible from Street. A combination of Primary and Secondary materials shall be used. Use of a secondary material for an entire façade is not permitted.
Request: To allow secondary materials on the west and south facades of Corridor Building D4; to allow the Thin Brick on Building D3; Thin Brick on Building D4; and Thin Brick on Building D5.

7. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(a) – Vertical Transitions
Vertical transition shall occur at inside corners.
Request: To allow fiber cement panel and aluminum metal tile transitions at the same plane for Building D3 on the north elevation; and thin brick and fiber cement panel transitions on the same plane for Building D4/D5 on the north, south, and east elevations on the fifth floor.
8. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(b) – Multiple Vertical Materials.
Where proposed, the 'heavier' material in appearance shall be incorporated below the 'lighter' material.
Request: To allow for tongue and groove wood siding below brick on the north, south, and west elevations of Building D4/D5.
9. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(c) – Transitions of Same Material.
Transitions between different colors of same material shall occur at locations deemed architecturally appropriate.
Request: To allow for brick colors transition horizontally on the same place between on the 3rd through 5th stories on Building D2 All Elevations; brick colors transition vertically on the same place between the 1st and 2nd stories on Building D3 North, South and East Elevations; and brick colors transition vertically on the same plane between 1st and 2nd stories on Building D4/D5 East and North Elevations.
10. §153.062 – Building Types (F)(3)(a) – Entrance Design.
All principal entrances are to be at a pedestrian scale, effectively address the street and be given prominence on the façade through the use of architectural features.
Request: To allow the design of the proposed principal entrance to Building D3, to not be prominently articulated/differentiated from other entrances through architectural features.
11. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(d) – Windows.
Windows may be wood, anodized aluminum, metal-clad or vinyl-clad wood, steel, or fiberglass.
Request: To allow for composite frame windows in Buildings D3 and D4/D5.
12. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(f) – Windows.
Windows within masonry walls shall have architecturally appropriate lintels and sills.
Request: To allow for no lintels or sills within masonry walls on Buildings D1 and D2.
13. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows.
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 allow for no trim or casing for fiber cement walls in Building D3; and a projecting precast concrete sill for windows in fiber cement siding walls on Building D4/D5.
14. §153.062 (O)(5)(a)(1) Mixed Use Building Type. Building Siting. - Front Property Line Coverage.
Minimum 95% front property line coverage required.
Request. Buildings D1, D2 to be 44% at Riverside Drive.
15. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(a)(1) – Front Required Building Zone.
0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 5-25 feet.
Request: To allow ±3 feet for Building D5.
16. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) – Required Build Zone Treatment.
Patio or streetscape permitted treatments.

Request: Landscaping proposed at south RBZ for Building D1.

17. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(a)(1) – Corner Side Required Building Zone.
Corner side permitted between 5-25 feet.
Request: To allow ± 0.7 feet for Building D5.
18. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(2) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage.
Maximum of 85% lot coverage.
Request: To allow for $\pm 96\%$ impervious lot coverage for Buildings D1 and D2; $\pm 93\%$ for Building D3; and $\pm 98\%$ for Building D4 and D5.
19. §153.065 – Required Loading Spaces (B)(7)(c)(1) and 153.065 (B)(7)(c)(1) – Number Required.
The number of spaces is based on the size of the principal structure. Two spaces are required.
Request: Allow for no loading space directly adjacent to Building D1.
20. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (O)(12)(a)(3) – Entry for Parking.
Rear, side, corner side facades on non-principal frontage streets.
Request: Allow for entry on front façade (Tuller Ridge Drive) for Building D5.
21. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (O)(12)(a)(3) – Access for Parking.
Access to be provided from an alley or service street.
Request: Allow for access on street for Building D5.
22. §153.065 – Parking and Loading (B)(5)(a)(2) – Parking Structure Design.
Double entrance and exit lanes shall be no wider than 24 feet at the street right-of-way.
Request: Allow for width of south entrance/exit lanes to be ± 56 feet for Building D5.
23. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (B)(5)(a)(4) – Number on Frontages.
On non-principal frontage streets, only one entrance and one exit lane shall be permitted for each 200 feet of frontage.
Request: Allow for two entrance and two exit lanes on Tuller Ridge Drive for Building D5.
24. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Upper Story Transparency.
Minimum street façade upper story transparency of 30%.
Request: To allow for a transparency of $\pm 24\%$ on the north elevation of Building D4.
25. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency.
Minimum ground story transparency of 70%.
Request: Building D1: to allow no less than $\pm 53\%$ transparency on the east (Longshore Street), $\pm 59\%$ on the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, and $\pm 53\%$ on the west (Riverside Drive) elevation;
Building D3: no less than $\pm 30\%$ on the north (John Shields Parkway) elevation, $\pm 31\%$ on the east (Mooney Street) elevation, and $\pm 28\%$ on the south (Larimer Street) elevation and;
Building D4: no less than $\pm 21\%$ on east (Mooney Street) elevation, $\pm 33\%$ on south (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, and $\pm 31\%$ on north (Larimer Street) elevation.
26. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments.
Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet.
Request: Building D1: to allow more than ± 101 feet on the west elevation, ± 60 feet on the south elevation, ± 60 feet on the east elevation, ± 60 feet on the north elevation;

Building D2: to allow no more than ±61 feet and ±134 feet on the west elevation, ±58 feet on the north elevation; ±61 feet on the south elevation, and ±157 feet on the east elevation;
Building D3: to allow no more than ±51 feet on the south elevation and ±52 feet on the east elevation;
Building D4: to allow no more than ±63 feet on the north elevation; and
Building D5: to allow no more than ±63 feet on the north elevation.

27. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(3) and 153.065(I)(4)(b) – Street Façade: Principal Entrance Location.
Principal entrance to be located on Frontage Street Façade of Building.
Request: To allow principal frontage entrance to be located on Longshore Street for Building D2; on Larimer Street for Building D3; on Mooney Street for Building D4; and on west façade for Building D5.
28. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(3) – Street Façade: Number of Entrances Required.
One entrance per 75 feet of façade minimum (3 entrances required).
Request. To allow 1 entrance on north (John Shields Parkway) façade, 2 entrances on east (Mooney Street) façade, 2 entrances on south (Larimer Street) for Building D3; 0 entrances on east (Mooney Street) elevation and 0 entrances on west (Longshore Street) elevation of Building D4; and no entrances on the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) façade of Building D5.
29. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(4) – Horizontal Façade Divisions.
On buildings 3 stories or taller, horizontal divisions are required within 3 feet of the ground story.
Request: To allow no horizontal façade divisions at east elevation of Building D2; all elevations on Building D3; all elevations on Building D4.
30. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.
Request: Building D2: to allow no less than ±70% on the east façade and ±50% on the west façade;
Building D3: no less than ±56% on the north façade and;
Building D4: no less than ±67% on north façade, ±69% on east façade; ±29% on west façade.
31. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(a)(1) - Right-of-way Encroachments.
Awnings, canopies, eaves, patios, and projecting signs are permitted to encroach.
Request. To allow for a canopy to encroach on Building D5 on Longshore Street.
32. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Blank Wall Limitations (Street).
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.
Request. To allow for the middle portion of the south elevation on Building D3 to be a blank wall on ground story; and 2 areas on the north elevation and 2 areas on the east elevation of Building D4.
33. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(d)(1) – Street Façade Blank Wall Limitations.
No open area greater than 30% of a story façade, as measured from floor to floor, shall be windowless on the ground story and solid on the upper stories.
Request. To allow a maximum of ±60% of windowless area of the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) façade at ground story of Building D5.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Conditional Use for portions of two unlined sides of the parking garage in building D5 with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space for the 0.56 acres of off-site open space. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Development Plan Review with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan to allow for 735 parking spaces where 1,087 spaces would be required and nine conditions:

- 1) That the applicant not use highly reflective glass, spandrel, or heavily tinted glass to meet the minimum transparency requirements;
- 2) That if gated entries are proposed, the applicant will work with staff to provide the required stacking spaces without encroaching the public right-of-way;
- 3) That the applicant work with staff to ensure that all off-street loading spaces shall be at least 12 feet wide and meet the minimum requirements;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to provide required building foundation landscaping along all sides of a building not otherwise occupied by entrances, sidewalk, parking, loading areas, or similar areas;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to ensure ground-mounted mechanical equipment is properly screened and is consistent with the design throughout the development;
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to include lighting within the pedestrianways;
- 7) That the applicant record an easement for the encroachment of the bridges to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 8) That the applicant revises the building plan to ensure all door-swing areas will not encroach into the public right-of-way to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(5)(b)(4); and
- 9) That the applicant continue to maintain and seal the wood paneling to maintain quality of the design.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

**2. PUD, Midwestern Auto Group – Jaguar & Land Rover Signs 5775 Venture Drive
18-031AFDP Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for new signs for the Jaguar and Land Rover portion of the Midwestern Auto Group campus, zoned Planned Unit Development District – Midwestern Auto Group, Subarea C. She said the site is south of Venture Drive, approximately 1,000 feet southwest of the intersection with Perimeter Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of

an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She said the Commission has the final authority on this application so witnesses will need to be sworn in.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

The Chair asked the case manager, Logan Stang, if the applicant had agreed to the one condition to which he answered affirmatively.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant address the comments in this staff report regarding utility separation and landscaping with the submittal of each sign permit.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

**3. BSD SRN - Bridge Park East, Section 6 (Block D)
18-038FP**

**PID: 273-012703
Final Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the subdivision of 5.296 acres into five lots and rights-of-way for Longshore and Larimer Streets to facilitate the mixed-use development for Block D of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site. She reported that previously the Commission recommended approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat and City Council approved it 2017. For the Final Plat, this will create the development and blocks and lots. She presented the proposed Final Plat and noted the dedication for the public street extensions of Larimer Street onto the west to intersect with the newly created Longshore Street, which will extend from Tuller Ridge Drive to the south and John Shields Parkway to the north. She said Lots 13 and 16 are for the John Shields Parkway Greenway space and the other lots will accommodate the Block D development, which will be reviewed later this evening.

Ms. Burchett reported that Staff has reviewed this application against the Final Plat Criteria and found that all criteria had been met or met with condition. Therefore, she said Staff is recommending approval to City Council for the Final Plat with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

That concluded Ms. Burchett's presentation and she said she could answer any questions and the applicant's representative was also present.

Jane Fox said when Planning was working on the block configuration, she asked if there was any discussion about service streets or alleys. Ms. Burchett said Larimer Street is an extension of Block H and the other streets were created with the original Development Plan back in the early phases. As far as the

alleyways, she said there have been a few iterations of the arrangement of Block D prior to the submittal and she indicated the applicant had considered several different layouts.

Claudia Husak said in terms of this plat it meets the Basic Plan that was approved by City Council for the block as well as for all of the Bridge Park Development as well as does it conform to the Preliminary Plat that has been approved by the PZC as well as Council. Ms. Fox said she was not here when the original plats came through so she has a few questions. She pointed out that in the BSD Code, there are block configurations, which require pedestrianways, block lengths, service roads and alleys. She said looking at these buildings, there is very little ability for loading/unloading and service of these buildings. She said where there is it took on-street parking away. She said Building D1 appears to have no loading capabilities at all. Ms. Husak explained the plat divides land into parcels and design discussions are not part of the criteria that they have for review of plats.

Ms. Fox said with Larimer Street being 50 feet wide leaving no room for on-street parking, and the other streets are 60 feet wide. Ms. Husak explained that Larimer Street is considered a neighborhood street and it meets the Street Network Map with that right-of-way allocation.

Ms. Fox indicated that, at times, the reviewing bodies allow the building size and the coverage on the lot to impede our ability to get the other elements of walkable urbanism that we are requiring, which would be alleys/service roads, bike parking, alternative transit, for example. She said she was bringing this up because she wants the City to think ahead. She said she was on Longshore Street, in front of the AC Marriot Hotel, and there was a back-in loading station to pick up trash and the truck came in and backed up into it, right in front of the lobby of the AC Marriott Hotel and it was quite intrusive. She said when we review plats, we need to consider enough space for everything, early on. She indicated she questioned all of this because when she looked at the layout for block configurations, she did not see that the City followed the block configuration guidelines of the Bridge Street District Code, exactly. She said she is very interested to hear the dilemma in trying to decide why a service street or alley was not used.

Phil Hartmann said this is probably better discussed during the planning stage and not at the Final Plat that is very specific, basically trying to mirror the Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Husak said Planning has followed the Street Network Map that assigns right-of-way widths to these streets. Ms. Burchett restated that Larimer Street extends into block H, which is primarily residential and where the townhome units are located. She said the intent of a neighborhood street is to keep it low volume to discourage a lot of through traffic. She said Longshore Street and Mooney Street are more suited for the service benefit of the uses developed on Block D.

Ms. Fox said on-street parking should always be the main concern and almost the entire street of Larimer Street is used for loading so there is no on-street parking there and that concerned her. The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Bob Miller said Ms. Fox brought up an excellent point. He said thinking about all the construction that has been going on at Longshore Street for the last year, it is not just trash trucks. He said it is a lot of construction vehicles taking up all that space. Once the construction is done, he indicated he is going to assume that space will be freed up but to Ms. Fox's point, there will be a loading/unloading issue. He said it probably is a good subject they struggle with long term.

For the Commission's interest, Ms. Burchett said there has been a consultant hired to address parking and part of that conversation has been parking and loading. She indicated she did not yet know the specifics of the outcomes of this study but Bridge Park has been included in the study.

Warren Fishman suggested that since Ms. Fox brought it up, but the developer is here, and before we approve the Final Development he assumed the Commission will see a solution to that. Victoria Newell said Legal Council could step in but these blocks are already established with streets so she did not think the Commission had the leeway to turn around and change the widths of the streets now. She said when the architecture of the buildings come in, one of the discussions we had very early on in this process is you have this in downtown urban areas, you are going to have deliveries made street-side at the curb but they are generally temporary so if there is someone unloading a truck, yes, they may be tying up two parking spaces but it is generally for a short period of time. She recalled that was a long discussion even developing the BSD Code, for which we were willing to accept for the walkable urbanism. She said if delivery drivers are plugged in, they are taking away usable land within that space and there will be less cohesiveness to the built environment that is there. She said to consider delivery drives for every single entity that starts to go in, so depending on what the uses are, and it will have an excessive amount of deliveries, then that is something the Commission would addressing when those structures came forward or those tenants came forward in some fashion. She asked if that made sense. Ms. Fox said it makes sense but she restated how narrow these streets are when loading/unloading is occurring in on-street parking spaces, it disrupts the pedestrian experience.

William Wilson suggested to alleviate this conflict between deliveries and pedestrians/cyclists, is to post hours to limit deliveries when no one is around. Mr. Fishman agreed and delivery times are posted in a lot of big cities. He suggested that when the buildings are designed, that there is another place, like in the rear of the building where they are only allowed to load and perhaps with special freight elevators.

Ms. Newell said the discussion is more appropriate when the Commission is reviewing architecture because the right-of-way is already established.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that wished to speak on this case. [Hearing none.] She called for a motion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Final Plat with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

4. Dublin Corporate Area Plan 17-093ADM

Administrative Request Community Plan Amendment

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for an amendment to the Community Plan to add a new Special Area Plan for Dublin's legacy office areas including Metro, Blazer, and Emerald Districts. She said the site is approximately 987 acres bordered by West Bridge Street to the north, Emerald Parkway to the west, Frantz Road to the east, and Tuttle Crossing Boulevard to the south. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for proposed amendments to the Community Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.232.

Devayani Puranik said the Dublin Corporate Area Plan was introduced at the last meeting that entailed a detailed presentation. She said they discussed the Community Plan, Special Area Plan, Zoning, the process for the plan, contents of the plan, different recommendations, and implementation strategies. She indicated tonight's presentation would be brief focusing on the comments from last PZC meeting.

Ms. Puranik presented an aerial view of the area this plan would cover. She said the project goals are as follows:

- Reposition the "legacy" office sites for success by encouraging new investment, as well as reinvestment in existing buildings;
- Create a walkable, mixed-use environment with the commensurate amenities, while recommending places for infill and new development;
- Identify under-served markets and the related opportunities for attracting new private investment;
- Establish a strategy to "refresh" the Frantz Road streetscape that better reflects the gateway nature of this important corridor;
- Recommend mechanisms to ensure additional development along Frantz Road does not adversely impact neighborhoods to the east;
- Recommend zoning tools to ensure successful implementation of the vision and plan recommendations, while providing new zoning protections for adjacent neighborhoods; and
- Introduce consistent and compatible architectural and site design guidelines for the entire district.

Ms. Puranik presented a graphic showing the planning process for the Dublin Corporate Area Plan that began in 2016 with analyzing of the existing conditions, engaging neighborhoods and stakeholders, developing conceptual recommendations, engaging neighborhoods and stakeholders again, finalizing recommendations that now have brought us to the adoption phase of the plan in 2018. She said the Dublin Corporate Area Plan will be included under the Special Area Plans upon adoption and she provided the following highlights of its progression:

- Phase I: Legacy Office Park Competitiveness Study – 2015, which focused specifically on parking and how to manage existing parking more efficiently and in some cases, trying to add parking for economic development within these districts; and
- Phase II: Dublin Corporate Area Plan - Public Workshops, Open Houses, neighborhood meetings, and Council Work Sessions from 2016-mid 2018, which focused on introducing new amenities and land uses within the district.

Ms. Puranik reported that one of the important points discussed during the PZC meeting on May 17 was that open space be an important amenity to the Plan and to consider a "central green" that can be a focal point of the area. She said that the Plan provides specific recommendations that the open space to be utilized as an organizational element, focal point, and usable amenity in the district along with the reconfiguration of interior landscaping.

Ms. Puranik said the plan also discusses interior landscaping within the parking lots and making meaningful islands for interior landscaping, including sustainable stormwater practices. She said the plan has references throughout the document regarding screening/buffering landscaping for existing neighborhoods.

Ms. Puranik stated large setbacks were also discussed along Frantz Road and the idea within the plan is to activate the streetscape by providing a visual connection for pedestrians and users nearby. She said the plan has references to 30-foot setbacks from Frantz Road but, however as staff moves forward to zoning discussions staff can look at specific site design patterns for setbacks. She said it is possible differentiate districts based on existing patterns and determine setbacks accordingly.

Ms. Puranik said a dedicated bike lane was discussed for Frantz Road. In the plan, she said, there is already a reference to examining connectivity through the Mobility Study. She said Planning has followed up with Engineering and they are working on Frantz Road/SR 161 intersection traffic study, some improvements will be made. She said that to possibility of bike lane along Frantz Road will definitely require a Feasibility Study.

Ms. Puranik said the Zoning Code and process has been discussed and will be starting soon. She said staff is anticipating a start in the Fall of 2018 and that is when all the details will be reviewed, which is very extensive. She explained because it would be a public process, all commercial property owners within the district would be involved, as well as neighboring property owners.

Ms. Puranik said approval is recommended to City Council for the Dublin Corporate Area Plan. She said if the Commission agrees, the next step will be a review and adoption by City Council and staff is anticipating that process to occur in August/September 2018.

Warren Fishman said Ms. Puranik did a fabulous job explaining what is being proposed. He said the Bridge Street District is a dense, urban area but he does not want that urban area spread all over the City because then, Dublin could look just like any other city. He said the City's forefathers worked so hard on getting open areas and the expansive look that is on Frantz Road, for example. He added that when he attended the car show at the Metro Center, people complemented the office park for the available green space. He suggested using the existing buildings and adding restaurants to the first floor of those buildings instead of building new. He said that the restaurants would be used by the people in that center and the green area will not be sacrificed. He said he liked the BSD but it is different than the rest of the City and he would like to preserve all the green areas in the rest of the City. He indicated the compliments about Dublin are that it is all green. He said a huge difference is visible when crossing over into Columbus, OH, on Frantz Road.

Victoria Newell said it becomes a Building Code issue. She indicated that when an office building is designed from the beginning with a restaurant in it, the two uses have to be separated in terms of construction. Exhaust for one needs to be dealt with when constructing a restaurant. She added that it becomes more difficult when adding a restaurant to a pre-existing building because that use was not planned for and if the office building is seven stories high for example, the exhaust still has to go all the way up through the roof. She stated she is not saying it cannot be done but it becomes problematic. Mr. Fishman suggested adding the restaurants to the side or front of the office building and possibly attached to keep the footprint minimal. He emphasized he wanted to keep the setbacks on Frantz Road as that kind of look is what Dublin is famous for and sets us apart from a lot of cities. He recalled pushing for 100-foot setbacks and they all look fabulous. He indicated if the setbacks are not actually 100 feet, they are certainly large.

Ms. Puranik clarified the recommended setbacks in this proposal are not the same as setbacks in the BSD. She said that the plan suggests that there would be a tree lawn, shared-use path, and then 30-foot setbacks here. She said the proposal would be more like a transition from BSD to a more suburban setting. She said the setbacks staff referenced in the proposed document are very different than the BSD; green space is anticipated along Frantz Road. Mr. Fishman said if grass and trees are being eliminated,

that would change the appearance. Ms. Puranik said the intention is to not eliminate the green grass along Frantz Road, it is just putting the building slightly forward to interact with the streetscape.

Tammy Noble noted a lot of the questions the Commission is asking are what the plan is addressing. She said the idea is to repurpose the existing buildings and build around them. She said the key element of this plan is for the office park as it is failing without amenities close by. She reported originally the scope of work was for a parking analysis but Staff has found there are a number of issues adding to the vacancy rate. She noted Jason Sudy, Side Street Planning, had said this at the May 17th meeting – green space is not being eliminated but they plan to reduce it and reconfigure it to then get to the economic incentives that will revitalize this area. She said she thought several issues that the Commission discussed, are addresses in the plan. She added the fundamental part of this plan is to revitalize those areas.

Bob Miller said he appreciates past Commissions and their input in creating aesthetics for Dublin. He said the reason we are having this discussion for redevelopment is because it is not economically feasible and needs to be protected for the next generation. He said it is sad it is about to change but on the other hand, it has to change; the redevelopment has to come forward to breathe life into the area. Mr. Fishman agreed that it has to change to make it economically feasible but the “good green feel to it” has to be maintained and not to appear like the Bridge Park Development. Mr. Miller said it was a very special place and at the time it was great.

Ms. Newell said the task to move forward with this is to pay attention to developing the Code. She said if there is open green space that is nothing but lawn, it can be used for new development or planned vegetative planting areas. She suggested there can be really good quality landscaping in exchange for some of the open, flat, lawn space that has to be mowed. She indicated that if this is not revitalized, for a draw it once had, ultimately we are hurting the City. Mr. Fishman agreed. In regards to landscaping, Ms. Newell said she still wants the area to appear as we have been known for in Dublin and to not lose that.

Ms. Noble said staff understands it is a balancing act.

Jane Fox said she disagrees with some development design principles, primarily the use of glass as a primary material. She said when the regulations or guidelines become too prescriptive, in terms of what shall be used and what should be used, etc., the developers are forced into boxed up buildings. She said if we really are a community that says we want to build walkable areas and we try to retrofit these large masses of land, we have to consider what makes that mass of land and those walkable areas attractive. As stated on surveys time and time again, she said, Dublin thinks the public realm is attractive because of the open natural environment. She hopes this plan does not lock us into the way the boxes are illustrated. She said there can be some wonderful public-realm open spaces, parklike elements, Llewellyn Farms, Waterford, and mid-century residents, will want to come and bring the kids and have a picnic or a wonderful place to run or take a walk. She said we have to be particularly careful when we are developing our open spaces, that we do not have long grassy areas and call that our public realm as it is not serving any purpose.

Mr. Fishman said the City does a wonderful job at obtaining public input. He said he has read all the minutes and what he finds interesting is the residents will say they want the redevelopment but not near their house or subdivision. He said he agreed we need to make changes; the Metro Center has outlived its spark and we need to make it economically feasible but we have to be so careful to ensure it looks great. To Ms. Newell’s point he agreed, we no longer need masses of lawn. Ms. Fox agreed a long open lawn will not draw the people to it.

Ms. Newell cautioned her fellow Commissioners that this is a plan and the illustrations in the plan are only examples and not real life projects.

Ms. Kennedy said that as indicated by staff, if the on-going traffic study will include dedicated bike lanes. She asked if the studies also include the pedestrian element as well. Ms. Puranik said the plan recommendations are for Frantz Road. She added that the crosswalk improvements and streetscape improvement project is on-going and Public Works department is managing it. She said the traffic study for Frantz Road and SR 161 will be on hold based on OCLC discussions. She said Engineering will have to complete a feasibility study if there is to be a bike lane on Frantz Road. She said the Frantz Road corridor streetscape improvement project has already been on Engineering's plate and they are looking at specifics for pedestrian improvements, etc.

Ms. Kennedy said she is really excited about this project and enjoyed reading this proposed plan as the revitalization is absolutely necessary. She agreed that Dublin is known for and loves its green space so she will also be taking a critical eye to that component in this study.

Mr. Fishman said there can be vertical greenspace as well as horizontal.

Ms. Fox said this is an opportunity to build a development the neighborhoods can use. She said this will be an interesting infill experiment but there needs to be sensitivity when it comes to how that is accomplished.

William Wilson said the design option in the plan shows repurposing the existing office buildings, which is good. He said the buildings in the back can be reused but buildings along Frantz Road look new in the concept and shown closer to the road, indicating something new is going on there and green space will need to be kept between the commercial uses and Frantz Road to again, differentiate this development from those in other cities. He said the key for this development to succeed is to get other uses back within existing office complex, and incorporating the residential and other uses. Ms. Puranik explained Metro Center has long-term leases and Option 1 reflects that, shown in the concepts, those buildings are to be kept as is and then Options 2 and 3 add to that.

Mr. Wilson asked if the owner of the property has been involved in this whole process. He said it would be interesting to see if we have support from everyone that has a stake in this. Ms. Puranik answered they have all been notified.

Mr. Wilson asked if there will be any educational opportunities offered here, which would draw the young people. Ms. Puranik said the WID was the latest special area plan that went through a similar process that was recently adopted by Council. She said the WID has Ohio University presence so the idea is to incubate businesses and new companies here in this area; they will then move on to the WID for partnerships with OU and other educational institutes. She said this area will serve as a connection between WID and BSD presenting opportunities to start-up companies are in this area, including our Dublin Entrepreneurship Center.

Mr. Stidhem said he thought that was more of a market driven thing; if you go to interesting places, then there can be office buildings that serve an educational purpose but it is going to have to be an interesting place where people want to go. He agreed, he thought the OU area was more geared toward that. When he looks at this area, he said, he thought having a college campus type of feel to it would be very interesting, with the mix of residential, retail, restaurants, and office space. He indicated he envisions educational businesses baked into the office spaces. He said he likes where this proposal is going in general. He said the trees that were planted in the 70s, 80s, and 90s will need to be preserved.

The Chair invited the public to speak in regards to this case.

Clay Daney, 5775 Settlers Place, said the comments he has heard from the Commission this evening are encouraging. He said he also thinks the residents understand redevelopment is something that needs to happen in order to revitalize the area. He said he lives in the area and spends a lot of time jogging/running using the recreation paths and this proposal will provide a lot of opportunity. He said this area is unique because there is some inherent friction in the way that the area is laid out. He said people moved here because they found nice backyards with beautiful landscaping and a home they could raise their family and it happens to be directly adjacent to commercial areas that could potentially be redeveloped in 20 years or with a vacant piece of property, it could be developed tomorrow. He said the canopies from the trees are 30 feet tall providing screening but underneath there are honeysuckle trees eating up everything beneath. He said there is an example, if landscaping is done correctly in this area, we can remove the angst that the Commission has seen in the correspondence between the residents in the area. Overall, he indicated the residents are very excited about the opportunity here and noted sites 10 and 11 may need special attention. He wanted to know what mechanisms would be available for residents to check during the zoning process to see if their interests and concerns are being considered.

Ms. Newell said the residential properties absolutely need to be protected and that is one of the Commission's goals as this redevelops. She said properties that abut commercial could be zoned differently and suggested a PUD to allow residents to be re-engaged into that process to feel complete ownership and provide input. She commended Mr. Daney for taking an active interest and said residents that participate help the Commission make the decisions that they do.

Mr. Wilson added buffers are critical.

Mr. Daney said he is not so concerned about the setbacks along Frantz Road as long as there is vertical greenery like beautiful trees, fountains, greenescapes, and beautiful landscaping that Dublin does so well. Mr. Wilson agreed that made sense from a planning standpoint.

Ms. Kennedy said it is exciting to have engaged citizens and express their views and she is looking forward to hearing from him again. Mr. Fishman said he also appreciates the public input and how Dublin allows for that input. Mr. Daney added that residents are vested in this area. Ms. Newell said we are all here because we are residents and want to protect the interests of our city.

Mr. Daney said he did not want to see tall, glass commercial buildings right behind a residence where at 10:00pm at night, the lights are on in the office and the resident can see the accountant working late with offices brightly lit, directly from their home. He suggested the offices have shades or the opacity of the windows be such so that does not happen. Ms. Newell said shades can be automated and programmed. She said there are office buildings that can be built to be more on a residential scale for those areas; one or two stories versus four to seven.

Ms. Fox said since site 11 is the only one the residents are most concerned with, maybe the Commission makes recommendations that the height allowances need to be studied. Ms. Puranik said one clarification on site 11 – it has a stream going through leaving half of the site unusable due to the Stream Corridor Protection Zone requirements. She noted the even if the rest of the site is built to its full potential, per existing zoning, only two stories are possible. She added that it will be a very small office building with not enough room for parking. She emphasized that is why this site has not been developed in a long time. She stated standard zoning exists there now and if developers meet the requirements of current zoning, it could potentially move forward. She emphasized there are considerable constraints when it

comes to development of this site. The Economic Development Team, she said, has been trying to figure out why it has not been selling and the reason being trees replacement standards and preservation of environmentally sensitive areas.

Mr. Daney said even when there are limited stories, there can be a variance in the height of stories permitted, which can make a huge difference to the overall height of the building. Mr. Fishman said the Commission usually puts a height restriction on the building. The crux here, he said, is the commercial buildings were there before the subdivision. He said the Commission likes buildings that abut residential to have the residential feel. He suggested ranch office buildings with shake roofs. Mr. Daney said the medical buildings on Emerald Parkway were done very well and thoughtfully which makes it very pleasant so it would not be a problem for neighboring residences. The buildings contain the interesting roofs, nice brick, and nice setbacks with landscaping so if something along those lines were created for here, we would get this right.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else from the public that wished to speak. [Hearing none.] She closed the public portion and asked if there were any further comments or questions from the Commission. [Hearing none.] She called for a motion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for an amendment to the Community Plan to add a new Special Area Plan for Dublin's legacy office areas as it promotes the objectives of the City of Dublin. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

COMMUNICATIONS

Claudia Husak said our Planning Assistant, graduate student, Sierra Saumenig, graduated from the Ohio State University with her Master's Degree and accepted a job as a planner in North Carolina. She said she is leaving Dublin next week.

Ms. Husak noted Vince Papsidero is on vacation, returning for the Commission's next meeting. She said she will be going on vacation and will miss the next two Commission meetings.

Victoria Newell said she wanted to suggest a field trip as the City moves forward with the Dublin Corporate Area Plan. She said one of the considerations in the plan was to seek ways to harvest and treat water better. She said there is an amazing facility (but it has been a few years since she has been there) on The Ohio State University campus that is done for research. She said the facility is surrounded with so much vegetation you barely know it is there. She said they collect all of the water off of the building and treat it and use it in the fountains and the site is incredible. She said she will do some Google research since it has been 6 or 7 years since she has been there but thought it would be a great place to tour to learn ways to treat and handle water differently, which might be something the City considers.

Ms. Fox said she wanted to ensure when notes go to Council that the discussion about the need for landscape and the green is emphasized and not have it just be a passing comment but rather an important one.

The Chair asked if there were any further items to discuss. [Hearing none] She adjourned the meeting at 9:44 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission August 9, 2018.