



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 17, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F
18-065FP**

**PID: 273-000867
Final Plat**

Proposal: Subdivision of 2.55 acres for two lots for future commercial development and one reserve to accommodate a future private drive.
Location: South side of Bridge Park Avenue between Dale Drive and Mooney Street, north of Banker Drive.
Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.
Applicant: Crawford Hoying Development Partners represented by James Peltier, EHM&T.
Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner
Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-065

MOTION: Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Final Plat with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the plat title be revised to add the vacation of portions of the Dale Drive right-of-way.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Plat was recommended for approval and forwarded to City Council for final review.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

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

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D, Parking Plan
19-001MPR**

**PID: 273-012703
Minor Project Review**

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for a Parking Plan for Block D of the Bridge Park Development zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood that is southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and reported 735 parking spaces were approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission during the Site Plan Review where 1,085 were required by Code and now the applicant is requesting to reduce the parking spaces to 717. The required parking count is based on the highest demand scenario using restaurant uses for all commercial portions of Block D. The proposed decrease of 18 spaces is due to changes in the structured parking layout that provides improved circulation within Building D4/D5. Per the proposal, 63 on-street spaces will be spread throughout Block D, while 654 will be within the parking structure.

Mr. Stang concluded approval is recommended for the Parking Plan without conditions under the Minor Project Review to permit 717 parking spaces where 1,084 spaces are required.

Colleen Gilger asked if Bridge Park were found to be under parked at any time in the future, if additional stories could be added to this structure. Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, replied there is no opportunity for stories to be added but if in the future the amount of parking allotted now was not needed, the structure could be changed to mixed-use buildings.

Brad Fagrell asked how parking is shared with other structures. James Peltier, EMH&T, answered that Crawford Hoying Development Partners has been conducting a non-scientific parking study and found that generally, extra parking is available. Tim Hosterman added Crawford Hoying has said that during a couple of events, both the Block B and Block C garages were full but the hotel parking was still not filled to capacity.

Mr. Peltier said there had been an issue of insufficient parking due to the reserved signs that were posted already for future tenants but they have since removed 90% of those signs.

Vince Papsidero indicated there will be more parking to come as Blocks F and G are developed.

Ms. Gilger said she was also concerned about having enough parking once the office building in Block A is filled.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion. Ms. Gilger motioned, Ms. Goss seconded, to approve the Parking Plan under the Minor Project Review. (Approved 8 - 0)

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

**PID: 273-008867
Development & Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan**

Claudia Husak said this application is a proposal for a six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel and commercial building and associated site improvements located southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan and Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of the site and the BSD Block layout with Block F highlighted for context. Blocks F and G have been informally reviewed and the Basic Plan Review was approved by City Council. The applicant has addressed the Commission's concerns regarding open space, trash, and circulation and provided summarized comments as well as a Parking Demand Study Data.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed site plan that included one building on one lot and a private street within a platted reserve area in the northern portion of Block F and a graphic showing the proposed public open space. The main change from the previous proposal is the elimination of a pool that was within the building. The Open Space requirement is not met with the proposal. Smaller open spaces are planned but will not be counted as they are located on a separate parcel. She explained the applicant will make up the deficiency as the rest of the block develops.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed landscape plan and noted the retaining walls could potentially exceed Code but this is due to the grading. There is a mid-block pedestrian way to provide walkability from the garage to the hotel; a drop-off area for hotel guest; and a dedicated on-street loading zone for hotel and restaurant deliveries.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed elevations as visible from the northeast, northwest, southeast, and the passenger drop-off area. The architecture for the east elevation on Dale Drive has been changed and no signs are visible now. She noted the alternative material proposed.

Ms. Husak stated 15 Waivers have been requested with the Site Plan Review, which is average for an application of this size in the BSD. Staff still has a few concerns in terms of pocket parks as the building has two frontages. She presented graphics as she explained the need for each of the following 15 Waivers:

- 1) Building Types – Parapet Height
- 2) Building Types – Horizontal Expression Lines
- 3) Building Types – Windows, Projecting Sills
- 4) Building Types -- Vents, Air Conditioners, and Other Utility Elements on Street Facing Facades
- 5) Building Types – Rear Setbacks
- 6) Building Types – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage.
- 7) Building Types – Street Facing Transparency
- 8) Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations
- 9) Building Types – Vertical Increments
- 10) Building Types – Permitted Primary Façade Materials
- 11) Building Types – Change in Roof Plane
- 12) Open Space – Provision of Open Space
- 13) Open Space – Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required
- 14) Open Space – Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings
- 15) Open Space – Ownership

Ms. Husak said staff is supportive of the contemporary architecture for this L-shaped, six-story Corridor Building with restaurant space on the ground story and ancillary hotel uses and amenities. The design is consistent with the character of the area, with building mass and scale visually reduced through overlapping rectangular forms defined by diverse and complementary materials cladding the exterior.

Ms. Husak said a Parking Plan is part of the Site Plan Review to allow for an Adjustment to Required Vehicle Parking through Shared Parking Calculations. The combination of uses proposed requires a total of 187 parking spaces, and 12 on-street parking spaces are provided along the perimeter of the site. To assist in meeting the parking requirement, 142 existing surplus parking spaces in the Block B parking structure will be applied to the uses in building F1, for a total of 154 parking spaces provided. The surplus parking spaces

are the result of the existing parking structure on B Block to the west providing more spaces than the minimum required for Block B uses when initially approved. This will handle the majority of the parking for the hotel and restaurant. She presented information obtained from the applicant containing data for the parking demand for both weekdays and weekends and with the different uses showing different peak times that off-set each other, including adjustments from the other blocks.

Ms. Husak stated the ART has the power to approve Administrative Departures because the differences varying from the Code are within 10%. The following three Administrative Departures have been requested and explained the need for each:

1. Corridor Building Type – Upper Story Transparency
2. Corridor Building Type – Vertical Façade Divisions
3. Corridor Building Type – Required Change in Roof Plane

Ms. Husak said the Development Plan is recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) without conditions.

Ms. Husak stated the Site Plan Review is recommended for approval to the PZC with eight conditions as follows:

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

Ms. Husak said the applicant had sample materials to share with the ART. Brian McNally, Meyers and Associates Architects, indicated they are backing off of the alternate façade product previously proposed and plan to use fiber cement with a smooth finish instead.

Aaron Stanford requested clarification on parking numbers. James Peltier, EMH&T, said when Block B was built, they provided 142 stalls over the Code requirements. He said 187 stalls were needed for the hotel. 140 stalls were left over from Block B. Per the Shared Use Study, the office use on Block B requires 107 stalls, which are not used on the weekends so they are available to the hotel on weekends as well as 5 pm – 10 pm on weekdays when the office is closed; 250 spaces are available for the hotel on weekends.

Ms. Husak said there are concerns with the functionality of the pocket park and encouraged the applicant to either make up the minimum numbers required when they develop the remainder of the block or pay a Fee-in-Lieu. Mr. Peltier asked where specifically for this application they are falling short of the requirements. Ms. Husak answered $\pm 1,900$ square feet of publicly accessible open space is required with this Site Plan for the mix of commercial uses. A total of $\pm 1,200$ square feet of open space are provided as a Pocket Park on the south side of the building, north of Winder Drive (Private). The Pocket Park is defined as part of building F1 containing steps and retaining walls and is programmed with a variety of seating areas. Based on the

proximity of the proposed Pocket Park to the hotel and the degree of separation from the public right-of-way and other existing open spaces, the primary users of this space will be hotel guests. She added the site for building F2 cannot be taken into consideration at this point and believes that is where they could make up the difference.

Ms. Husak indicated the applicant could go before the PZC on February 7, 2019. She restated the ART needs to make a determination for three Administrative Departures today, and recommendations to the PZC for the Development Plan without conditions, 15 Waivers, and a Site Plan with eight conditions that also included a Parking Plan.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended for three Administrative Departures:

1. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)1. Façade Requirements, Upper Story Transparency. Minimum transparency required for upper stories of street facing facades is 30%. Request. Proposed transparency of 28% for the upper stories of the north elevation.
2. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) Façade Requirements, Façade Divisions. Vertical Increments no greater than 45 feet. Request. South elevation—middle portion permitted to be 48-foot wide vertical increment.
3. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane. Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet. Request: To permit a roof plane of 87.92 feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane on the west elevation.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan without conditions.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 15 Waivers:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height. Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high. Request: To parapets of .5 feet and 7.5 feet in height.
2. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Expression Lines. Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building. Request: Expression lines distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and define the top of the parapet.
3. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows, Projecting Sills Required. Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one-by-four trim or brick mould casing. Request: To permit windows to be recessed into the siding clad facades with no projecting sills.
4. §153.062 – Building Types (N)(4)(a)(5) Vents, Air Conditioners, other Utility Elements. Vents, air conditioners, and other utility elements are not permitted on street facing facades. Request. Permission for PTAC and VTAC units grills/louvers on street facing facades and architectural louvers above restaurant storefront windows for future mechanical systems.
5. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks. The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.

Request. Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve "B" to be setback ± 3.33 feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.

6. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.
Request. Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
7. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.
Request: To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
8. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.
Request. To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.
9. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments
Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.
Request: To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.
10. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane
Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.
Request: To permit roof planes of ± 111 feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.
11. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.
Request: To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.
12. §153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.
One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.
Request: To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.
13. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.
A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.
Request: 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.
14. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.
The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.
Request: Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.
15. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.
Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.
Request: Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended to the PZC for the Site Plan with a Parking Plan and the following eight conditions:

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

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion to approve the three Administrative Departures. Mr. Krawetzki motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, to approve the three Administrative Departures. (Approved 8 - 0). Mr. Papsidero asked for a recommendation of approval to the PZC for the following: Development Plan without conditions, 15 Waivers, and a Site Plan with eight conditions that also included a Parking Plan. (All were Recommended for Approval 8 – 0)

**4. BSD HC – Commercial Building
19-004ARB-MPR**

**25 North Street
Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for exterior paint modifications to an existing two-story, commercial building zoned Bridge Street District - Historic Core that is south of North Street, ±150 feet east of the intersection with N. High Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §§153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site as well as photographs of the existing beige building from the southwest and southeast. She said the structure was built in the 1960s with simple Vernacular architecture with an asphalt shingle gable roof, clad in Stucco except for wood shingles along the second story of the west elevation. The structure has a rectangular footprint, built into a hillside. The main entrance is on the west elevation with secondary entrances on the north and east elevations.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed paint color of gray “Downing Slate” for the stucco and wood shingles with off-white trim “Divine White” selected from the Sherwin Williams Historic Color Palette.

Ms. Martin said this application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria, the Architectural Review Board Standards, Alterations to Buildings, Structure, and Site, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. The Minor Project was found to be consistent with the applicable review criteria.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for the Minor Project Review without conditions.

Ms. Goss encouraged the applicant to holistically update the exterior in addition to the proposed paint modification. Ms. Martin said she would convey that message to the applicant since he was not present.

CASE REVIEW

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

**PID: 273-008867
Development Plan Review/Site Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this application is a proposal for a six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel, a commercial building, and associated site improvements southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak said she received revised materials the day before this meeting but has not had the opportunity to fully review them. Brian McNally, Meyers and Associates, passed out paper copies for everyone to review.

Ms. Husak said this was a Case Review today and the application is intended to be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) on January 17, 2019, after the ART has made a determination on January 3, 2019.

Ms. Husak reported Staff reviewed this application December 13, 2019, and indicated that the City's consultants reviewed the application as well from a Code adherence standpoint. She said the consultant found measurement issues as the applicant's measurements varied from how Staff measures. She said the numbers should all match for the future reviews and with the numbers aligned, Waivers or Administrative Departures can be identified. She said she would provide the applicant with a summary of the issues as soon as possible.

Ms. Husak said the renderings submitted appeared to show up-lighting on the buildings and that is not permitted in the BSD. She specifically noted the wall sconces on pages 16 and 20 of the materials distributed. She said sconces can only distribute light downwards. Mr. McNally said they were going for a dramatic effect to accent the architecture.

Ms. Husak questioned the alternative material proposed. She said she requires additional information on the product. She said it is being used as a primary material on the south facades as shown on pages 18 and 19 at 80% and this material is not permitted as primary or secondary. She asked to see a material sample board. Chris Meyers, Meyers and Associates, said they were working on a full mach-up with the materials painted but in the meantime, he brought out individual samples.

Brad Fagrell asked if the material would be painted after it was installed or if it would come prefinished from the manufacturer. Mr. Meyers answered the material would be painted after, all one color for the panels as well as the reveal system. Mr. Fagrell was concerned about painting such a smooth surface. Mr. Meyers said there is a certain paint they have to use.

Mr. Meyers said due to the rigidity of the material, it appears like metal panels and lighter. He noted the material has a high recycle content in terms of sustainability. Mr. McNally asked the ART if they were supportive of the elevations or if they had any concerns.

Ms. Husak encouraged the applicant to show the buildings as they would interact with the surrounding buildings via third-dimensional renderings. Mr. Meyers said the company that created all the animations for the video of Bridge Park for the City's website is in the process of making a video of these buildings. He explained they are taking a model using white box forms for the relationships as there are not actual buildings to show for the rest of the blocks. Mr. McNally referred to page 17 that included images of the Scioto River.

Ms. Husak said she wants to ensure the applicant has checked everything prior to the review from the PZC as they will ask very detailed questions.

Ms. Husak asked if the street name could be changed to something else. Aaron Stanford agreed the name should be different.

Mr. Stanford said this is a private access drive in a separate reserve and he wanted to see the mid-block crossing and where it was located. He indicated the canopy proposed extends into the reserve and may impact the easements.

Mr. Stanford asked about site lighting along the private drive. James Peltier, EMH&T, presented the site plan provided with an earlier submission and also referred to pages 8 and 9. He said they are proposing three standard light poles, identical to those used on Mooney Street, to achieve all the photometric requirements. He said lights will have to also be installed on Dale Drive.

Mr. Stanford said again he was interested in the pedestrian crossings. Mr. Peltier explained the mid-block crossing would impact loading/unloading and deliveries so it was moved further east. He said they also wanted to be able to accommodate a bus in the loading area without blocking traffic.

Chad Hamilton asked how wide the access road was. Mr. Peliter answered it is 18 feet wide at the largest point and shrinks to 14 feet wide to be more pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Hamilton asked where the fire department connection (FDC) would be located. Mr. McNally answered on the south elevation and added there is an existing fire hydrant by the restaurant.

Ms. Husak asked if anyone from the Fire Department or Engineering requested an Autoturn for the private drive. Mr. Peltier answered they will provide that with the resubmittal.

Ms. Husak said transparency and glass continuously comes up during Building Permitting. She asked what type of glass was being proposed. Mr. McNally said he would provide a cut sheet.

Mr. Peltier referred to page 3 and reported Crawford Hoying Development Partners are still conducting a parking study for the parking garage on B Block. He said the intent is for hotel guests to be able to use the B Block garage to park and then proceed over to building F1. He said there is an internal elevator proposed for the planter side of the building but the planter will need to be modified. He said he would provide Ms. Husak with a report.

Colleen Gilger said Crawford Hoying Development Partners have been stating how much of the garages remain empty and how this area is over parked but when a group from the City went down there for an event, public parking was scarce because all the spaces were marked reserved. She asked if those were spaces reserved for residents and if the apartments were not yet full. She stated that some of the signs for those reserved spaces could be removed for now and opened up to the public.

Ms. Husak said she was uncomfortable with the sidewalks on Bridge Park Avenue as they only appear to have 10 feet of sidewalk clearance. Mr. Peltier referred to page 4 of the earlier submission, which reflected the patio walls are closer than 12 feet. He said the walls are on the right-of-way line and do not encroach into the right-of-way.

Ms. Husak inquired about the materials to be used for the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Woods said they did not want to spend a lot of money on something that would be temporary. Ms. Husak said even a temporary

enclosure needs to be attractive. Mr. Woods said the enclosure may be a treated wood fence. Ms. Husak said Staff needs to know what it is proposed and when the permanent structure will be built. She said a condition can be added to speak to the timing of the permanent structure. Mr. Woods said they could also use plant material for temporary screening.

Ms. Husak said foundation plantings have not been provided and they are required. Mr. Woods asked if she was referring to the north side. Ms. Husak said Bridge Park Avenue has not had any but maybe the applicant could get there with the streetscape elements. Mr. Woods indicated they intend for the tenant space to the west will put their statement on it.

Mr. McNally explained why they are requesting a Waiver for floor to floor height.

Ms. Husak noted the signs will be addressed later.

Ms. Husak indicated the Commission was pleased with the open space that was accomplished with the pool being eliminated. She said it is a great amenity and makes the street successful. She inquired about the open space with the benches and trees and how the ART felt about that programming.

Ms. Husak said she will provide a list of needs from the applicant but the timing is tight with the holidays.

Mr. McNally requested feedback from the ART on the general architecture. Mr. Papsidero said it was well designed. Mr. McNally said he wanted to make sure there would be no significant changes needed due to the tight schedule and Ms. Husak indicated she did not anticipate that happening.

Mr. McNally asked for the ART's first impression of the alternate material. Mr. Stanford asked if it would appear different in sheen. Mr. Fagrell asked the applicant if they will use a flat paint. Mr. Meyers said they try to fight the impact of the sun and glare. Mr. Fagrell asked the applicant if they were satisfied with the performance of the material. Mr. Meyers answered it is a new product and they are relying on the testing that has been done. He added it will have a baked on finish and painting on site of the finished product is better than if the product was pre-finished.

Ms. Husak said she was concerned about this tight schedule. She said there are a lot of small details that need to be sifted through and is not sure how realistic the timeline is to be able to turn this around with the holidays in between. She said planning to go to the PZC for review on January 17, 2019, is unrealistic. Mr. Meyers agreed that the timing around the holidays was challenging. He said they are comfortable pushing this back to the February 7, 2019 Commission meeting but wanted to keep the plat for Block F on the January 17, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.]

INTRODUCTION

3. BSD HR – 86 Franklin Street 18-075ARB-MPR

Minor Project Review

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for exterior modifications and associated site improvements to an existing home located on a 0.36-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Residential. She said the site is east of Franklin Street, approximately 350 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Demolition and Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066, 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

for a MSP. She indicated that incorporating their brand into what the district will permit is unusual for them and not the standard.

Brad Fagrell asked about the height of the existing lollipop sign versus the new ground sign proposed. Jacob Alber, McDonald's, answered approximately 5 – 8 feet shorter. He explained McDonald's has a lot of standards for their color schemes and use of the iconic golden arches. He explained they had to obtain special approval in order to incorporate a gray background on the ground sign as that is not one of the brand's colors.

Ms. Martin asked the applicant, if they had to reduce the number of signs, which signs could be removed from the current proposal. Mr. Alber said when vehicles are heading west, they would see the east side of the building and their goal is for signs to be visible on both corners and one is blocked by The Heartland Bank. Mr. Alber said they could possibly take down one sign on the east elevation by removing "McDonalds" text but keep the golden arches. Mr. Papsidero noted on the north elevation there is the ground sign and arches. Mr. Alber said they face different directions. Mr. Papsidero indicated the ground sign would be most effective given its size. Ms. Green pointed out a large tree blocks the view of that sign from the roadway.

Ms. Martin presented a photograph of the existing site.

Claudia Husak emphasized this is an existing auto-oriented location, which the BSD Code permits one sign for perspective on the discussion. She said the applicant is proposing a series of signs in addition to window signs as shown by the photograph. Mr. Alber said those window signs will be removed. Mr. Papsidero encouraged the applicant to look into ways to reduce the number of signs for this proposal.

Colleen Gilger pointed out there is no direct curb cut to the site and cars are flying by on W. Bridge Street at this end so she can justify the MSP as proposed.

Aaron Stanford noted the BSD Code is set up to accommodate buildings in different areas and asked that a compromise somewhere in the middle would be fair as these are existing conditions.

Lynsey Jordan, Permit Solutions, said if they were to remove the golden arch on the "arcade" wall, the architectural element would look a lot bigger and provide more blank space. Mr. Alber said they are trying to draw the eye to the entry and if they were to remove that golden arch, the wall will not be aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Papsidero inquired about door locations for the building. Mr. Alber answered there are currently double doors but they are proposing to eliminate one door.

Ms. Martin presented the Master Sign Plan request graphic of the five signs and their locations. Mr. Papsidero asked the applicant to think about ways to reduce the request because as the proposal stands, it will be difficult to get approved.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Martin said the application will tentatively be forwarded to the PZC for their review on January 17, 2019.

INTRODUCTIONS

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

**PID: 273-008867
Development Plan Review/Site Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this application is a proposal for a six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel, a commercial building, and associated site improvements southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale

Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak said the Basic Plan for both Blocks F and G were approved by the PZC in October, which were forwarded to City Council for approval for both blocks on October 22. She said when the Administrative Review Team (ART) and the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) had an Informal Review, the applicant indicated F1 would be the first building to move forward on the block. She explained the process in the Bridge Street District (BSD) is for the ART to make a recommendation to the PZC as they have final authority.

Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of the BSD for context and then the layout image of blocks in the Bridge Park Development. She presented the proposed site plan and highlighted F1, which is on the northern portion of Block F surrounded by public right-of-way on three sides.

Ms. Husak said the hotel (F1) is oriented towards Bridge Park Avenue and will be platted in conjunction with this application. She said the site will include a reserve to function as a private drive for a (future) parking garage on the south side. She said the discussions have been about open spaces and how they are integrated, walkability, placemaking elements, vehicle and pedestrian circulation, and how refuge is handled.

Ms. Husak said Waivers were approved at City Council for front property line coverage and ground story height as Dale Drive has a curvature to it and there are commercial spaces on the other side of Mooney Street.

Ms. Husak said there are existing tree grates for the streetscape so patio and seating areas cannot interfere. She asked if there was a 12-foot differentiation and to prepare a verification for the Commissioners. She noted there will be one condition addressing modifications for an access drive.

Ms. Husak presented proposed renderings and indicated the City's request was for a building to fit within the district but be different by introducing different architecture. She said the materials the applicant proposed are not permitted so that will need to be discussed. She said a significant change has been made on the access drive. She said the pool on the first floor has been eliminated. She said the applicant has modified the vehicular drop off area and canopy. She said they have increased green space and decreased the footprint of the building.

Ms. Husak said Staff reviewed this application yesterday, and the retaining wall and tree grate appear to be close. She said the applicant has created a loading area and a guest drop-off area as requested by City Council. She said Staff is asking if there is a possibility of adjusting the angle of the canopy to reflect the roadway. She stated the first floor plan has not changed except for the pool area.

Ms. Husak noted in preparation for a Parking Plan, parking information received from the applicant are included but only for Block C and asked about Block B. James Peltier, EMH&T, said they are still completing the parking study but will have it prepared for review before the recommendation to the Commission. Ms. Husak asked Mr. Peltier to create a short report on how the parking was studied for justification and methodology, to which he answered he would complete.

Ms. Husak said the Waiver Summary is very broad and asked the applicant to designate where there are issues and to get those listed and labeled in the document.

Ms. Husak said for justification for materials not permitted in the BSD, the applicant must demonstrate where the material has been used locally and how it is installed as well as how it has weathered. Mr. Peltier had brought in a sample.

Ms. Husak said, out of all the Waivers, the most concerning is about the east and west side of the building not adhering to the required five-foot setback as the building is closer to the property line. She noted door swings would touch or be located within the right-of-way. She pointed out the applicant was just one foot short of the property line in one area and a three-foot clearance in another area. Aaron Stanford said to make sure foundations are also located outside the right-of-way. Ms. Husak emphasized that five feet is already small for a setback.

Mr. Peltier thought the economic agreement allowed the applicant to encroach into the right-of-way. He said only a three-foot clearance is needed for a door swing. Ms. Husak asked if the required build zone is 0 – 5 feet on all sides and asked the applicant to double check on the foundation.

Mr. Peltier noted the access drive was originally a two-way but they were asked to make it more pedestrian friendly, especially for the drop-off area to the hotel so it was changed to a one-way street. He said three parallel parking spaces were added to act as temporary parking. He said the loading zone was over 80 feet to accommodate buses, etc.

Mr. Stanford asked why there is not a mid-block crossing. He said he understands the entry to the garage is not directly across the drive but a mid-block crossing would be beneficial to pedestrians. Mr. Papsidero said pedestrians could use it as a cut-through and if it were constructed of all brick pavers, it would be considered a shared space. Mr. Papsidero asked if there would be valet service. Mr. Peltier answered potentially.

Mr. Papsidero said pavers can be used to direct people and also slows traffic. Mr. Stanford said Staff needs to provide safe direction but if people do not follow the direction, that is on them.

Mr. Papsidero asked the applicant if they plan to pave with asphalt and Mr. Peltier answered affirmatively.

Mike Altomare said he would like to see an Autoturn Exhibit for the private drive to ensure Fire access is sufficient. Mr. Peltier said he would provide this for review.

Mr. Peltier suggested that if they make the drop-off space so it is wide enough to park two cars, people will try to double stack the cars.

Mr. Peltier said he followed the line of the street and the depth is the same as the AC Marriott Hotel. He asked if there should be a head-in option for parking. Mr. Peltier said he would have to balance distances to make it work and not block the fire lane.

Brian McNally, Meyers & Associates Architecture, said the canopy will consist of a translucent material. He said there are options for the canopy situation – not necessarily angling it but it could be wider from east to west.

Mr. Peltier said the garage and office will make a nice lawn area and there will be grading. He said for the Parking Plan, they still need to study the Block D garage. John Woods, MKSK, said the green space can be broken up into different seating areas and some lounge seating. By opening this area up, he said, it becomes more of a public space and invites people off the sidewalk, etc. He said the wall is 5 or 6 feet tall to filter out lights from cars. He said this end of the plaza level is secluded. He suggested open planters for trees would make it a street. He said seating areas are dotted in there. He suggested lounge seating out front could be an amenity on Bridge Park Avenue. He said activity can spill out onto the space in the corner and the ballroom can spill out onto the patio. Ms. Husak said it would be interesting to see how the interior access space separates the arrival area and the pedestrian traffic planning to go through for shopping.

Ms. Husak inquired about the trash enclosure. Mr. Woods said they would use a wood fence until the future building comes on, then a different, permanent material would be used when the other building fills in.

Mr. McNally presented proposed materials. Ms. Husak requested more information on the materials. Mr. Papsidero said the PZC will ask about the quality and similar installations.

Ms. Husak said the elevation that faces the garage has a high percentage of that material versus permitted materials. She pointed out the Code requires 80% of permitted material be used so she asked the applicant if they would consider increasing the panels or the brick.

Ms. Husak said the signs are not included in this proposal but the applicant will need a MSP later. Ms. Husak said the renderings were good at showing dimension and angles of this building. Mr. McNally asked about transparency and the amount of glass. She said Staff will need to know the sizes and the amount of transparency percentages.

Ms. Husak stated this application overall would be discussed further at the General Staff meeting. Mr. Peltier asked if they could show a graphic behind the glass on a back wall. Ms. Husak recommended the applicant leave it for now but could discuss at a later time.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.]

**4. BSD C – Hollywood Feed – Sign
18-081MPR**

**6329 Sawmill Road
Minor Project Review**

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for the installation of a wall sign for an existing commercial tenant space located within the Trader Joe's Shopping Center. He said the site is west of Sawmill Road, approximately 500 feet southwest of the intersection with West Dublin-Granville Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Mr. Stang said this application is for a pet store and the applicant is showing two signs where only one is permitted. He said the sign needs to be installed on a single panel within the existing sign band.

Vince Papsidero asked if the applicant would be permitted a window sign. Mr. Stang said this tenant space defers to the standard Sign Code. He said they would be permitted a window sign but the dimensions would be subtracted from the overall size for the wall sign. Colleen Gilger noted the applicant cannot increase the size of the sign as they are limited to the size of the sign band used in that plaza.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.]

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:25 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on January 17, 2019.

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F
18-060BPR** **PID: 273-000867
Informal Review**
- 2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block G
18-061BPR** **PID: 273-012471
Informal Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the two applications were proposals for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, a parking structure, residential units and a future office building as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, north and south of Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for informal feedback on two proposed Basic Plan Review applications prior to a formal review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Lori Burchett presented the Bridge Street District (BSD) application process that includes a Basic Plan Review and a Development Plan Review followed by a Site Plan Review. She said if a project includes a Development Agreement, City Council serves as the reviewing body and designates a final reviewing body for future applications. She explained the Basic Plan outlines the character and nature of the development including general massing and any open space locations. She said the Site Plan provides the final details of the proposal, including: materials, landscaping, and additional Code requirements.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted the two blocks are located south of Tuller Ridge Drive, north of Banker, east of Mooney Street and west of Dale Drive with Bridge Park Avenue dissecting the two blocks. She presented a graphic of the two blocks in context of the overall Bridge Park Development. She said Block D was the most recent block reviewed by this Commission.

Ms. Burchett presented the Basic Plan for Block F that consisted of three new buildings with office, commercial, hotel, restaurant, and open space on the 2.31-acre site. She pointed out a private access drive located between buildings F1 and F2, connecting Mooney Street and Dale Drive. She indicated staff had expressed concerns with the access drive and pedestrian mobility through this block.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the massing that represented the scale and height within this block as viewed from the northwest corner of Banker Drive and Dale Drive. She said the general layout of the buildings were represented on the site with the street network represented throughout.

Ms. Burchett said one of the discussion questions for the Commission's consideration this evening is whether the proposal effectively meets the intent and purpose of the walkability standards and promotes the principles of walkable urbanism. She presented another massing view of the future hotel with its access drive and canopy drop-off area. She presented the western elevation that faces Dale Drive that showed an unlined portion of the parking garage. She said a second discussion question asks the Commission if there are additional design considerations that should be made for the unlined portions of the parking structures, particularly as it faces Dale Drive - the principal frontage street.

Ms. Burchett presented images that illustrated the general character of contemporary design for this block with multiple angles and a mix of panels, brick, and glass, which is very similar to the established character of the overall development.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant has proposed to provide 0.35 acres of public open space on Block F where 0.09 acres would be required and presented a graphic to illustrate the locations of the open spaces.

Ms. Burchett presented the Basic Plan for Block G that consisted of three new buildings with office, commercial, residential, 0.43 acres of open space, and associated site improvements on the ±2.28-acre site.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the massing that represented the scale and height within Block G. She pointed out that building G1 is the proposed office building and the applicant is requesting a Waiver to allow for a seven stories. She presented more graphics illustrating general massing and noted the east elevation reflected the unlined portion of the parking garage.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed uses would require a minimum of 435 parking spaces for Block F and 669 for Block G. She reported the applicant proposed 288 structured spaces and 11 on-street parking spaces. She explained the applicant intends to use 136 spaces from Block C garage to help close the deficit for Block F and 355 spaces from Block C garage for Block G. She reported there is a preliminary study on the uses of the garages that is on-going as the development fills. Based on that study, she said, there is an excess of parking within Block C, even at the highest use.

Ms. Burchett presented inspirational images for Block G that included brick, glass, and metal details. She said the design is best described as contemporary with multiple projections and a defined first floor. Overall, she said, these images show glass as the predominant material with a complementary brick or stone. She asked the Commission to consider if the provided images achieve an appropriate design direction and if they had any architectural design suggestions. She also requested suggestions from the Commission on the variety of materials and colors that should be applied to Blocks F or G.

Ms. Burchett said ± 0.43 acres of on-site open space is proposed for Block G with 0.16 acres proposed as an off-site public open space on Block F, to meet the open space requirement of 0.59 acres. Additionally, she noted, 0.18 acres of private amenity space is proposed for residents of Block G. For feedback to the applicant as design advances for these areas, a recommended discussion question asks the Commission if the proposed open space treatment was appropriately located, sized, and designed. She presented a graphic to illustrate the locations of the open space proposed for Block G.

Ms. Burchett said Staff has identified potential Waivers for this Basic Plan Review including:

- Allowance for a 7-story office building (G1)
- Front property line coverage
- Occupation of corner (G4 & F4)

Ms. Burchett presented the discussion questions in their entirety for the Commission to consider:

1. Does the proposal effectively meet the intent and purpose of the walkability standards and promote the principles of walkable urbanism?
2. Is the proposed open space treatment appropriately located, sized, and designed?
3. Do the provided images achieve an appropriate design direction; and are there any architectural design considerations or variety in materials and colors that should be applied to these two blocks?
4. Are there additional design considerations that should be made for the unlined portions of the parking structures, particularly as it faces the principal frontage street (Dale Drive)?
5. Are there any other considerations by the Commission?

Ms. Burchett concluded her presentation and stated the applicant was present to address any questions or concerns, as well.

Victoria Newell asked about the height of the AC Marriott Hotel. Ms. Burchett answered that it is eight stories in height.

Steve Stidhem asked if the new buildings would appear taller than the AC Marriott Hotel, due to the increased elevation change. Ms. Burchett answered the same question was raised at the ART earlier in the day and the applicant had said the new buildings would not be taller.

Jane Fox asked for height, story-wise to put in context to across the street. Ms. Burchett answered corridor buildings are five stories tall.

Warren Fishman asked how wide the buildings are on the sidewalk front. He said there is an amenity space on G4 that is private. Ms. Burchett clarified there would be open space between buildings G2 and G1. Mr. Fishman asked if the open space would be green. Ms. Burchett said, overall, the proposal at this point, would be similar to other passageways we have seen in developments. She said the applicant is requesting feedback from the Commission this evening. Mr. Fishman asked if these areas would be considered walkable since the buildings were so wide.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, explained parking is driving how the applicant is looking at these two blocks. He said the most cars they have ever counted on C Block is 373 and there were 506 spaces left open. He indicated the applicant does not see B Block being remarkably different. Given these outcomes, he said, the applicant is re-evaluating the need for parking in this part of the development.

Mr. Hunter referred to the site plan for Block F. He said the hotel will be the first building to come forward as a final site plan as it is the most 'baked' on their end. He said it is a Marriott hotel and the units lining the parking will be like an extended stay. He said these units are almost apartment size. He said they would be managed out of the F1 hotel. Mr. Hunter stated the F4 office building will not be considered until the future.

Mr. Hunter explained the reason the applicant is requesting a Waiver for a seven-story building for G1 is due to the market forces. He reported there are 150,000 – 200,000-square-foot office users out there that want to be in Bridge Park and currently they cannot be accommodated. He indicated if they design a 200,000-square-foot office building from scratch, for a user that may or may not emerge, that is a great way for the applicant to go bankrupt. He said they have to ensure they are nimble enough to be able to respond to those market forces; if they are not able to go taller, that is not the block for a large user so they need to know that now. He said their architect for this project, Chris Meyers, and their team have taken this through the Basic Site Plan and they desire feedback about the seven stories. For the G1 office building, he said, there will be a different architect to take them through the schematic design and that is to ensure the applicant is keeping everything fresh and authentic.

Chris Meyers, Meyers and Associates Architects, 232 N. Third St., Columbus, Ohio, said only diagrammatic massing and basic footprints were presented this evening. He said there will be a lot more detail and articulation forthcoming in the Final Site Plan. He said the applicant's objective is to enhance the community even further. He said walkability and approachability comes with that, especially at the street level. He said the increased grades will affect the access points to the buildings.

Mr. Meyers asked Ms. Burchett to present some photographs of buildings where the heights range from four stories to seven stories. He said the architecture for hotels is always repetitive as the rooms are stacked with a grid façade. He indicated their intent is to get away from the typical hotel design. He said they welcome the Commissions' feedback to help drive the direction the applicant takes.

Mr. Stidhem said he liked the artistic neatness and the photos presented were interesting. He asked if the garage will be flat or sloped. Mr. Hunter answered the garages would be sloped, similar to the garages on Blocks B and C.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about electric plug-ins for vehicles in the parking garages as he has seen some but wondered if more were coming, which Mr. Hunter confirmed.

Mr. Stidhem asked the applicant if they had considered roof access for any of the buildings. Mr. Hunter said they plan at least a portion of the rooftop of G1 to be accessible.

Mr. Stidhem asked if solar had been considered for G1. Mr. Hunter said the applicant has in the past and believes they will continue to do so. Mr. Stidhem suggested the applicant at least wire for it so solar could easily be installed in the future.

Ms. Fox inquired about the space between F1 and F2/F3. She said it appears as a driveway but asked about sidewalks, bikes, or scooter accommodations. Mr. Meyers said the entire F1 building is wrapped.

Mr. Fishman suggested the amenity/private space for the residents of Block G be instead open to the public. Mr. Hunter emphasized they have had this conversation many times about these particular spaces. He explained G4 has an interior space that has units aligned around the four sides and up against the parking garage. He said that amenity space would not be seen from the street. He said they look at those open spaces as residents' backyards. He said everyone's front yard is accessible but the people that live at Bridge Park also deserve to have something that is kind of their own. In many cases, he explained, if those spaces were public, anyone could approach the sliding glass door and knock on it so it becomes a security issue.

Mr. Hunter said, speaking from a developer's standpoint, they do not believe they have enough grass on Blocks B and C as there is a lot of hardscapes with beautiful plantings. He said they are taking that into consideration as they are developing these open spaces for Blocks F and G. Mr. Fishman emphasized he will be looking for green.

Kristina Kennedy clarified Block F is meeting the green space requirement but the G Block is not. Mr. Hunter said together they meet the requirements.

William Wilson said he has witnessed an issue with delivery and asked if food trucks would be coming onto the scene. He asked if these situations were being analyzed.

Mr. Hunter said Crawford Hoying is living that daily as well with their office in Bridge Park. He said he likes the little bit of activity on the street, making it feel urban in a way that is not typically seen in Dublin. He said when vehicles cannot get down the street, it is an issue. He said he hears him and the applicant agrees and that is something they will need to address, especially with this block because there are two major office buildings. He said food trucks are permitted to park in those public parking spaces so the developer cannot tell them to leave. He said they do not have an answer to that yet. He said the studies determining if the on-street parking should become paid parking would effectively fix that problem. Maybe, sometimes food trucks are okay in certain areas and that is a discussion to be had. He said he is torn between the two because again, they help make the development feel more urban.

Vince Papsidero added, in the larger Code update that is underway now, food trucks are being addressed as a land use so there are regulations staff is proposing. Currently, he explained, the food trucks are regulated as any other vehicle in Bridge Park from a parking standpoint. For vehicle loading/unloading delivery, the City has designated locations and times of day when those trucks are allowed. Mr. Hunter said right now, that issue is magnified because of the construction.

Mr. Wilson said we have talked about not filling all the parking spaces for the current programming but he asked if they had considered parking for the park across the street. Mr. Hunter said the Parking Plan will address everything, holistically.

Mr. Wilson indicated there a quite a lot of residents in Bridge Park now. He asked if pets were allowed. Mr. Hunter answered pets are allowed in certain buildings on certain floors. Mr. Wilson asked if sidewalk staining is being addressed given the lack of green grass.

Mr. Fishman asked if pets can even be controlled in condominiums. Mr. Hunter indicated the condominium association probably could but he cannot say that for certain as he is not the lawyer on this issue.

Mr. Fishman reported he has been spending a lot of time in this development and complimented the applicant; the energy is fabulous and it is fun to be there. He said he visits the market on Saturdays and has noticed a lot of people are walking dogs. He said that is his concern about providing enough green space and having rules about the dogs. Mr. Hunter indicated they have taken a real cautious approach. He said pets are allowed in buildings on the lowest floor. He said as much as they try to police the dog activity, the guys cleaning the grounds have to clean up after the dogs sometimes. He concluded people love their dogs – it is the way it is.

Ms. Newell inquired about the stacking of cars at the drop-off area for the hotel. Mr. Hunter said the stacking number is six. Ms. Newell asked if the hotels will have a certain quantity of parking spaces reserved for their guests. He suggested when they do the study, the answer is absolutely yes. The Marriott says they need about 80% a piece but it depends on the environment.

Mr. Wilson said wide sidewalks can be attractive and make an area more walkable; it is an opportunity to add benches so people have additional places to sit/meet outside of those little green spaces. He suggested adding drinking fountains for both humans and pets and by adding these things, the result can be an enriched community.

Ms. Kennedy said she loved the design proposals and they coordinate and fit with the other buildings in the development while also adding character. She said she is concerned about having room for bicycles as that is becoming more popular in Dublin. She said she loved the Bocce Ball Court in D Block and would like to see more little pocket parks like that. She said it would be so nice to have something more to do outside besides walking and 16-Bit that is inside entertainment.

Mr. Fishman said he agreed with both of his colleagues. He said it is important for sidewalks to be wide enough as now there are a lot of scooters flying by. He said couples on benches makes a lovely scene. He emphasized green, green, green; “everything grows here” is the City’s tag line.

Mr. Stidhem said he is not against grass but there is going to be an amazing park across the street and that will take care of a lot of issues that were discussed this evening. He said in general, he likes the proposal and would love to see something that is a little bit different, especially in terms of the details and character with the new architect. He would like to see something “just a little bit out there”, something that is unique. He said he thinks of Chicago and how all the architecture is different. He stated the proposal is absolutely walkable. He said he is not passionate about parking because the trends show not as much parking will be needed.

Ms. Fox stated the applicant has done a really good job with walkability and connecting the green space notes and the corridors. She indicated placemaking is missing on the corner of G4. She said there is nothing on Tuller Ridge Drive that would stop a pedestrian.

Ms. Fox asked if Bridge Park is still considered the designated shopping area. Mr. Papsidero clarified it is Bridge Park Avenue.

Ms. Fox said she loves the area between F1 and F2/3 and if designed correctly, can become a little individual oasis. If landscaped correctly, that just might be a hub of activity there for those walking, riding bikes or scooters.

Ms. Fox asked if an interesting archway can be created for the parking garage there and allow for a peek at the plaza park/backyard that is hidden for G4 residents. She also suggested something interesting be

created for the southwest corner of F1. She stated she loved the separation of the buildings as it allows for some very interesting things to be created.

Ms. Newell said generally the proposal meets the intent of walkability. She said she was concerned about the access drive and pedestrians only permitted to walk on one side because the other space is completely green. She suggested the applicant treat the whole access drive area with some very upscale amenities so it appears as its own pocket park. If it was very well landscaped, it would encourage walkers to want to walk on just one side of the street.

Addressing question #2, Ms. Newell said the proposed open space treatment was appropriately located and sized but there is not enough design details yet to comment. She said she was concerned about the height of the buildings and the shadows they would cast on the open spaces as she wants to see any plantings truly survive.

Ms. Newell said she was completely supportive of the sharing of the parking. She said right now, she has had no issues with trying to find a parking space, even on a Friday night, going to a restaurant at peak times, which has been wonderful and convenient.

Ms. Newell said the added height to the structure to achieve seven stories creates another amenity. She recalled originally on this Commission fighting hard and had lengthy discussions holding to the six-foot height but things change as the City develops. She said when all of the buildings are going in at four and five stories, it is nice to have that change in elevations. She said she is a little concerned about going up that hill, as the proposed building may overshadow the AC Marriott Hotel.

Ms. Newell said she liked the images for Block G a little bit more than those for Block F but overall she liked the architectural design considerations.

The Chair asked the applicant if the Commission had provided enough direction and answered all the questions to which the applicant responded that this meeting was perfectly wonderful.

Mr. Fishman asked to address the seven-story building. He said he did not have a fundamental problem but it should be a unique building. He referred to the Leveque Tower downtown as an example as it is certainly different from the other buildings downtown. Mr. Hunter agreed; he would love it if a large corporation went in there and their corporate logo would be great to make it more notable. Mr. Hunter confirmed the buildings would be roughly about the same height, even with the increased height of the grade.

The Chair invited anyone from the public that wished to speak in regard to this case. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Fox asked to make a few more comments. She referred to G2/3 and said if the applicant did not create an archway there, G3 could have an interesting architectural frontage as it would be so visible from the park across the street. She said she liked the L-shape of the hotel and liked the variety of massing elements.

Ms. Fox asked to refer to the inspirational photographs. She said the photo on the bottom, left-hand side is much more interesting than the bottom, right-hand side. She noted the projections, some of the walls, the transparency of the glass, and other materials found in the BSD. She said it was more interesting than typically seen in a lot of structures like that. She restated that the space between the parking garages could be an absolutely unbelievable space. She said Dale Drive is an important, district connector so the building elevations on Block F should have a notable presentation on the street. She asked the applicant what those elevations would be like and if they had any thoughts they had been considering.

Mr. Meyers said the first approach, F3 is to mask the F2 garage and have it be a discreet veil in front. The uniqueness of the building type, the conversation of the hotel is a breakdown of mass, material, and form. That is going to translate to these other buildings; they have not gone through the planning exercise to create the real form. He said being on Dale Drive will be different than being on the access drive. He indicated they are considering an outdoor garden and a roof terrace to get that activity to that corner, not just an amenity for the tenant but also for what is visible from two miles away. He said the whole community has branched to a greater vista. He said he can see it from I-270 and the Historic District. He said the rooftop bar on the AC Marriott Hotel can be seen from miles away and those kinds of effects are being considered here, too.

Ms. Fox said that was a great idea. She hears people talk all the time about Vaso, the rooftop bar. She said the variation of architecture is very important on the residential building. She said she liked the idea shown in some of the pictures of projections off the wall so there is interest in the street, whether that is balconies or the offices but not grid-like projections. She indicated that overhangs of awnings above the ground floors enables the pedestrian to feel warm and safe.

Mr. Wilson referred to the pictures for Block G; the bottom left is the most dramatic. He noted there is not a building like this yet in the whole development. Everything is pretty much a block shape, he said, but this becomes several pieces put together with different materials in it and brings a lot of design features to it. He said seven floors could be a win-win since some large corporations are looking for that to house all their employees under one roof.

The Chair said if there are no further comments, she thanked the applicant for coming forward and is looking for development in the near future.

3. Perimeter Center, Subarea E – McDonald’s Sign Modifications
18-035AFDP **6830 Perimeter Loop Road**
Amended Final Development Plan

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said this application is a proposal for the installation of a digital menu board sign for an existing McDonald’s restaurant located in Perimeter Center, Subarea E, which is northeast of the intersection of Avery-Muirfield Drive and Perimeter Loop Road. 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 is the final authority for this case and witnesses would have to be sworn in.

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

Logan Stang reminded the Commission the Amended Final Development Plan is the last stage in the Planned Unit Development process and is to allow for any modification to the approved Final Development Plan from August, 1995. He noted the graphic showed some of the dates from the original rezoning in 1988.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site along with the site plan. He pointed out the applicant requested to remove and replace the existing menu board sign with an approximately 18-square-foot digital menu board sign. He said the existing menu board sign is located along the northern edge of the building, adjacent to the drive-thru.

Mr. Stang presented a photograph of the existing conditions that included a view of the menu board for reference. He described the proposed sign as containing two digital screens that allow for the display of pre-set content with the ability to adjust light levels based on the surrounding ambient light. He said the

Held

October 22, 2018

Page 16 of 30

visiting and having discussions with the City residents. They want people to be able to vote informed, and understand the benefits that Issue 5 will bring not only to the School system but to the greater community. He appreciates the comments made at City Council's October 8 meeting. He has received positive feedback from many people who watched the meeting. He congratulated Vice Mayor Amorose Grooms on her son's Dublin Jerome Men's Golf team state championship!

Scott Melody, Dublin Board of Education President, on behalf of the Board of Education expressed appreciation to City Council for their comments in support of the Schools at the last Council meeting and for the Resolution of Support tonight. The Board appreciates their leadership in the City and their support of Schools. They look forward to continued partnership between the two entities.

Vote on the Resolution: Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Grooms, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.

OTHER

- **Basic Plan – Bridge Park Block F – (Case#18-060BPR)**
- **Basic Plan – Bridge Park Block G – (Case#18-061BPR)**

Ms. Husak stated that she would present the information on adjacent Bridge Park Block F and Block G together. Council's actions related to the respective Blocks will be handled separately. City Council members are asked to review and make determinations on the Basic Plan applications in accordance with the Bridge Street District (BSD) zoning regulations. Under these provisions, all projects involving development agreements require Basic Plan Review by City Council, who will then direct the review of the final Development Plan and Site Plan applications to City Council, the Planning and Zoning Commission, or the Administrative Review Team.

- The two blocks are north and south of Bridge Park Avenue, east of Mooney, and Dale Drive is adjacent on the east side. Five blocks have either been constructed or are under construction.
- The actions requested of Council are:
 - Six waivers for F Block and 4 waivers for G Block
 - Approval of the Basic Plans for each Block. Both have seven conditions recommended. Both were recommended for approval by the Administrative Review Team (ART) and both have had informal review by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC).
 - Determination of the required reviewing body for any future applications for these two blocks.

Basic Plan – Bridge Park Block F – (Case#18-060BPR)

Block F Application

The application is for a ±2.31-acre development containing three new buildings with office space, restaurant space, a hotel, parking garage and open space located on the south side of Bridge Park Avenue, between Dale Drive to the east and Mooney Street to west and north of Banker Drive.

- The northernmost building would be a hotel with an access drive for drop off, similar to what exists at the AC Hotel, which would be a private drive within this block.
- A parking garage would be located in the center of the block, with a residential liner that is also intended to be hotel use on the east and north side.
- An office building would be located on the southern portion of the block, similar to that on Block A, and would likely be addressed later in the Final Site Plan.
- The applicant has provided some massing diagrams, but this is the Basic Plan Review stage, and detail is not required at this step.
- Some architectural character images have been provided. They have been working with a different architectural team for Blocks F and G. They are providing complementary but different characteristics for these two blocks.
- Open space – The applicant has provided what is typically seen at this stage. More detail will be shown with the Final Site Plan. Some detail of the landscaping of the spaces is shown. PZC has encouraged the applicant to consider provision of more green in the open spaces.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARNETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

October 22, 2018

Page 17 of 30

The waivers and conditions that Council is asked to approve include:

Approve the 6 Waivers:

- 1) Building Types – Incompatible Building Types (Building F2)
- 2) Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (Building F1)
- 3) Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (Building F3)
- 4) Building Types – Maximum Ground Story Height (hotel) (Building F1)
- 5) Building Types – Entry Location for Parking within Building (Building F2)
- 6) Site Development Standards – Parking Structure Design: Entrance and Exit Lanes (Building F2)

Approve the Basic Plan with 7 Conditions:

- 1) That Building F3 be located within the required building zone and comply with the front property line coverage requirement to the maximum extent possible, for verification with the Site Plan Review;
- 2) That Building F2/F3 be relocated within the required building zone of 5 feet to 25 feet for Parking Structures, for verification with the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the proposed patio space and seating areas located between the existing tree grates in the Bridge Park Avenue right-of-way and the façade of Building F1 be revised to provide the minimum 12 feet of clear sidewalk width;
- 4) That the applicant provide a Parking Plan with the Site Plan Review to the satisfaction of the Planning Division;
- 5) That the applicant continues working with staff to ensure the private access drive located between Building's F1 & F2/F3 can accommodate appropriate pedestrian circulation to the satisfaction of the Engineering & Planning Divisions;
- 6) That the applicant provide all final details regarding open space and site development standards with the Site Plan Review;
- 7) That the applicant continues to refine architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review.

ART has reviewed and recommends Council approval.

Determine the required reviewing body determination for future Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review applications (CC, PZC, or ART).

Council Discussion:

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she has a number of concerns:

- In regard to the height of hotel - is the height waiver requested in order to have six stories?

Ms. Husak stated that the building is actually permitted to be that height. The additional height is requested for the ground story. The Code permits a maximum of 16 feet. Their plan is up to 20 feet in a certain area that has a restaurant space.

Mr. Reiner inquired if the extra height is requested in the lobby area.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development, 6640 Riverside Drive, stated that the 20-foot ground story height is actually very similar to what exists in the B and C Blocks. In those blocks, there is about an eight foot difference from the east to the west side of the building, in terms of topography. They don't want the building to be too tall, but want to make sure that the first floor is usable throughout its entirety.

Mr. Reiner stated that Council had a previous extensive discussion on that matter with the AC Hotel, and Council granted a waiver to create a dramatic effect and more interesting hotel, and it worked – it is a good-looking lobby.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes continued:

- She has some concerns about the F4 office building, primarily because most of the greenspace is clustered around the edges of a building that is not yet designed. The greenspace is being calculated for a building that when completed may need a significant change in the greenspace.
- She received no images or design details for this building. It really isn't possible to lay out a portion of a block that doesn't have a building on it – how can we do a basic plan review for a block that doesn't have all of its building? What happens

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form B101

October 22, 2018

Page 18 of 30

Held

in that space will profoundly impact the balance of the block in terms of adjacent, compatible uses, etc.

- It was also indicated that the Parking Garage would not need any additional exits because it was unlikely all would exit at a single point in time. With all of the events that are anticipated to be scheduled in Bridge Park over time, those garages are going to empty at the same time with relative frequency. There may be hazards related to having only one exit from a parking structure of that type. She does not view that waiver favorably. There is an entire block that can be designed to permit another exit from this building. If it is designed creatively, there would be the opportunity to provide an exit for it.
- What is the name of the street that is adjacent to the hotel opposite Bridge Park Avenue, to the south?

Ms. Husak responded that an unnamed private drive is proposed there.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired if a private drive is being provided here.

Ms. Husak responded that is the proposal, which is the same condition as at the AC Hotel. The portion of Mooney near the A1 Office Building is private, as well.

- Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that we are artificially pinching that site down over there. It is difficult to lay out anything for the F4 building. Is it possible to approve a partial block versus approving a whole block at one time?

Ms. Husak responded that Council could opt to conduct Basic Site Plan approvals for each of the buildings for which we have details.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated it would likely need some private roadway access between F2 and F4 buildings, or some type of connector. She assumes the parking garage is designed to facilitate parking for this potential office building.

Ms. Husak asked Mr. Hunter to provide details about the proposed parking. In terms of a connector, she does not believe that the Engineering division would be in favor of breaking that block up more for vehicular use.

Mr. Hunter stated that for these two blocks in particular, we have more information about parking ratios and parking provided, based on the existing B and C Blocks. We are seeing evidence of being over parked in those two blocks and by a fairly significant amount. He and Mr. Starr have been on site, and have taken 25 different samples at different times, including during the Farmers Market, and at times when the restaurants were full, to gain a good understanding of how the parking is being utilized. Block C is 100% occupied -- the offices are now built out with the exception of about 6,000 square feet in Building C3; the residential units are largely occupied; and all the restaurants are completed. With a fully occupied Block, the greatest number of occupied parking spaces they counted at one time was 373. That left 506 unoccupied spaces, which was a wakeup call. A significant investment was made to build these garages to support the development. They have approached Blocks F and G with the intent of taking advantage of the existing parking, knowing that as the plan proceeds to Final Site Plan, a careful analysis will be necessary to make certain, from both the City's and the developer's standpoint, that there is sufficient parking. They do not want to build office or retail space that isn't supported with parking, as the spaces would not be leased. In the past, at the Basic Plan stage, the plan was more developed than was necessary because there weren't as many of these bigger questions. In this case, with the Basic Plan they wanted to focus on the layouts, building uses and sizes, specifically of the garages. If they were to build garages to support these large office buildings or the hotel to zoning standards, they would end up with a much larger garage on both the F Block and the G Block and much less investment in the Office space or the Hotel space. They do not believe that would benefit anyone. That is what is driving many of the decisions on these blocks.

Ms. De Rosa inquired what has changed from the original estimates to make the costs off by 50% or more.

Mr. Hunter responded that parking is an art and a science, and it is difficult, especially today. It is hard to understand the "Uber factor." Additionally, this site is well-connected with bikepaths and sidewalks. Zoning Codes were written for very specific uses. With Office space, typically the formula is four cars per 1,000 square feet, which equates to 250 square feet per person. The formulas worked for more suburban locations where there was not significant sharing of parking occurring. The Bridge Street District Code already took shared parking into consideration and lowered some of the numbers. When

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

October 22, 2018

Page 19 of 30

the B and C blocks were developed, they believed the amount of parking made sense; Office, for example was not four cars per 1,000, but three cars per 1,000. Similarly, parking for the other uses was a little lower than would have been included with a development ten years ago. However, we were unable to fully grasp what the situation would be when it was fully built. Now it is built, and now there is a block that is nearly 100% complete. Day after day, they are seeing entire floors of parking spaces that are largely unused. It makes no sense to continue to build parking garages, as the anticipation is that the use will decrease as we continue to see ride sharing and smart cars. A transition is occurring in transportation that will result in less parking spaces, not more.

Mr. Keenan stated that he and his wife visit the area frequently, and they park at the garage across from Cap City even when their destination is the AC Hotel. They want to enjoy the walk and the environment. He believes others are following the same strategy, selecting parking that isn't necessarily across from their destination.

Mr. Hunter responded that F Block could be a similar example. B Block isn't as occupied as C Block, so it will take more time to understand how many extra parking spaces will be there. However, B Block will likely have the same level of parking space usage as C Block. It is positioned well to support F Block, and C Block is set up well to support G Block.

Ms. Fox stated that at the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) meeting:

- Concern was expressed about the drive. There will be more Uber rides and autonomous vehicles, and there was a sense that this component was underdeveloped. The area does not provide adequate stacking for cars dropping off at the hotel. If the Dublin connector vehicle becomes a reality and runs are made through this area, there are spaces to stack six cars only. PZC expressed concern as to whether there is sufficient transit mobility provided through this narrow area.

Mr. Hunter stated that there are six stackable spaces in front of the hotel entry. The road that runs through the District is the typical two-way width, but without the parallel parking spaces on either side.

Ms. Fox stated that six cars stacked in this location would block traffic; cars will be waiting to pull up. Other than the six stacking spaces, there is no other place to park in front of the hotel.

Mr. Hunter stated that the six vehicles would fit without extending into the drive aisle. There is an entrance to the B Block garage directly across from that curbcut to that access drive. The AC Hotel has approximately six spaces, as well, but he has never seen six cars lined up.

Ms. Fox inquired if the hotel has a valet or concierge service out front.

Mr. Hunter responded that it does not.

- The Commission discussed the northwest corner, where the restaurant is, as being a significant intersection corner. In spite of its strong position in the area, it only has a patio on one side, and really doesn't do much for the west side of the street. She asked Mr. Hunter to respond. She is referring to Building F1.

Mr. Hunter stated that the F1 hotel building was pulled a little further away from the right-of-way than some of the other buildings, such as the B3 building that is directly to the west of this building. That building is much closer to the right-of-way than this one. There are many more steps as one moves up Bridge Park Avenue, but it is a subtle transition. With the F1 building site, they have reduced the number of steps in order to make the transitions less subtle, which will create opportunity for interest. Between the restaurant and the hotel, they can introduce more landscaping than they have had, but they can also introduce larger, more impactful public and private spaces that are on our side of the right-of-way.

Ms. Fox inquired how much space was increased in the right-of-way. Are these spaces private or public?

Mr. Hunter responded that they considered integrating the public and private spaces, because there is sufficient space to do so. Neither the hotel nor the restaurant need all of it. If the integration is successful, it shouldn't be possible to tell the difference.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

October 22, 2018

Page 20 of 30

Held

Ms. Fox inquired the width of the seating area—how far off Bridge Park Avenue? Mr. Hunter responded that it would be 12-14 feet from the ROW, but it changes somewhat along the street. On the B and C Blocks, the greatest width is six to eight feet. Ms. Fox stated that PZC made some suggestions about looking at this private area as a window view of the area. Would it be possible to enhance that so it does not consist only of a tree-lined green but is similar to a little oasis? On Corner D, there is a little café patio area. Have they given any more thought as to how they might utilize that space and improve the way it functions for those who are staying or walking through? It is a very narrow space, and there was concern about the parking and drop-off area. Mr. Hunter responded that it does feel a little narrow. However, we don't want it to be too wide, as we want it to feel a little different from all of the other streetscape. Sometimes the best spaces can be narrow or tall, if they are done right. That effort will need attention to detail and materials. That is one of the reasons there is more greenspace here. The space between C3 and C4, behind Ram is very lush. It should not feel like a throughway; it needs to feel like its own experience -- special to the uses that line it and not just a way to get to the B Block garage faster.

Ms. Fox stated that what seems to be missing in these green spaces is unique pockets that provide an opportunity for a guitar or jazz player; they are not just a walkable view, but spaces with a more unique identity in the greenspace, which would attract a different kind of activity. There is that opportunity here, even though it is a drop-off point, for a more unique type of space and activity

Mr. Hunter stated that on the other side of the corner is a much larger space that is intended for such purposes, and that kind of space also exists between Cap City and Fado. One more such space could be added, but no more than that should be created. Discussion about how to program these spaces will occur in the Final Development Stage. He noted that in D Block, there is a bocce ball court between the D1 and D2 buildings. That area will be unique and will draw usage.

Ms. Fox inquired if the size of the F1 building was established, or is there possibility of movement for it, if a deeper space or carve out on a corner was desired. Mr. Hunter responded that the F1 building, the hotel, is set. It is necessary to determine that building early, due to the approval process with Marriott. The building size is driven largely by the room sizes on the floors above. The first floor does extend a little, particularly at the back of the building. That building is the least flexible in the plan. The F4 building could be many different shapes. At this point, it is a basic shape, which will evolve later, determined primarily by the market.

Ms. Fox asked Ms. Husak to remind Council of staff's concerns that were shared with PZC, such as how the streets tie into the building fronts.

Ms. Husak responded that one of their main concerns, which is reflected in one of the conditions, was that while the through movement from a vehicular and drop-off standpoint is important, they also recognize that there will be significant crossing of that drive by people coming from/returning to their vehicles or people renting the rooms on that side. They are working with the applicant to get it closer to what exists with the AC hotel, which appears to work well. She cannot recall any other issues that staff mentioned at PZC.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired:

- What is envisioned for this private drive on the drop-off side of the hotel, opposite this intersection on Dale Drive. This intersection appears to be very close to Bridge Park Avenue – what is that distance?

Ms. Husak responded that is approximately 120 feet.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes continued:

- Where will deliveries be made for this hotel?

Mr. Hunter responded that there are a couple spaces. There is drop-off space at the entry, which is very close to the delivery location at the back of Healthspot. There are spaces on Mooney Street that could be assigned, just west of there on the other side of the restaurant space. This is similar to Longshore Street, where there are parking spaces

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 8101

Held

October 22, 2018

Page 21 of 30

that can be marked. This is preferable to creating large loading zones that remain empty other than certain times of the day.

- o Where is the trash pickup?

Mr. Hunter responded that the trash pickup is tucked in the corner of F2.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired if the intent is that all of the trash from this hotel be taken across the street to the parking garage.

Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively. It is similar to what is presently occurring at Cap City. Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that is not working very well. She is there often, and every time someone has been parked in the street and someone is trying to take trash across the street, all while people are trying to move through the area. She would prefer a different solution.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she would caution against presenting Blocks F and G together. Reading from the PZC meeting minutes, which is how she arrived at her first question:

"Mr. Hunter stated the F4 office building will not be considered until the future. He explained the reason the applicant is requesting a waiver for a 7-story building is due to market forces. He reported there are 150,000 – 2000,000 square foot office users out there that want to be in Bridge Park and currently cannot be accommodated."

Is that testimony related to building F4?

Ms. Husak responded that it is not. It could be a typo in the minutes, but that is not what the plans or the analysis have shown.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that is why doing these two blocks together make it very difficult to separate the items. It is very difficult when applications are co-mingled.

- o Again, she is concerned about the delivery area. She understands that it isn't desirable to put large delivery zones in front of every building, but it is essential to put a delivery zone on every block. She does not see a delivery zone on this block, but she is viewing a small image. Perhaps there is such a zone on an adjacent block? It isn't referenced in any of the discussion. We need to make sure every block has a delivery option that is reasonable for everything in proximity to eliminate the need for UPS, FedEx and Uber drivers to stop in the middle of the street and disrupt traffic. She wants to ensure that on this block that is achieved.
- o This is a fairly large garage. She believes two exits are appropriate, or perhaps an entry could be modified into an exit for event times. There are a number of garages downtown Columbus where that occurs at certain times of the day – entry is blocked off during that period of time. She is not suggesting that occur here, but it is an option.
- o For the F4 building, it is difficult for her to approve a Basic Site Plan when the uses are unknown. The way all these services are handled is important.
- o She is concerned with the finishes. She travels for work, and these images look like every Residence Inn she has visited across the country. She was hoping for something more special, because this is located on Bridge Park Avenue – the best street in the District, other than Riverside Drive itself. In most of what is proposed, white panels and off-color brick are applied in a variety of ways. Bridge Park Avenue deserves better than that.

Ms. Fox stated that she believes PZC was shown different images at their meeting that were more unique.

Mr. Hunter stated that the two blocks were combined into one discussion at the PZC meeting. There was discussion about how the G Block images were more appealing than the F Block images.

Ms. De Rosa inquired if the footprint is complete for this building, what does the design look like?

Mr. Hunter indicated that their design architect will respond.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

October 22, 2018

Page 22 of 30

Chris Myers, Myers and Associates, stated the Marriott process is very lengthy, so the plan that is seen is fairly well developed, although there is room for adjustment based on the comments. The images show combinations of some of the exterior finishes, but the G Block images also apply. Materiality and uniqueness is the design direction. Their development of the hotel in their presentation of the building design will reflect that. Ms. De Rosa inquired if the footprint is completed, why can't that be shown. Mr. Hunter responded that although the footprint is done, that doesn't mean the building is designed yet.

Ms. De Rosa stated that the footprint has much to do with what the exterior shaping will be.

Mr. Hunter indicated that is true, but these are all representative images. The footprint, which indicates how the rooms are laid out, must be completed early in the process, but there is still opportunity for changes in massing and they can still change materials. For example, in early discussion with Marriott, one of their notes on the drawings was "no brick". Everything is to be smooth-faced finishes. His response was that in Dublin that wouldn't be permitted; there would need to be more flexibility. Although they are in the process, there is no building design that can be shown yet. That is part of the goal of this discussion – to obtain Council's feedback on what they like and don't like. They want to make sure everything is understood before proceeding further.

Vice Mayor Groomes inquired if there is a building yet for F4.

Mr. Hunter responded that there is no building design yet.

Vice Mayor Groomes stated that there is much left to do, and the time is late. At this point, she is not comfortable approving this Basic Site Plan given some of these unanswered questions about loading zones. That is part of the Basic Site Plan review, and once the plan is passed on by Council, the opportunity is gone. Assuming this plan will be passed on to the Planning and Zoning Commission, she is unwilling to approve the Plan as it is and limit PZC's ability to alter it. That may be the case for the developer, as well. Are there things that Mr. Hunter would like to share with Council that are not included in these documents that might answer the questions that Council has asked? Mr. Hunter responded that they approached this at a basic level, setting lots and blocks. The F4 building is Office use, but although the use is known, there is no building design yet. If that use were to change, it would be necessary to bring the plan back for City review. The plan they have presented to Council reflects their best understanding of where the market is leading them, and how that can be supported with the parking and the street networks. It is not dissimilar with what occurred with the A Block office building. They are fully aware that if anything should change, it would be necessary to bring the plan back to Council. If the plan remains the same, they could move forward.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the difficulty with setting the lots and blocks is the access points. If we set these lots and blocks and we want other entrances to the parking garage, that ability is limited because the access road will be on the side that is servicing the hotel rather than having a service loop there that isn't interconnected. They won't be able to have roadway access on the other side of this parking garage between it and the office building, because it isn't desirable to break up the blocks to that degree. The lots and blocks are fundamental because it determines access and layout, more than it is uses. Lots and blocks focus on far more than uses.

Mr. Hunter stated that in terms of the street network and specifically the road between the garage and the office building, if they were to put a road between them, one building would be surrounded by four streets. This is not in keeping with the way they have developed Bridge Park and would begin to break up both Mooney and Dale streets. Between Banker and Bridge Park Avenue, there would be two more curb-cuts and potentially three, counting the entrances to the parking garage, as well – it would really break things up. That is the reason they arrived at this plan, which is what they consider to be the best solution. If Council is not comfortable, for example, with a single exit out of the parking garage, there are ways to accommodate that. It is acceptable not to have that waiver approved. However, the reason for the way it is currently is due to grade changes and the difficulty in making ramps align. There is likely a way to accomplish this differently. If there are waivers Council does not support, they will continue to work through the design.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 61 Q1

Held

October 22, 2018

Page 23 of 30

Mr. Reiner suggested reviewing the list of waivers, which is what has been requested. [Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes reviewed the list of Waivers and Conditions, noting any concerns.]

Mayor Peterson stated that the issues have been identified and will need to be resolved. These relate to entrance and exit in Waivers #5 and #6.

Mayor Peterson moved to approve Waivers #1 through #4:

1. Building Types – Incompatible Building Types (Building F2)
2. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (Building F1)
3. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (Building F3)
4. Building Types – Maximum Ground Story Height (Building F1)

Ms. Fox seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes.

Mayor Peterson moved to disapprove Waivers #5 and #6:

5. Building Types – Entry Location for Parking within Building (Building F2)
6. Site Development Standards – Parking Structure Design: Entrance and Exit Lanes (Building F2)

Mr. Reiner seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes.

Mayor Peterson moved to approve the Basic Plan with a modified Condition 5 and an additional Condition 8:

1. That Building F3 be located within the required building zone and comply with the front property line coverage requirement to the maximum extent possible, for verification with the Site Plan Review;
2. That Building F2/F3 be relocated within the required building zone of 5 feet to 25 feet for Parking Structures, for verification with the Site Plan Review;
3. That the proposed patio space and seating areas located between the existing tree grates in the Bridge Park Avenue right-of-way and the façade of Building F1 be revised to provide the minimum 12 feet of clear sidewalk width;
4. That the applicant provide a Parking Plan with the Site Plan Review to the satisfaction of the Planning Division;
5. That the applicant continues working with staff to ensure the private access drive located between Building's F1 and F2/F3 can accommodate appropriate pedestrian circulation and other types of mobility and transportation options to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Planning Divisions;
6. That the applicant provide all final details regarding open space and site development standards with the Site Plan Review;
7. That the applicant continues to refine architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review; and,
8. That the applicant address deliveries and trash removal to address the concerns raised at City Council's review of the Basic Plan.

Ms. Fox seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.

Mayor Peterson moved to designate the Planning and Zoning Commission as the required reviewing body for future Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review applications for Bridge Park Block F.

Ms. Alutto seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.