



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 7, 2018 | 6:30 pm

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

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

Proposal: Development of four mixed-use buildings in Block D of the Bridge Park development, including approximately 120,000 square feet of office space, 45,000 square feet of retail space, 35,000 square feet of restaurant space, 186 residential units and 671 garage parking spaces on 5.3 acres, zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive.

Request: Review and approval of a Development and Site Plan under provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.026.

Applicant: Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan.

Planning Contact: Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-007

MOTION#1: Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Wilson seconded, to approve 33 Waivers, because they meet all applicable review criteria.

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



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

1. **BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D** **PID: 273-012703**
18-007SPR/DP/CU **Site Plan Review/Development Plan/Conditional Use**
 - 7) 153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(a) – Vertical Transitions Vertical transition shall occur at inside corners.
Request: To allow fiber cement panel and aluminum metal tile transitions at the same plane for Building D3 on the north elevation; and thin brick and fiber cement panel transitions on the same plane for Building D4/D5 on the north, south, and east elevations on the fifth floor.
 - 8) 153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(b) – Multiple Vertical Materials. Where proposed, the 'heavier' material in appearance shall be incorporated below the 'lighter' material.
Request: To allow for tongue and groove wood siding below brick on the north, south, and west elevations of Building D4/D5.
 - 9) 153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(c) – Transitions of Same Material. Transitions between different colors of same material shall occur at locations deemed architecturally appropriate.
Request: To allow for brick colors transition horizontally on the same plane between on the 3rd through 5th stories on Building D2 All Elevations; brick colors transition vertically on the same plane between the 1st and 2nd stories on Building D3 North, South and East Elevations; and brick colors transition vertically on the same plane between 1st and 2nd stories on Building D4/D5 East and North Elevations.
 - 10) 153.062 – Building Types (F)(3)(a) – Entrance Design. All principal entrances are to be at a pedestrian scale, effectively address the street and be given prominence on the façade through the use of architectural features.
Request: To allow the design of the proposed principal entrance to Building D3, to not be prominently articulated/differentiated from other entrances through architectural features.
 - 11) 153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(d) – Windows. Windows may be wood, anodized aluminum, metal-clad or vinyl-clad wood, steel, or fiberglass.
Request: To allow for composite frame windows in Buildings D3 and D4/D5.
 - 12) 153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(f) – Windows. Windows within masonry walls shall have architecturally appropriate lintels and sills.
Request: To allow for no lintels or sills within masonry walls on Buildings D1 and D2.
 - 13) 153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows. Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one by four trim or brick mould casing.
Request: To allow for no trim or casing for fiber cement walls in Building D3; and a projecting precast concrete sill for windows in fiber cement siding walls on Building D4/D5.
 - 14) 153.062 (O)(5)(a)(1) Mixed Use Building Type. Building Siting. Front Property Line Coverage. Minimum 95% front property line coverage required.
Request. Buildings D1, D2 to be 44% at Riverside Drive.
 - 15) 153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(a)(1) – Front Required Building Zone. 0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 5-25 feet.
Request: To allow ±3 feet for Building D5.
 - 16) 153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) – Required Build Zone Treatment. Patio or streetscape permitted treatments.
Request: Landscaping proposed at south RBZ for Building D1.
 - 17) 153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(a)(1) – Corner Side Required Building Zone. Corner side permitted between 5-25 feet.
Request: To allow ±0.7 feet for Building D5.





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 7, 2018 | 6:30 pm

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

1. **BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D** **PID: 273-012703**
18-007SPR/DP/CU **Site Plan Review/Development Plan/Conditional Use**
 - 18) 153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(2) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage. Maximum of 85% lot coverage.
Request: To allow for $\pm 96\%$ impervious lot coverage for Buildings D1 and D2; $\pm 93\%$ for Building D3; and $\pm 98\%$ for Building D4 and D5.
 - 19) 153.065 – Required Loading Spaces (B)(7)(c)(1) and 153.065 (B)(7)(c)(1) – Number Required. The number of spaces is based on the size of the principal structure. Two spaces are required.
Request: Allow for no loading space directly adjacent to Building D1.
 - 20) 153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (O)(12)(a)(3) – Entry for Parking. Rear, side, corner side facades on non-principal frontage streets.
Request: Allow for entry on front façade (Tuller Ridge Drive) for Building D5.
 - 21) 153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (O)(12)(a)(3) – Access for Parking. Access to be provided from an alley or service street.
Request: Allow for access on street for Building D5.
 - 22) 153.065 – Parking and Loading (B)(5)(a)(2) – Parking Structure Design. Double entrance and exit lanes shall be no wider than 24 feet at the street right-of-way.
Request: Allow for width of south entrance/exit lanes to be ± 56 feet for Building D5.
 - 23) 153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (B)(5)(a)(4) – Number on Frontages. On non-principal frontage streets, only one entrance and one exit lane shall be permitted for each 200 feet of frontage.
Request: Allow for two entrance and two exit lanes on Tuller Ridge Drive for Building D5.
 - 24) 153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency. Minimum ground story transparency of 70%.
Request: Building D1: to allow no less than $\pm 53\%$ transparency on the east (Longshore Street), $\pm 59\%$ on the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, and $\pm 53\%$ on the west (Riverside Drive) elevation;
Building D3: no less than $\pm 30\%$ on the north (John Shields Parkway) elevation, $\pm 31\%$ on the east (Mooney Street) elevation, and $\pm 28\%$ on the south (Larimer Street) elevation and;
Building D4: no less than $\pm 21\%$ on east (Mooney Street) elevation, $\pm 33\%$ on south (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, and $\pm 31\%$ on north (Larimer Street) elevation.
 - 25) 153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Upper Story Transparency. Minimum street façade upper story transparency of 30%.
Request: To allow for a transparency of $\pm 24\%$ on the north elevation of Building D4.
 - 26) 153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments. Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet.
Request: Building D1: to allow more than ± 101 feet on the west elevation, ± 60 feet on the south elevation, ± 60 feet on the east elevation, ± 60 feet on the north elevation;
Building D2: to allow no more than ± 61 feet and ± 134 feet on the west elevation, ± 58 feet on the north elevation; ± 61 feet on the south elevation, and ± 157 feet on the east elevation;
Building D3: to allow no more than ± 51 feet on the south elevation and ± 52 feet on the east elevation;
Building D4: to allow no more than ± 63 feet on the north elevation; and
Building D5: to allow no more than ± 63 feet on the north elevation.
 - 27) 153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(3) and 153.065(I)(4)(b)– Street Façade: Principal Entrance Location. Principal entrance to be located on Frontage Street Façade of Building.
Request: To allow principal frontage entrance to be located on Longshore Street for Building D2; on Larimer Street for Building D3; on Mooney Street for Building D4; and on west façade for Building D5.





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 7, 2018 | 6:30 pm

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

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

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

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 7, 2018 | 6:30 pm

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

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

MOTION #2: Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Conditional Use, because it is consistent with all the applicable review criteria, with no conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Conditional Use was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION #3: Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Open Space Fee in Lieu, because it is consistent with all the applicable review criteria.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Open Space Fee in Lieu was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION #4: Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Development Plan, because it is consistent with all the applicable review criteria, with no conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 7, 2018 | 6:30 pm

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

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

MOTION #5: Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Site Plan, because it is consistent with all the applicable review criteria, with nine conditions:

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

*Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying, agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Site Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Lori Burchett, AICP
Planner II



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The 33 Site Plan Waivers requested are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Motion and Vote

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

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

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

Request: Landscaping proposed at south RBZ for Building D1.

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

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

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

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

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

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

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

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

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

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



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, May 31, 2018

The Administrative Review Team made the following determinations at this meeting:

- 2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D** **PID: 273-012703**
18-007SPR-DP-CU **Site Plan and Development Plan Reviews**
Conditional Use
- Proposal: A mixed-use development for Block D of the Bridge Park Development, including four buildings with approximately 110,000 square feet of office space, 44,000 square feet of retail space, 35,500 square feet of commercial space, 186 residential units, and a parking garage with 671 spaces located on 5.3 acres.
- Location: Southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive.
- Request: Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for Site Plan and Development Plan Reviews and a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
- Applicant: Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan.
- Planning Contact: Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II.
- Contact Information: 614.410.4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us
- Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-007

REQUEST 1: ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTURES

Request for approval of nine Administrative Departures.

1. §153.062 (D)(4)(b) Roof Type ~ Tower Width: Required - The width of a tower shall not exceed its height; Requested – The south tower of Building D4/D5 is proposed at 12 feet wide, with the height at 11 feet.
2. §153.062 (O)(5)(a)(1) Mixed Use Building Type ~ Front Property Line Coverage: Required - Minimum 95% front property line coverage; Requested - Building D1 to be 92% at Tuller Ridge Drive.
3. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) ~ Front Required Building Zone: Required - 0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 10-20 feet; Requested - To provide ±16 feet at Riverside Drive for Building D2.
4. §153.062 (O)(5)(d)(4) Mixed Use Building Type ~ Façade Requirements. Vertical Increments: Required - Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet; Requested - Building D1 to be ±48 feet at two locations on the east elevation.
5. §153.062 (O)(12)(d)(4) Parking Structure Building Type ~ Façade Requirements - Vertical Increments: Required - Vertical increments shall be no greater than 30 feet; Requested - Building D5 to be ±33 feet on the south elevation and ±31 feet on the west elevation.





MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, May 31, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Donna Goss, Director of Development (Acting Chair); Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner/Chief Building Official; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; and Alan Perkins, Fire Plans Examiner.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Nichole Martin, Planner I; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Sierra Saumenig, Planning Assistant, and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Teri Umbarger, Brian Sell, and Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan; James Peltier, EMH&T. (Case 2).

Donna Goss called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm. She asked if there were any amendments to the May 17, 2018, meeting minutes. The minutes were approved as presented.

Ms. Goss noted the Minor Modifications that were deemed appropriate by the Planning Director.

1. Bridge Park, Building B4
2. Local Cantina
3. Bridge Park, Buildings B1 & B2
4. Z Cucina
5. Bridge Park, Building B2 (Sweetwater's)

Ms. Goss asked the ART if they had any issues or questions regarding the Minor Modifications. [There were none.]

DETERMINATION

**1. BSD-SCN – Penzone Patio
18-033MPR**

**6645 Village Parkway
Minor Project Review**

~~Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for a 430-square-foot patio and associated site improvements for an existing salon and spa, zoned Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood. She said the site is on the west side of Village Parkway, northwest of the roundabout with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.~~

~~Ms. Martin said the ART last reviewed this proposal May 17 and were concerned with the circulation outside of the patio; the grade change as it would apply to a walkway; and the operation of the mobile fire table.~~

~~Ms. Martin presented the aerial view of the site and the existing conditions as viewed from Village Parkway as well as a graphic to show the highlighted proposed patio location.~~

~~Ms. Martin presented an amended site plan that now includes the new walk around the corner of the patio that provides a connection to the existing walk around the perimeter of the building as well as a connection to the public right-of-way. This plan, she said, also included details of the landscape plan that showed a tree~~



and plantings to be relocated and the light bollard and trash receptacle that were to remain. She reported the applicant also provided the metal fence and post detail with two gates located near the building. She noted the proposed 430-square-foot patio to contain six moveable lounge chairs, two stationary benches, side tables, planters, a mobile fire table, and string lights overhead remain unchanged.

Ms. Goss asked Alan Perkins if he was up-to-date on this project as it was the Fire Marshal that attended the last review when there was concern about the operation and mobility of the fire table.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant coordinate with the Washington Township Fire Department to ensure safe seating with the operation of the fire pit; and
- 2) That the applicant provide verification the pedestrian path slope is in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) at Building Permitting.

Ms. Goss asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She called for a vote on a motion to approve the Minor Project Review with two conditions as stated above. Mr. Harpham motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and the Minor Project Review was approved.

RECOMMENDATION

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D
18-007SPR-DP-CU**

**PID: 273-012703
Site Plan and Development Plan Reviews
Conditional Use**

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for a mixed-use development for Block D of the Bridge Park Development, including four buildings with approximately 110,000 square feet of office space, 44,000 square feet of retail space, 35,500 square feet of commercial space, 186 residential units, and a parking garage with 671 spaces. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for Site Plan and Development Plan Reviews and a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site in context to the existing Bridge Park Development, the proposed Development Plan outlining the roadway network with building pads and lot configuration, for the four buildings the applicant is proposing for this site. She noted where Longshore Street bisects the site running north and south from Tuller Ridge Drive to John Shields Parkway and Larimer Street that connects from Mooney Street to Longshore Street.

Ms. Burchett reported that the Site Plan was informally reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission at their meeting on May 3, 2018. While the Commission was supportive overall, she said, there were comments regarding the pedestrian circulation around the pedestrian tunnel, the pedestrian experience along any blank walls at the street level and they expressed their preference of the private open space for Building D3 to be open and accessible to the public. Lastly, she reported the Commission appreciated the continuation of high-quality architecture.

While the Basic Plan has been approved, Ms. Burchett said, the applicant has furthered developed the architecture and site improvement details, which can all be found in the Planning Report.

Ms. Burchett began reviewing the nine Administrative Departures that were identified during the analysis with graphics that highlighted what she was referring to in regards to tower width, front property line coverage, required building zone, façade requirements, vertical increments, required change in roof plane, minimum primary façade materials, ground story height, and upper story transparency, noting the buildings which these departures corresponded.

Ms. Burchett then explained the 33 Waivers identified for the four buildings included in this proposal, which she represented on graphics to show the location of the Waivers. These included parapet wrapping, horizontal shadow lines, tower quantity, height, and location, permitted primary façade materials, vertical transitions, multiple vertical materials, transitions of same material, entrance design, window requirements, front property line coverage, front required building zone, required build zone treatment, corner side required building zone, lot coverage loading spaces, parking entry, access, and design, number of frontages, transparency, vertical increments, entrance location, number of entrances, horizontal façade divisions, primary materials, encroachments, and blank wall limitations.

Claudia Husak noted that Block A contained only three buildings and many Waivers were identified so 33 Waivers for four buildings is not out of line.

Ms. Burchett presented elevations of Building D4/5 and explained a Conditional Use is identified for portions of two unlined sides of the parking garage along Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive. She noted the building does contain commercial and residential liners for two full sides of the parking garage, however.

Ms. Burchett said a Fee-in-Lieu is requested for the 0.56 acres of off-site open space. She explained that per Code, open space is calculated based on the number of units and not the size of units. With the mix of residential unit sizes, this development contains several units, some of which are micro units under 500 square feet, which is a disproportional to other residential developments with larger units. Additionally, the proximity to public parks within 600 feet provides for usable, quality open space for the residents.

Ms. Burchett said the Development Plan Review is consistent with all applicable review criteria.

Ms. Burchett said there is a proposed Parking Plan to allow for 735 parking spaces where 1,087 spaces would be required and a Site Plan Review with eight conditions, which she reviewed:

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

Ms. Burchett noted that some of the conditions above are for basic Code requirements that were not specifically identified with submittal items would need to be confirmed at time of building permit. She said the applicants were present to answer any questions.

James Peltier, EMH&T asked for clarification on Condition #3. Ms. Burchett said she was referring to the loading area inside the garage. Aaron Stanford remarked that public spaces should not be used for loading/unloading.

In conclusion, Ms. Burchett recommended approval of nine Administrative Departures:

1. §153.062 (D)(4)(b) Roof Type ~ Tower Width: Required - The width of a tower shall not exceed its height; Requested – The south tower of Building D4/D5 is proposed at 12 feet wide, with the height at 11 feet.
2. §153.062 (O)(5)(a)(1) Mixed Use Building Type ~ Front Property Line Coverage: Required - Minimum 95% front property line coverage; Requested - Building D1 to be 92% at Tuller Ridge Drive.
3. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) ~ Front Required Building Zone: Required - 0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 10-20 feet; Requested - To provide ±16 feet at Riverside Drive for Building D2.
4. §153.062 (O)(5)(d)(4) Mixed Use Building Type ~ Façade Requirements. Vertical Increments: Required - Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet; Requested - Building D1 to be ±48 feet at two locations on the east elevation.
5. §153.062 (O)(12)(d)(4) Parking Structure Building Type ~ Façade Requirements - Vertical Increments: Required - Vertical increments shall be no greater than 30 feet; Requested - Building D5 to be ±33 feet on the south elevation and ±31 feet on the west elevation.
6. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) ~ Change in Roof Plane: Required - change at 80 feet; Requested - To allow no more than ±84 feet on the north and south elevations of Building D1.
7. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(5) ~ Minimum Primary Façade Materials: Required - 80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass; Requested:
Building D1: to allow no less than ±73% on the west façade, ±76% on the south façade, ±77% on the east façade, and ±74% on the north façade;
Building D2: no less than ±74% on the north façade, ±71% on the south façade;
Building D3: no less than ±61% on the south façade; and ±72% on the west façade; and,
Building D5: no less than ±78% on the west façade.
8. §153.062 – Height (b) ~ Ground Story Height: Required - The ground story shall be between 12 feet and 16 feet in height; Requested - To allow for a ground story height of no less than 10 feet at the east end of Building D3; no less than 10 feet at the east end and 17 feet on the west end of Building D4.
9. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) - Upper Story Transparency: Required - Minimum street façade upper story transparency of 30%; Requested - To allow for a transparency of ±27% on the east elevation of Building D4.

Ms. Burchett recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 33 Waivers:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(b) – Parapet Wrapping
Parapets shall wrap all sides of the building.
Request: To allow parapet not to be wrapped on all sides of Building D4/D5.
2. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Shadow Lines.
Parapets shall wrap all sides of the building.

Request: Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and to define the top of the parapet Buildings D1, D3, and D4/D5.

3. §153.062 (D)(4)(a) Roof Type Requirements - Tower Quantity.
Only one tower is allowed per building.
Request. Allow for three towers for Building D4/D5.
4. §153.062 (D)(4)(a) Roof Type Requirements and 153.062 (O)(5)(g)(12) - Tower Height.
Maximum height shall not exceed the height of an additional upper floor of the building to which the tower is applied. Maximum of 14 feet.
Request. Allow for north tower to be ±18 feet in height on Building D4/D5.
5. §153.062 (D)(4)(b) Roof Type Requirements. Tower Location.
Permitted on facades only at terminal vistas, corners at two principal frontage streets, and/or adjacent to an open space type.
Request. Allow for Building D4/D5 towers to not be located at a terminal vista Principal Frontage Street, or adjacent to an open space.
6. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(5) – Permitted Primary Façade Materials.
Facades not visible from Street. A combination of Primary and Secondary materials shall be used. Use of a secondary material for an entire façade is not permitted.
Request: To allow secondary materials on the west and south facades of Corridor Building D4; to allow the Thin Brick on Building D3; Thin Brick on Building D4; and Thin Brick on Building D5.
7. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(a) – Vertical Transitions
Vertical transition shall occur at inside corners.
Request: To allow fiber cement panel and aluminum metal tile transitions at the same plane for Building D3 on the north elevation; and thin brick and fiber cement panel transitions on the same plane for Building D4/D5 on the north, south, and east elevations on the fifth floor.
8. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(b) – Multiple Vertical Materials.
Where proposed, the 'heavier' material in appearance shall be incorporated below the 'lighter' material.
Request: To allow for tongue and groove wood siding below brick on the north, south, and west elevations of Building D4/D5.
9. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(c) – Transitions of Same Material.
Transitions between different colors of same material shall occur at locations deemed architecturally appropriate.
Request: To allow for brick colors transition horizontally on the same place between on the 3rd through 5th stories on Building D2 All Elevations; brick colors transition vertically on the same place between the 1st and 2nd stories on Building D3 North, South and East Elevations; and brick colors transition vertically on the same plane between 1st and 2nd stories on Building D4/D5 East and North Elevations.
10. §153.062 – Building Types (F)(3)(a) – Entrance Design.
All principal entrances are to be at a pedestrian scale, effectively address the street and be given prominence on the façade through the use of architectural features.
Request: To allow the design of the proposed principal entrance to Building D3, to not been prominently articulated/differentiated from other entrances through architectural features.

11. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(d) – Windows.
Windows may be wood, anodized aluminum, metal-clad or vinyl-clad wood, steel, or fiberglass.
Request: To allow for composite frame windows in Buildings D3 and D4/D5.
12. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(f) – Windows.
Windows within masonry walls shall have architecturally appropriate lintels and sills.
Request: To allow for no lintels or sills within masonry walls on Buildings D1 and D2.
13. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows.
Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one by four trim or brick mould casing.
Request: To allow for no trim or casing for fiber cement walls in Building D3; and a projecting precast concrete sill for windows in fiber cement siding walls on Building D4/D5.
14. §153.062 (O)(5)(a)(1) Mixed Use Building Type. Building Siting. - Front Property Line Coverage.
Minimum 95% front property line coverage required.
Request. Buildings D1, D2 to be 44% at Riverside Drive.
15. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(a)(1) – Front Required Building Zone.
0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 5-25 feet.
Request: To allow ± 3 feet for Building D5.
16. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) – Required Build Zone Treatment.
Patio or streetscape permitted treatments.
Request: Landscaping proposed at south RBZ for Building D1.
17. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(a)(1) – Corner Side Required Building Zone.
Corner side permitted between 5-25 feet.
Request: To allow ± 0.7 feet for Building D5.
18. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(2) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage.
Maximum of 85% lot coverage.
Request: To allow for $\pm 96\%$ impervious lot coverage for Buildings D1 and D2; $\pm 93\%$ for Building D3; and $\pm 98\%$ for Building D4 and D5.
19. §153.065 – Required Loading Spaces (B)(7)(c)(1) and 153.065 (B)(7)(c)(1) – Number Required.
The number of spaces is based on the size of the principal structure. Two spaces are required.
Request: Allow for no loading space directly adjacent to Building D1.
20. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (O)(12)(a)(3) – Entry for Parking.
Rear, side, corner side facades on non-principal frontage streets.
Request: Allow for entry on front façade (Tuller Ridge Drive) for Building D5.
21. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (O)(12)(a)(3) – Access for Parking.
Access to be provided from an alley or service street.
Request: Allow for access on street for Building D5.
22. §153.065 – Parking and Loading (B)(5)(a)(2) – Parking Structure Design.
Double entrance and exit lanes shall be no wider than 24 feet at the street right-of-way.

Request: Allow for width of south entrance/exit lanes to be ± 56 feet for Building D5.

23. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (B)(5)(a)(4) – Number on Frontages.
On non-principal frontage streets, only one entrance and one exit lane shall be permitted for each 200 feet of frontage.
Request: Allow for two entrance and two exit lanes on Tuller Ridge Drive for Building D5.
24. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency.
Minimum ground story transparency of 70%.
Request: Building D1: to allow no less than $\pm 53\%$ transparency on the east (Longshore Street), $\pm 59\%$ on the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, and $\pm 53\%$ on the west (Riverside Drive) elevation;
Building D3: no less than $\pm 30\%$ on the north (John Shields Parkway) elevation, $\pm 31\%$ on the east (Mooney Street) elevation, and $\pm 28\%$ on the south (Larimer Street) elevation and;
Building D4: no less than $\pm 21\%$ on east (Mooney Street) elevation, $\pm 33\%$ on south (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, and $\pm 31\%$ on north (Larimer Street) elevation.
25. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Upper Story Transparency.
Minimum street façade upper story transparency of 30%.
Request: To allow for a transparency of $\pm 24\%$ on the north elevation of Building D4.
26. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments.
Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet.
Request: Building D1: to allow more than ± 101 feet on the west elevation, ± 60 feet on the south elevation, ± 60 feet on the east elevation, ± 60 feet on the north elevation;
Building D2: to allow no more than ± 61 feet and ± 134 feet on the west elevation, ± 58 feet on the north elevation; ± 61 feet on the south elevation, and ± 157 feet on the east elevation;
Building D3: to allow no more than ± 51 feet on the south elevation and ± 52 feet on the east elevation;
Building D4: to allow no more than ± 63 feet on the north elevation; and
Building D5: to allow no more than ± 63 feet on the north elevation.
27. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(3) and 153.065(I)(4)(b) – Street Façade: Principal Entrance Location.
Principal entrance to be located on Frontage Street Façade of Building.
Request: To allow principal frontage entrance to be located on Longshore Street for Building D2; on Larimer Street for Building D3; on Mooney Street for Building D4; and on west façade for Building D5.
28. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(3) – Street Façade: Number of Entrances Required.
One entrance per 75 feet of façade minimum (3 entrances required).
Request. To allow 1 entrance on north (John Shields Parkway) façade, 2 entrances on east (Mooney Street) façade, 2 entrances on south (Larimer Street) for Building D3; 0 entrances on east (Mooney Street) elevation and 0 entrances on west (Longshore Street) elevation of Building D4; and no entrances on the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) façade of Building D5.
29. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(4) – Horizontal Façade Divisions.
On buildings 3 stories or taller, horizontal divisions are required within 3 feet of the ground story.
Request: To allow no horizontal façade divisions at east elevation of Building D2; all elevations on Building D3; all elevations on Building D4

30. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.
Request: Building D2: to allow no less than $\pm 70\%$ on the east façade and $\pm 50\%$ on the west façade;
Building D3: no less than $\pm 56\%$ on the north façade and;
Building D4: no less than $\pm 67\%$ on north façade, $\pm 69\%$ on east façade; $\pm 29\%$ on west façade.
31. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(a)(1) - Right-of-way Encroachments.
Awnings, canopies, eaves, patios, and projecting signs are permitted to encroach.
Request. To allow for a canopy to encroach on Building D5 on Longshore Street.
32. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Blank Wall Limitations (Street).
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.
Request. To allow for the middle portion of the south elevation on Building D3 to be a blank wall on ground story; and 2 areas on the north elevation and 2 areas on the east elevation of Building D4.
33. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(d)(1) – Street Façade Blank Wall Limitations.
No open area greater than 30% of a story façade, as measured from floor to floor, shall be windowless on the ground story and solid on the upper stories.
Request. To allow a maximum of $\pm 60\%$ of windowless area of the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) façade at ground story of Building D5.

Ms. Burchett recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use for portions of two unlined sides of the parking garage in Building D5 with no conditions.

Ms. Burchett recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Fee-in-Lieu of the Open Space requirement for the 0.56 acres of off-site open space.

Ms. Burchett recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan Review with no conditions.

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

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

Ms. Goss asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She called for a vote on a motion to approve nine Administrative Departures. Mr. Harpham had motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and all nine Administrative Departures were approved.

Ms. Goss called for a vote on a motion to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 33 Waivers. Mr. Harpham had motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and all of the 33 Waivers were recommended for approval.

Ms. Goss called for a vote on a motion to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Conditional Use for portions of two unlined sides of the parking garage in Building D5 with no conditions. Ms. Gilger had motioned, Mr. Harpham seconded, and the Conditional Use was recommended for approval. Ms. Goss called for a vote on a motion to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space for the 0.56 acres of off-site open space. Mr. Harpham had motioned, Mr. Krawetzki seconded, and the Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space was recommended for approval.

Ms. Goss called for a vote on a motion to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan Review. Mr. Harpham had motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and the Development Plan Review was recommended for approval.

Ms. Goss called for a vote on a motion to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Parking Plan to allow for 735 parking spaces where 1,087 spaces would be required and a Site Plan Review with eight conditions. Mr. Harpham had motioned, Mr. Krawetzki seconded, and the Parking Plan and the Site Plan Review were both recommended for approval.

INTRODUCTIONS

3. **BSD HC – Dublin Town Center Exterior Modifications 18-034ARB/MPR**

19 W. Bridge Street Minor Project Review

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for exterior modifications including siding and window replacements to an existing commercial building located within Historic Dublin. She said the site is southwest of the intersection of West Bridge Street and 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 Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Donna Goss reported she rec'd a letter from Tom Holton what modifications

Ms. Burchett...maintenance issues with wood siding on building. Applicant Proposed Hardi plank in same color and design.

Aaron Stanford asked what areas.

Ms. Goss changing siding. Ray why deterioration. Lb not revealed. Working with architect and not owner. Lb hardi has been used for other new projects. Not historic building. Harding not approved material hence the waiver would be needed of ART and ARB also want aluminum clad wood window. Has been approved other bldgs.. ch where? Lori biddies had used hardi plank and this window. 109 s riverview used a Pella wood window alum clad of historical character arb approved. And part of Z ldg. Ch historic bldg. on north High Street and ultimately told them to use a wood window to keep character.

Built 2001 so this is needed. Roof remain and stone remain. Ray Trouble across street with wood trim coming off.

Ms. Goss size of hardi plank will match. This would match condition when approved as PUD.

Ch from look and feel tell difference not being architect? Ray only time gets funky repeats in pattern too quickly. The sample provided – the striations are good. Touch is noticed only by tapping for sound. No trouble to recommend and leave for arb to decide.

Ray hardest part with windows is mullions. Wrap not cheap so protecting windows from weather. Good thing. Positive change. Shawn if mullions on inside will not be historic but lasts better. Arb to decide.

Ms. Goss currently all 4 pane window keep for consistency. How they do it is up to arb.

Aaron asked if across the street at bridge and high if they use hardi?

Goss Recommend individual lights. Safe home window.

Ms. Goss asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

4. **BSD SRN – Hen Quarter 18-040WR**

6628 Riverside Drive Waiver Review

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal to allow for the installation of operable sun shades at an existing tenant space in building C2 of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is northeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett...previously approved patio. Applicant proposal mentioned owner is interested in cover. Proposing vinyl screen at cap city. Specs do not exactly match up. More dialogue with applicant. Provided color of panes of vinyl and sample of sunshade. We would have less of a concern with later, only to be down during sunny weather. Panes is concern with staff. Staff had recommended a permitted material and pzc approved but with stringent requirements. Ch not same restaurateur. Cap City not complying with when shades up/down. Down to cap when vinyl is down and wind makes it bow outward and not attractive. Staff did not determine this was high quality material. Ray, add screen, then window, not patio but a building.

Lb review further with applicant.

Ray re recommended against. Pzc approved but trouble policing it. Remember to revisit at a later date (1 – 2 yrs?)

Ch applicant address? Design (hen) on western façade, how impacted by proposal. Shawn dark background of the hen design will disappear.

Alan deal with ___? Ray dealt with at Bldg Z. have to be listed as class A material. ART Generally concerned. Gilger too much building and not enough patio. Ch concerned with longevity. Vinyl part stretches. Ray transparency goes away.

Donna Goss asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] Thursday, June 7, 2018 – target Administrative Review Team recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their meeting on June 21, 2018.

**5. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block H
18-041WR**

**PIDs: 273-012751 & 273-012752
Waiver Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal to permit an alternative material on the exterior elevations as architectural detailing for Block H of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is southwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Dale Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett...has been approved. Request chg in material EIFIS was permit. Now want Fyton

Showed graphic for locations. Ch form new material in easier. Concerned with previous material longevity and maintenance. Look will be same. They showed where in ohio been used and standard in some areas.

Aaron photos of use? Ch woodlands at ballantrae used for gables vinyl accents permitted. Ray can get very detailed. Looks like wood. Medallions and stuff.

Shawn fades and yellows then have to paint. Ch ask applicant to address that. Ray asked for spec sheet. Aaron color of most of trim? Lb light beige? Heavier materials were gray. Ch applicant cannot get eifis to

be as needed. Ch inconsistent elevation drawings. lb ask to chg. Goss need clarity on where material will go and sample and specs. To make decision.

Donna Goss asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] ch reminder art very next wk, back to back. 5 wk mo.

ADJOURNMENT

Donna Goss asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 2:50 pm.

DRAFT

6. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) ~ Change in Roof Plane: Required - change at 80 feet; Requested - To allow no more than ±84 feet on the north and south elevations of Building D1.
7. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(5) ~ Minimum Primary Façade Materials: Required - 80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass; Requested:
Building D1: to allow no less than ±73% on the west façade, ±76% on the south façade, ±77% on the east façade, and ±74% on the north façade;
Building D2: no less than ±74% on the north façade, ±71% on the south façade;
Building D3: no less than ±61% on the south façade; and ±72% on the west façade; and,
Building D5: no less than ±78% on the west façade.
8. §153.062 – Height (b) ~ Ground Story Height: Required - The ground story shall be between 12 feet and 16 feet in height; Requested - To allow for a ground story height of no less than 10 feet at the east end of Building D3; no less than 10 feet at the east end and 17 feet on the west end of Building D4.
9. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) ~ Upper Story Transparency: Required - Minimum street façade upper story transparency of 30%; Requested - To allow for a transparency of ±27% on the east elevation of Building D4.

Determination: The nine Administrative Departures were approved.

REQUEST 2: SITE PLAN WAIVERS

Request for an approval recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 33 Site Plan Waivers:

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

6. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(5) – Permitted Primary Façade Materials.
Facades not visible from Street. A combination of Primary and Secondary materials shall be used. Use of a secondary material for an entire façade is not permitted.
Request: To allow secondary materials on the west and south facades of Corridor Building D4; to allow the Thin Brick on Building D3; Thin Brick on Building D4; and Thin Brick on Building D5.
7. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(a) – Vertical Transitions
Vertical transition shall occur at inside corners.
Request: To allow fiber cement panel and aluminum metal tile transitions at the same plane for Building D3 on the north elevation; and thin brick and fiber cement panel transitions on the same plane for Building D4/D5 on the north, south, and east elevations on the fifth floor.
8. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(b) – Multiple Vertical Materials.
Where proposed, the 'heavier' material in appearance shall be incorporated below the 'lighter' material.
Request: To allow for tongue and groove wood siding below brick on the north, south, and west elevations of Building D4/D5.
9. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(c) – Transitions of Same Material.
Transitions between different colors of same material shall occur at locations deemed architecturally appropriate.
Request: To allow for brick colors transition horizontally on the same place between on the 3rd through 5th stories on Building D2 All Elevations; brick colors transition vertically on the same place between the 1st and 2nd stories on Building D3 North, South and East Elevations; and brick colors transition vertically on the same plane between 1st and 2nd stories on Building D4/D5 East and North Elevations.
10. §153.062 – Building Types (F)(3)(a) – Entrance Design.
All principal entrances are to be at a pedestrian scale, effectively address the street and be given prominence on the façade through the use of architectural features.
Request: To allow the design of the proposed principal entrance to Building D3, to not been prominently articulated/differentiated from other entrances through architectural features.
11. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(d) – Windows.
Windows may be wood, anodized aluminum, metal-clad or vinyl-clad wood, steel, or fiberglass.
Request: To allow for composite frame windows in Buildings D3 and D4/D5.
12. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(f) – Windows.
Windows within masonry walls shall have architecturally appropriate lintels and sills.
Request: To allow for no lintels or sills within masonry walls on Buildings D1 and D2.
13. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows.
Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one by four trim or brick mould casing.
Request: To allow for no trim or casing for fiber cement walls in Building D3; and a projecting precast concrete sill for windows in fiber cement siding walls on Building D4/D5.

14. §153.062 (O)(5)(a)(1) Mixed Use Building Type. Building Siting. - Front Property Line Coverage.
Minimum 95% front property line coverage required.
Request: Buildings D1, D2 to be 44% at Riverside Drive.
15. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(a)(1) – Front Required Building Zone.
0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 5-25 feet.
Request: To allow ±3 feet for Building D5.
16. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) – Required Build Zone Treatment.
Patio or streetscape permitted treatments.
Request: Landscaping proposed at south RBZ for Building D1.
17. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(a)(1) – Corner Side Required Building Zone.
Corner side permitted between 5-25 feet.
Request: To allow ±0.7 feet for Building D5.
18. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(2) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage.
Maximum of 85% lot coverage.
Request: To allow for ±96% impervious lot coverage for Buildings D1 and D2; ±93% for Building D3;
and ±98% for Building D4 and D5.
19. §153.065 – Required Loading Spaces (B)(7)(c)(1) and 153.065 (B)(7)(c)(1) – Number Required.
The number of spaces is based on the size of the principal structure. Two spaces are required.
Request: Allow for no loading space directly adjacent to Building D1.
20. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (O)(12)(a)(3) – Entry for Parking.
Rear, side, corner side facades on non-principal frontage streets.
Request: Allow for entry on front façade (Tuller Ridge Drive) for Building D5.
21. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (O)(12)(a)(3) – Access for Parking.
Access to be provided from an alley or service street.
Request: Allow for access on street for Building D5.
22. §153.065 – Parking and Loading (B)(5)(a)(2) – Parking Structure Design.
Double entrance and exit lanes shall be no wider than 24 feet at the street right-of-way.
Request: Allow for width of south entrance/exit lanes to be ±56 feet for Building D5.
23. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (B)(5)(a)(4) – Number on Frontages.
On non-principal frontage streets, only one entrance and one exit lane shall be permitted for each 200 feet of frontage.
Request: Allow for two entrance and two exit lanes on Tuller Ridge Drive for Building D5.
24. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Upper Story Transparency.
Minimum street façade upper story transparency of 30%.
Request: To allow for a transparency of ±24% on the north elevation of Building D4.

25. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency.
Minimum ground story transparency of 70%.
Request: Building D1: to allow no less than $\pm 53\%$ transparency on the east (Longshore Street), $\pm 59\%$ on the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, and $\pm 53\%$ on the west (Riverside Drive) elevation;
Building D3: no less than $\pm 30\%$ on the north (John Shields Parkway) elevation, $\pm 31\%$ on the east (Mooney Street) elevation, and $\pm 28\%$ on the south (Larimer Street) elevation and;
Building D4: no less than $\pm 21\%$ on east (Mooney Street) elevation, $\pm 33\%$ on south (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, and $\pm 31\%$ on north (Larimer Street) elevation.
26. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments.
Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet.
Request: Building D1: to allow more than ± 101 feet on the west elevation, ± 60 feet on the south elevation, ± 60 feet on the east elevation, ± 60 feet on the north elevation;
Building D2: to allow no more than ± 61 feet and ± 134 feet on the west elevation, ± 58 feet on the north elevation; ± 61 feet on the south elevation, and ± 157 feet on the east elevation;
Building D3: to allow no more than ± 51 feet on the south elevation and ± 52 feet on the east elevation;
Building D4: to allow no more than ± 63 feet on the north elevation; and
Building D5: to allow no more than ± 63 feet on the north elevation.
27. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(3) and 153.065(I)(4)(b) – Street Façade: Principal Entrance Location.
Principal entrance to be located on Frontage Street Façade of Building.
Request: To allow principal frontage entrance to be located on Longshore Street for Building D2; on Larimer Street for Building D3; on Mooney Street for Building D4; and on west façade for Building D5.
28. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(3) – Street Façade: Number of Entrances Required.
One entrance per 75 feet of façade minimum (3 entrances required).
Request. To allow 1 entrance on north (John Shields Parkway) façade, 2 entrances on east (Mooney Street) façade, 2 entrances on south (Larimer Street) for Building D3; 0 entrances on east (Mooney Street) elevation and 0 entrances on west (Longshore Street) elevation of Building D4; and no entrances on the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) façade of Building D5.
29. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(4) – Horizontal Façade Divisions.
On buildings 3 stories or taller, horizontal divisions are required within 3 feet of the ground story.
Request: To allow no horizontal façade divisions at east elevation of Building D2; all elevations on Building D3; all elevations on Building D4.
30. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.
Request: Building D2: to allow no less than $\pm 70\%$ on the east façade and $\pm 50\%$ on the west façade;
Building D3: no less than $\pm 56\%$ on the north façade and;
Building D4: no less than $\pm 67\%$ on north façade, $\pm 69\%$ on east façade; $\pm 29\%$ on west façade.
31. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(a)(1) - Right-of-way Encroachments.
Awnings, canopies, eaves, patios, and projecting signs are permitted to encroach.
Request. To allow for a canopy to encroach on Building D5 on Longshore Street.

32. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Blank Wall Limitations (Street).
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.
Request. To allow for the middle portion of the south elevation on Building D3 to be a blank wall on ground story; and 2 areas on the north elevation and 2 areas on the east elevation of Building D4.
33. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(d)(1) – Street Façade Blank Wall Limitations.
No open area greater than 30% of a story façade, as measured from floor to floor, shall be windowless on the ground story and solid on the upper stories.
Request. To allow a maximum of ±60% of windowless area of the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) façade at ground story of Building D5.

Determination: The 33 Site Plan Waivers were recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission as part of the Site Plan Review.

REQUEST 3: CONDITIONAL USE

Request for a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use for portions of two unlined sides of the parking garage in Building D5 with no conditions.

Determination: The Conditional Use was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission as part of the Site Plan Review.

REQUEST 4: FEE-IN-LIEU

Request for a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Fee-in-Lieu of the Open Space requirement for the 0.56 acres of off-site open space.

Determination: The Fee-in-Lieu was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission as part of the Site Plan Review.

REQUEST 5: DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Request for a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan Review with no conditions.

Determination: The Development Plan Review was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

REQUEST 6: SITE PLAN REVIEW

Request for a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Parking Plan to allow for 735 parking spaces where 1,087 spaces would be required and the Site Plan Review with eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant not use highly reflective glass, spandrel, or heavily tinted glass to meet the minimum transparency requirements;

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D
18-007SPR-DP-CU**

**PID: 273-012703
Site Plan and Development Plan Reviews
Conditional Use**

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

Determination: the Parking Plan and the Site Plan Review were both recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with eight conditions.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia Husak, AICP, Senior Planner
Current Planning Manager

proposals in terms of size, scale, and massing but the applicant has been working to address these with the most recent rendition.

Ms. Burchett presented a rendering of the proposed building to show how the materials would be used and said overall, the proposal meets the Code requirements. She reported staff reviewed this proposal against the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and found the proposal compliant. She noted the *Guidelines* do not discourage modern architectural designs. She said this is not a representation of a historic structure but it complements the neighboring structures.

Kelly Burke, U Crew Holdings, reported that this proposal is a result of reviews by the ART, ARB, and the neighbors. Claudia Husak asked who the neighbors were that reviewed the proposal and Mr. Burke said there was no true HOA but the applicant had met with property owners directly adjacent to the site and told them to distribute information to anyone else in the neighborhood. He indicated that many of the surrounding neighbors were supportive of the proposal.

Ms. Burchett noted only outdated tree survey information was provided thus far and a new tree survey has been requested to determine size and quality of the existing trees. She said there are 10 trees that the applicant would like to cut down: three trees on the property line and seven others throughout and staff wants to ensure that trees are added to the site that are appropriate.

Mr. Burke said the law firm next door is supportive of removing the three trees on the property line between the two businesses.

Ms. Burchett asked the ART how they felt about the 8 by 8-foot open space plaza proposed between the two buildings. Staff had felt that open grassed areas in between buildings is more characteristic of this part of the Historic District. She said that due to the minimal amount of open space that would be required, the applicant could also pay a fee-in-lieu of open space.

Ms. Burchett said the next step is for the applicant to return to the ART on April 19, 2018 for a recommendation to the ARB for their meeting on April 25, 2018.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D
18-007SPR**

**PID: 273-012703
Site Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for a mixed-use development for Block D of the Bridge Park Development, including four buildings with approximately 110,000 square feet of office space, 44,000 square feet of retail space, 35,500 square feet of commercial space, 186 residential units, and a parking garage with 671 spaces. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site in context to the existing Bridge Park Development, the proposed Development Plan outlining the roadway network with building pads and lot configuration, and the Landscape Plan for all the open spaces included in this block. She noted where Longshore Street bisects the site running north and south from Tuller Ridge Drive to John Shields Parkway and Larimer Street that connects from Mooney Street to Longshore Street. She said this proposal is similar to the Basic Plan but contains significantly more detail on materials, architectural design, and open space design.

Ms. Burchett provided an overview of the individual buildings starting with D1, which is a Corridor Building with six stories; commercial on the first floor, office on the second, and 43 residential condominiums on floors three thru six. She said D2 is a Corridor Building with six stories; retail on the first floor and office space on floors two thru six with balconies on various sides facing Riverside Drive and Longshore Street. D3, she said, is a Corridor Building with six stories; commercial on the first floor and 83 residential units on floors two thru six with an elevated courtyard open space facing Larimer Street. Lastly, she said, D4/D5 is a Corridor Building with six stories; commercial on the first floor with a loading dock from Tuller Ridge Drive and a parking garage on floors two thru six. She said the garage is lined with 60 residential units on floors one thru five, due to the grade change, that face Mooney Street and Larimer Street. She concluded by noting new materials are being introduced on buildings D3 and D4/D5, which are textured aluminum metal tiles.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, presented the northwest view of D2 from John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. Claudia Husak reported that the treatment of the recessed walkway was discussed at City Council; their concern was whether it is too narrow and if the walkway will feel publically accessible. Mr. Gonzalez said the illustrations provided thus far do not accurately depict the size of the walkway but he would obtain different renderings at the pedestrian level to better reflect the available space. Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said they did not have the massing last week but can now get pedestrian level renderings produced to share with staff.

Aaron Stanford asked if there was access to the underpass from Riverside Drive and Ms. Husak answered affirmatively. She said it appears tight from the tunnel wall to the face of the building, which further limits pedestrian access. Ms. Husak asked if the building overhang encroaches into the pedestrian space and right-of-way. Mr. Gonzalez said he would verify the distance and correlation with the right-of-way. He added the canopy extends over the first floor and the colonnade is for the retail spaces. Vince Papsidero inquired about the setback of the wall and façade from the right-of-way. Ms. Umbarger explained it is 9.6 feet wide at the closest point and widens out down Riverside Drive. She said it is purposeful for a pedestrian connection.

Ms. Husak stated the distance of the building from the pedestrian underpass still appears tight. Ms. Umbarger restated that the illustrations are not reflecting this area well and they will provide those at a future date. Mr. Stanford asked about the overhang distance to the wall of the pedestrian tunnel. He said they appear to not overlap but it is difficult to tell from the drawings. Shawn Krawetzki said the colonnade on Riverside Drive appears tight as well. Mr. Gonzalez responded it has been widened from the initial design.

Mr. Papsidero inquired about the shade of brick proposed for D4/D5. Mr. Gonzalez answered the brick is lighter than those previously used. Ms. Umbarger stated the applicant would bring in material samples for review at the next meeting. She added the lighter color was proposed to create variety in the design. Mr. Papsidero affirmed that a lighter brick is more appropriate for D4/D5. He asked about the materials used for the vertical and horizontal areas extending from the ground to top story. Ms. Umbarger clarified the vertical black material is black brick and the horizontal material is a metal panel.

Ms. Husak asked if there is an entrance on Riverside Drive for Building D1 and Ms. Umbarger answered affirmatively and added the main entrance for the residential is from Longshore Street on the east elevation.

Ms. Umbarger indicated that D1 consists of a darker red brick with the retail use on the first floor, office use on the second floor and condominiums above. She pointed out the open space on the north side of the building. She said brick and wood would be used to enclose the utilities. John Woods, MKSK, said cedar planks of wood would be used between the brick for a fence/gate.

Mr. Gonzalez presented the southwest view of D4/D5 that includes retail on the ground floor and the entry into the parking garage. Mr. Papsidero indicated that the roofline appears flat when viewed straight on and that more variation should be provided to the facade. He suggested that if it is illuminated at night it would appear more interesting especially for vertical features. He encouraged the applicant to play off the warehouse feel they are trying to project elsewhere. He suggested the main entrance have more presence at the street level and inquired about the proposed materials. Ms. Umbarger stated the dark gray was fiber cement panels, the base material is limestone, and layered brick was used on the garage portion for more articulation.

Mr. Gonzalez presented the northwest corner view of the D3 building. Ms. Husak asked if any vegetation would be used on the taller blank walls at the ground level. Mr. Gonzalez answered the walls will be covered with plant material. Mr. Woods added they have proposed to have planters running down the street. He said no parallel parking is proposed so they will use planter boxes to supplement areas near the main entrance. Ms. Husak indicated that if these elements do not materialize in the end, staff could not support the proposal. Mr. Gonzalez said he did not think that would be an issue. He said they have not yet prepared a definitive plant material plan but they would not use the same treatment every time; in one area they might use shrubs and in another they might use vines.

Mr. Woods stated the Code does not permit blank walls but they are proposing some blank areas because they are intending to have so much texture and consider that visual relief.

Mr. Papsidero said for the façade of the residential units along Larimer Street of D4/D5, more treatment should be added to the ground level to activate the pedestrian realm. He also noted the garage entry and the stair should have similar architectural design.

Mr. Papsidero asked about the entrances for the potential grocery tenant and if that is something that will materialize with this proposal. Ms. Umbarger indicated that until a tenant comes on, they are leaving the area flexible and cannot prescribe designs at this point. Mr. Papsidero suggested that maybe something could happen through creative signage or a public art piece to highlight the entrance.

Ms. Burchett said Waivers have been identified and most have been seen before in this development such as Maximum Block Length, Building Compatibility with Block H, wall heights, and number of entrances. Ms. Burchett said staff needs to see the material details and calculations to determine if primary materials are being met with this design.

Ms. Burchett asked about the commercial space and how that use is being calculated for the Parking Plan. Mr. Gonzalez said the office use and commercial use are differentiated as they would like to label areas commercial to leave it flexible for future tenants. He said he understands there are more stringent requirements on parking for restaurant use and they have used that requirement for the Parking Plan. He concluded true calculations will be difficult as they are designing for flexibility. Ms. Burchett suggested that the applicant state what requirements they are using when calculating parking for future reference once a tenant is determined.

Ms. Burchett asked if patios are proposed at this time. Ms. Umbarger answered patios were not proposed but may come with individual tenants. Mr. Gonzalez added space is available. Ms. Umbarger stated the arcade area was expanded to permit outdoor seating for the retail uses.

Ms. Burchett said the next step would be for the applicant to return to the ART in two weeks for a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their meeting on May 3, 2018.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

**3. BSD-SCN – Tuller Heights
18-021BPR**

**PID: 273-008811
Basic Plan Review**

Sierra Saumenig said this proposal is for a four-story, approximately 140,000-square-foot retirement facility consisting of approximately 130 residential units - 20 of which may be allocated for personal care, two dining areas, two studio spaces, and a fitness center. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Saumenig said the official name for this facility is "Residences at Tuller Heights" and presented an aerial view of the site to support the 140,000-square-foot facility. Ms. Saumenig said she would turn over the presentation to the applicants and asked that they introduce themselves.

Julie Polletta, architect for Radelet McCarthy Polletta Architecture and Interior Design introduced herself; Denise Pompena, representative for Graziano, the developer and contractor introduced herself; and Chris Jaeger, with Graziano Construction introduced himself.

Ms. Polletta said the site for the new Retirement Living Facility is on the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said the residents' common areas will all be located at street level and highly visible facing the public street so the life of the residents can be seen. She said outdoor patio seating will be included for the Café and Bistro-style dining areas that wrap around the tower as to not show a cafeteria-style look traditionally found in retirement facilities. Other interior spaces clustered on the ground level, she said, include a pub-style recreation area, planting studio, art studio, library/lounge, salon, and fitness center. She said the apartment units are for residents living independently and for residents with personal care needs. She emphasized that this prominent location and scale of the proposed facility will provide both visual interest and opportunities for social interaction at the street level.

Ms. Polletta indicated they are still in the early stages of architectural design so they have not applied details to the building. She presented images to illustrate the types of design elements that will be incorporated. She stated they would use traditional materials such as brick as the primary material. She emphasized how they want to use porch elements to allow for more interaction between the residents and life on the street. She added a roof garden may also be incorporated.

Ms. Polletta said at the prominent intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway the facility will be set back 18 feet from the street. She said with a sidewalk and a patio there will be a fairly large paved area perceived as public space but in reality it would be their private space. She suggested this area would be good for public art installment and they would work with the Dublin Arts Council to determine what is most appropriate for this space.

Ms. Polletta stated many units will have porches and each will have a standing seam roof. On the west end of the site, she explained the slab level will be several feet above the sidewalk so the porch will be raised from street level. At the northwest corner, she said, they propose a two-tier, outdoor plaza with one level at grade and the other at floor level. She said both levels would be accessible to the public. At the northeast corner, she said, they are proposing a similar two-tier plaza that will be screened from the service area by hardscape.

Vince Papsidero reported a lot of the issues have been dealt with at this point through bi-weekly meetings for the last year or so and the application is scheduled to be reviewed by City Council.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Waiver was approved as well as the Development Plan and Site Plan with a Parking Plan with three conditions as stated above and the vote was unanimously approved for the complete proposal.

INTRODUCTIONS

3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D 18-007SPR

**PID: 273-012703
Site Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this is a proposal for a mixed-use development located within Block D of Bridge Park. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She called on the applicants to present their proposal.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, said the block consists of four buildings with open space between buildings D1 and D2. Block D at Bridge Park, he said, is bound by Riverside Drive to the west, John Shields Parkway to the north, Mooney Street to the east, and Tuller Ridge Drive to the south. A graphic was presented to show the positioning of each building; D1 fronts the corner of Riverside Drive and Tuller Ridge Drive; D2 fronts the corner of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway; D3 fronts the corner of John Shields Parkway and Mooney Street; and D4/D5 fronts the corner of Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge Drive. Longshore Street bisects the four buildings with D1 and D2 on the west side of Longshore Street and D3 and D4/D5 on the east side. In addition, Larimer Street runs between buildings D3 and building D4/D5 which ends at Longshore Street and extends east to Dale Drive.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said there have been changes since the Basic Plan. He said originally a giant grocer was planned for D2 but now they are proposing a smaller concept and moved the grocer to building D5 to provide access and circulation in the parking garage utilizing a speed ramp and patrons will not have to cross any streets to get to the store after parking. Additionally, there is a loading dock for D4/5 off Tuller Ridge Drive.

Mr. Yoder said D Block includes the following:

- D1 – mixed-use, six story “podium” building - the ground floor is comprised of retail and restaurant over 23,000 square feet, the second floor is office use at over 22,000 square feet, and the upper four floors are comprised of 43, for-sale, condominium units.
- *D2 - office building with retail below (not submitted at this time)*
- *D3 - retail with residential above (not submitted at this time)*
- D4/D5 – 35,000 square feet of retail – store front all around with access to parking on ground floor (D4) residential liner with (D5) garage. There is an open out area for a north market or grocer.

Mr. Yoder said each building has a unique character, which is expressed through a variety of material finishes and details. An open green space is proposed between the buildings D1 and D2 to be a plaza marked by

large lushly planted raised planters that define spaces within the courtyard. Shade trees dotted through the space provide filtered light and an overarching canopy. Café style seating will provide a place for retail patrons to relax and enjoy a coffee.

Mr. Yoder said there is over 12,000 square feet of open space along John Shields Parkway and they will need to integrate a stair.

John Woods, MKSK, said they created something different for this block but not different than what was shown previously. He said they proposed green space with seating nooks, fixed bench seating, chairs to make areas more playful, and crushed aggregate. He said the transformers have been consolidated to one side. He said there will be areas for residents to gather around fire pits or for dining as there will be outdoor kitchens and areas will be screened with cedar trellises and plant material will be utilized for blank walls.

Both Mr. Woods and Mr. Yoder talked about and presented the various facades and materials proposed and noted the great views of the river and park that will be available from the extensive use of balconies. Building D2 will be the bookend for the development on the north side like Block A is the bookend on the south side at the roundabout for Riverside Drive and Bridge Street.

Mr. Yoder said they are very flexible but multiple Waivers still need to be requested. The following issues have been identified for all buildings and they could include:

- Ground Story Street Façade Transparency
- Upper Story Façade Transparency
- Number of Street Façade Entrances
- Blank Wall Limitations
- Vertical Increments
- Horizontal Façade Divisions
- Permitted Primary Materials
- Changes in Roof Plane
- Maximum Building Height

James Peltier, EMH&T focused on bollards, parking moved on John Shields Parkway, and brick added to islands.

Aaron Stanford inquired about Tuller Ridge and circulation needed north and south. He noted there are no crossings at Longshore and asked if that is because of grade changes. Mr. Peltier answered yes and no.

Mr. Stanford asked why there is just crossing available on just one side of the intersections. Mr. Yoder said they could do both sides. Mr. Stanford asked if there are any right-of-way encroachments and Teri Umbarger, EMH&T, answered there were not. She explained Larimer Street is steep so no on-street parking is permitted, just loading zones.

Mr. Stanford asked if sidewalks will be blocked when loading/unloading is occurring. Mr. Peltier answered trucks can pull all the way in so sidewalks would not be blocked.

Mr. Stanford inquired about lighting for the loading dock area. He said an island could be an option but it could get hit.

Tim Hosterman asked why the intent is to force traffic on Tuller Ridge. Mr. Stanford answered that decision came from the traffic department.

Sergeant Hosterman inquired about the entrance to the garage for north traffic. He asked how many parking spaces there were. Mr. Peltier answered 671 spaces and some are reserved spaces for condominiums and those will be gated.

Sergeant Hosterman asked where parking would be available for the apartment tenants. Mr. Yoder answered the upper floor.

Vince Papsidero concluded there will be plenty of work sessions to deal with all of this. He asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

**4. SRN – Bridge Park, Amendment to MSP for VASO Rooftop Bar 6540 Riverside Drive
18-020MSP Master Sign Plan**

Claudia Husak said this is a proposal for an amendment to the Master Sign Plan for the Bridge Park Development for the VASO Rooftop Bar located in Block A of the Bridge Park Development, zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of Riverside and Banker Drives. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for an amendment to the Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066, and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines.

Ms. Husak explained there is an elevator on the north side of the building that provides direct access to the rooftop bar. She said there is a sign proposed for the rooftop bar at the AC Hotel that is a panel type screen that extends up from a patio platform with the sign integrated into the center. She said the four powder coated, precision-cut aluminum metal panels will be a copper color and the sign box in the center is aluminum at 3 inches deep to be powder coated to match the existing storefront mullions. Ms. Husak said the box will have pin-mounted, dimensional, face-lit letters with the text "VASO" made of perforated day-night vinyl to match the copper color that will glow white at night and the text "Rooftop Bar" beneath "VASO" will be flush-mounted metal, dimensional letters to be painted the same copper color.

Ms. Husak said based on the proposed design and high quality materials, the applicant was encouraged to move forward with the addendum to the Master Sign Plan. She stated there were no window signs proposed currently, which would be required to adhere to the approved Master Sign Plan. She said what currently exists today will be removed and replaced with 1.5-square-foot door signs on the entrance to the elevator.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were 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 3:40 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on April 19, 2018.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held _____

October 23, 2017

Page 12 of 17

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the resolution calls for a representative from the City. Has it been determined who that representative will be?

Mr. Plouck responded that it has not yet been determined, but a designee will be determined in the future.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired if this might be appropriate for CSAC to undertake. There are several great initiatives. It is not clear whether the City could designate a staff member or two individuals.

Mayor Peterson stated that this opportunity was discussed at the recent agenda discussion meeting. He recalls that Ms. Crandall was suggested as the representative. The City does have several sustainability programs.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the intent was to send a staff member. He does not believe there would be an issue if two individuals represented the City, but they will verify that. It is a good suggestion to include a CSAC member, if they are able to attend the meetings, which occur during the workday.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it appears that there will be many good ideas coming from this, which could be implemented on a number of different levels.

Mr. McDaniel responded that the opportunity would be offered to CSAC, if a member is interested and available to participate. If not, a staff member would serve as representative.

Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes.

• **Process for Naming of the New Park at Tuller Flats on John Shields Parkway**

Mr. McDaniel noted that Council has an adopted policy for options for the process for a park naming, but Council can also designate staff to propose park names for Council's final determination. Staff will followed the direction of Council in their preference for the naming of this park.

Vice Mayor Reiner moved that staff propose names for final consideration by Council. Mayor Peterson seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if it has been determined that this new park would be a dog park. She believes it was reflected in some previous meeting minutes.

Mr. McDaniel responded that this park will not be a dog park.

Vice Mayor Reiner noted that the City will have a new and quite large dog park at the Glacier Ridge Metro Park.

• **Approval of Preliminary Plat – Bridge Park, D Block**

Ms. Groomes stated that no presentation is needed, but she would like to make some comments.

- This block is where the pedestrian tunnel will land. It is adjacent to John Shields Parkway, which is ultimately planned to have a vehicular bridge across the Scioto River. She assumes that as part of that vehicular bridge, there also will be a walkway for pedestrian crossing.
- Her concern with the plat is that, in looking at the drawings, the building footprint extends all the way out to the permitted edge. By approving this plat, Council would be excluding the opportunity for any future activity to occur along John Shields Parkway.
- There will be a beautiful bridge and a pedestrian tunnel under Riverside Drive -- which will be the most used and safest route; however, these will be placed in a location where there is no street engagement whatsoever. There will be no retail shops, outdoor patios or seating, because the building footprint extends to the edge. There will be an adjacent beautiful greenway that the City will be unable to engage in a meaningful way, because there will be nothing to do in that space. She does not

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

October 23, 2017

Page 13 of 17

Held _____

believe that is what Council intended, but it is what the approval of the plat would solidify tonight.

- She believes that John Shields Parkway should be an active street, but there will be no opportunity for activity on the street level of this first block on John Shields, if Council approves these plats that will take the building all the way to the end of the buildable zone.
- She appreciates the Cap City Diner and Ram restaurant, where there is some outdoor space for various activities. Those spaces may be used for other purposes than restaurant in the future; there is the opportunity to do so because the building footprint will not be extended to the maximum edge of the building area.
- However, along John Shields Parkway, there is no opportunity for anything to happen. On the edge of that building, there are no doorways or entrances of any significance, and that streetscape is not going to be activated.
- The City will be investing \$15-20 million in another vehicular bridge across the river, and it has invested heavily in this tunnel so that our residents are able to traverse Riverside Drive in the safest manner. However, when they exit the tunnel on the east side, there will be nothing for the pedestrians to be engaged with, which falls short of Council's goal.

James Peltier, EMH&T, stated that along John Shields Parkway, the first floor of the building sits back from the property line by 15-20 feet. The second level of that building does extend to the edge of the buildable zone, which is what is depicted on the diagram. However, the first floor is held back with the intent to have patios and activate that space, particularly in the location of the underpass.

Vice Mayor Reiner asked if this would be a cantilevered second story.

Mr. Peltier responded that it would not be cantilevered; there will be columns.

Mr. Amorose Groomes stated that the space is occupied by the patio spaces of the individual condominiums or apartments that line the parking garage.

Mr. Peltier responded that the parking garage is farther east, and it is up to the property line of the greenway. At the building at the intersection with Riverside Drive, the space opens up at the first level with opportunity to activate that space.

Vice Mayor Reiner inquired about potential future uses for that space.

Mr. Peltier responded that they are attempting to secure a grocer for this space.

Ms. Alutto inquired if the space at the first level would not be utilized by resident units.

Mr. Peltier stated that the building at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive is an office building, second floor and up. The first floor will be retail and restaurant space, and outdoor dining.

Ms. Alutto inquired if that same space is intended to include open space to engage pedestrians.

Mr. Peltier stated that the John Shields Parkway open space is public, so there would be no encroachment into that space.

Vice Mayor Reiner noted that a grocer in that area could have a potential outdoor dining space. He inquired the lineal feet of the first and second floor setbacks.

Mr. Peltier responded that the second story extends to the property line, as intended, but the first floor is set back 15-20 feet from the property line.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the greenway along John Shields Parkway remains consistent to the intersection. Pedestrians will emerge from the underground tunnel at that point. The building wall extends to that point. There is no good option for activity between the east side of the tunnel entrance and the building because the pedestrians need to move around the building wall. Is the concern with the corner of Building D3, to the north?

Ms. Amorose Groomes responded that Buildings D2 and D3 are the concern.

Mr. McDaniel that the space at the first level of building, over which the second floor will extend, will provide an opportunity for engagement between the building and the

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

October 23, 2017

Page 14 of 17

Held _____

greenway. The public greenway has not yet been programmed, so there is opportunity to activate that space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the challenge of activating a greenway is to have activity adjacent to it, such as an ice cream shop, a deli, etc. It is far more difficult to activate a greenway along a solid wall than to activate a greenway that has active uses on both sides.

Mr. McDaniel stated perhaps there is opportunity for some first floor sidewalk café space next to the greenway. There is an opportunity there that has not yet been determined. He is not aware how far along the conceptual designs of the bridge are relative to how the bridge on the other side starts to engage, other than that it will carry vehicles and be walkable. He does not believe the design concepts are sufficiently advanced to determine if there is some square footage available to utilize.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated those are not the same drawings she is viewing. What she sees is a 1 to 60 scale. The greenway itself is 40 feet, which is a very healthy greenway, but immediately adjacent to the greenway, on the lawn, particularly at Building D2, is going to be a solid wall that will have no opportunity for engagement. Those will be residential units in that location -- either condominiums or apartments. That makes activating that 40-foot strip of grass difficult. The bulk of the Riverside crossing will occur at this tunnel. If she is scaling it correctly, there will be only 12-15 feet in which to have anything occur.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he believes that in moving down into that corner, the greenspace changes, so the opportunity to leverage more building could be offset by allowing more access to the greenspace. Perhaps instead of greenspace, there is hardscape, a plaza, in that location.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it would appear that the intent is to figure out where and how the activity happens after everything else in place.

Mr. McDaniel stated that, in his view, if the desire is to have a lot of activity happening at the corner, it should not be greenspace, but pavers or some material that accommodates a lot of movement, a wide, not narrow, space. Is the issue one of giving up more private space to avoid using public space? In this case, more private space is better, because the building will provide more office space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that her concern is not the building use. It is the planning and opportunity for the engagement.

There were no further comments.

Vice Mayor Reiner moved to approve the preliminary plat for Bridge Park, D Block.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, no; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes.

STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. McDaniel stated that the 2018 Operating Budget is being prepared. He has spoken to the Mayor about the possibility of presenting an introduction overview of the proposed operating budget at the November 6 Regular meeting to reduce the amount of time needed at the first budget workshop on Wednesday, November 8. The second budget workshop is scheduled for Monday, November 13. An introductory overview of the CIP budget has been provided the last couple of years in advance of the workshop. That approach appears to be helpful, if the Finance Chair is in agreement.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Administrative Committee: Mr. Keenan shared that there will be a Special Meeting on Wednesday, November 1 beginning at 6 p.m. for the purpose of adjourning to executive session to interview candidates for appointment to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

MORPC: Mr. Lecklider reported that the Board met on October 12. The PUCO Chairman and CEO gave a special presentation, but there were no other significant actions.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held _____

September 11, 2017

Page 20 of 30

Mr. Keenan moved approval of the development plan and site plan with a parking plan with the five conditions as recommended.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Mayor Peterson stated that Condition #1 indicates that all ground-mounted mechanicals located along Rock Cress Parkway will be screened along the north side. Does that mean the north side of the building or the unit?

Mr. Lecklider stated that his understanding is that the mechanicals were to be screened on three sides.

Ms. Rauch responded that is correct. However, the plans before Council tonight do not reflect this, and therefore a condition was added to make sure it was clear.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she understood that all sides of it would be screened except for the east side.

Ms. Rauch responded that was the intent, but the plans as shown at ART did not meet that. The condition is intended to make sure they fulfill this requirement. It is essentially a housekeeping provision.

Mr. Keenan accepted the amended condition #1, adding the language "of the unit."

Ms. Salay seconded the amended motion.

Vote on the motion: Mayor Peterson, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

• **Basic Plan Review - Bridge Park D Block (Case 17-022BPR)**

Ms. Husak stated that City Council is the reviewing body for this plan, due to the applicant having a development agreement in place with the City. This comes to Council with a recommendation of approval from the Administrative Review Team on August 31. Informal review comments by the Planning and Zoning Commission are also included in the packet.

The site is located on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of John Shields Parkway and north of Tuller Ridge Drive. The proposed development plan for D Block is outlined in blue on the slide.

The first portions of Bridge Park that came before Council were Block B and Block C. Block C is, for the most part, completed; Block A is under construction, and the PZC recently had an informal review of the last building within that block, which is the office building – A-1. Block H to the east of Block D is also under construction, and it is immediately adjacent to Block D. Block D is bounded by John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. As part of this development, the applicant is creating three blocks as well as the extension of two public streets. Larimer Street is being extended from Block H toward Longshore Drive. These are both public streets that provided a north/south connection from John Shields Parkway to Tuller Ridge Drive.

There is one waiver associated with the development plan that relates to the length of this block, due to Larimer Street not extending to Riverside Drive. This was driven by the desire not to have interruptions along that roadway. The length of the block exceeds what the Code would permit.

Building D-1 is a mixed-use building type of six stories, including retail and restaurant on the first floor; office on the second floor; and 44 units for sale within the building. There is also a proposed pedestrian bridge that would extend to the east to provide access to Building D-4 and D-5. This will also provide parking for this building.

The ART approved an administrative departure to allow the story of the main floor to be taller than what Code would allow.

The waiver requested is for the pedestrian bridge to encroach over the right-of-way for Longshore, as well as for the building to be six stories in height.

The applicant has provided inspirational images for that particular building, which is intended to be more of a warehouse, modern style architecture.

Building D-2 is the building that anchors the block on the north side, immediately adjacent to John Shields Parkway. It is a corridor building type with six stories in height.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held _____

September 11, 2017

Page 21 of 30

It includes retail on the first floor, and office on floors 2 to 6. There is also an outdoor terrace proposed on the sixth floor. Staff has been working with the applicant throughout the review of this portion of the application to ensure there is ample room where it is adjacent to the greenway at John Shields Parkway as well as the bridge access to go below Riverside Drive for pedestrians.

A waiver is requested as part of this building, which relates to the front property line coverage that is required to be 95 percent. Due to the shape of the building, the pedestrian tunnel and the infrastructure in place today, the applicant can provide 83 percent of that requirement.

The architecture for each of the buildings will become more formal as the final site plan moves forward. The idea is to provide some type of juxtaposition to the AC Hotel on the opposite side of Bridge Park.

Moving to the east, D-3 is a corridor type building of five stories in height with a parking structure in the center. The applicant is showing a small tenant space of about 1,000 square feet with a drive through – essentially, planning ahead if development in a retail business were to occur in the D-2 building, it could be serviced through an additional tenant area within this building.

There are 76 dwelling units lining the space on floors 2 through 5; there is a terrace in the building for open space amenities for residents; and there is a pedestrian bridge connecting the adjacent building.

There are two administrative departures approved by ART and they relate to lot coverage and ground story height.

There are waivers requested for this building, which address incompatible building types, as H Block to the east is a residential building and there are Code requirements that indicate that a corridor building should not be adjacent to a residential building. The applicant will provide architectural detailing that will make that not incompatible, as they work through the requirements.

The other waiver is for parking within the building, which is proposed to be in the ground story. This will require additional excavating. Due to the grade, a waiver is required and is supported by ART and staff.

There is a lot of movement up going to the east within this particular block.

She shared images for this building, which include a modern design with glass and masonry.

Building D-4 and D-5 is one building, with two building types. It is a corridor building and a parking structure, five stories in height, with the potential for retail on the first floor; 85 parking spaces on that floor; and 552 parking spaces throughout the rest of the building, with residential liners. The applicant is providing parking for the office building within this building as well as for Building D-1 for the residences there. A ground story height administrative departure was approved by ART for this building.

This building also includes pool and outdoor space on the top floor for residents within all of Bridge Park.

The waivers requested for this building are the incompatible building type due to the residences in H Block to the east; the encroachment for the pedestrian bridges over the rights-of-way, as have occurred in previously approved developments within Bridge Park; and lot coverage, to make the most out of the building and parking. There is a request for lot coverage to be at 90 percent.

Overall, there is approximately an acre of open space required per the Code for this particular building. The applicant is providing three publicly accessible open spaces – the John Shields Parkway greenway, as well as the open space between the two buildings that front Riverside Drive. There are privately accessible open spaces in Buildings D-3 and the pool and amenity deck in Buildings D-4, D5. The applicant will be required to pay a fee in lieu of the open space that is not included within this development, should the development be approved by the reviewing body. The deficit is minimal – ½ acre or less.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held _____

September 11, 2017

Page 22 of 30

Three motions are required on this application: a motion to approve the nine waivers; a motion to approve the basic plan itself, with four conditions as recommended by ART; and a motion to designate the future required reviewing body for this application. This would include any future kind of application the applicant is subjected to – whether it is a conditional use, a parking plan, fee in lieu of open space, and the final site/final development plans.

She offered to respond to questions, noting the applicant and their team are present as well.

Mayor Peterson asked if Buildings D-1, D-2 and D-3 were always contemplated as six stories in height.

Ms. Husak responded they were not. In the staff review of the application, they encouraged the applicant to look at the height specifically in this particular area where D-2 is located. There is an eight-story building on the south end and a taller building on that end as well. What changed is that there was more office space requested in the area, and that drove the desire for an additional story for this building, as well.

Mayor Peterson noted that he recalls there was an expectation of a grocery store coming in one of these buildings. He does not see that a grocery store is included.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners stated that they have been working on a grocery for this block since the outset. The grocery market, in general, is in turmoil with the Amazon entry into that market. Amazon groceries are 3,000 square feet, while traditional grocery stores are 120,000 square feet. They had considered a large-scale, more traditional grocer from the outset, and this building was to extend all the way across Longshore, creating a wall along the greenway. There was also a loading dock, backing onto Mooney Street across from the condos. They felt it was necessary to provide a grocer in this development under the previous thinking. With a large-scale grocery not likely, it provided an opportunity to review the plan. Longshore now continues all the way through to the greenway, although it was initially to turn down to interrupt the block length. There were engineering issues, and concern with people weaving in to cross the John Shields Parkway bridge. The result is opening up a nice view corridor through there. Moving to a smaller format grocery store is now the plan. They have now identified this retail space, and it will work for multiple grocery tenants. The garage in D-3 has an area completely screened from the outside for a potential pharmacy drive-through. Some tenants require a pharmacy as a critical part of their profit margin, and they will not sign a lease without a pharmacy drive-through. There is a lot of grade change along John Shields Parkway of 15 feet. That parking garage quickly is buried as one goes up the hill. At the top of the hill, facing the condominium building is a four-story stick apartment building facing a three or four-story stick condominium building directly across the street. While this is a waiver being requested tonight, it is really residential across from residential. It is a good cohabitation of two different building types located directly across from each other. The changes in the market have brought some positive changes to their plan, breaking the scale of the buildings down in D Block. It enables pulling building D-2 out as a pure office building, adding some height to it, making it more exciting, bookending what is happening with the AC Marriott. Then focus the residential and parking in Building D-3 right behind it, plus the grocery.

Mayor Peterson noted that the extra floor planned is therefore to accommodate more office space versus more apartment space. His point is that the buildings are getting larger, and wider and taller – the concern would be with packing more apartments into the plans.

Mr. Yoder responded it is the exact opposite. They are looking at 112,000 square feet of office running on Riverside Drive. They originally had 43 condos over ground floor retail. Due to the amount of office, they added office and stretched the building height. To do that, they are going to a more extensive wood construction type, just shy of 85 feet tall versus 75 feet as on the other blocks. They now have office use on the river. The owner-occupied will face Riverside Drive and the river. Building D-2 is an office building similar to the Crawford Hoying office building, with ground floor retail and five stories of

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

September 11, 2017

Page 23 of 30

office above. There will be a nice bookend feeling with the office building on one end and the AC Marriott on the other end.

Mayor Peterson stated that the units are referred to as living units. Are all condos owner occupied or are there apartments included?

Mr. Yoder responded that there are apartments sprinkled in as well. The units facing and on the river in Building D-1 are all owner-occupied units. The entire building is owner-occupied. There are eight units in that building that face Longshore and are all owner-occupied as well. The larger condominium of 2,200-2,500 square feet all have river views; and there are 1,400 square feet flats in the back that face Longshore. There are 76 apartments sprinkled in Building D-2. There are about the same number of units over by the parking garage. They are looking at the units lining the garage as going to condominium, but a decision has not been made. The H Block buildings directly behind are townhome condos, and the foundations will be started on Wednesday.

Vice Mayor Reiner stated that it is interesting that more office space is being included.

Mr. Yoder responded that now that the critical mass and restaurants are at the gate, the living spaces created for the employees and the environment that exists at Bridge Park, office users want to be on the site. They will be in front of PZC on November 2 for an 80,000 square foot office building located at the corner of Riverside Drive and SR161; that is an A Block office building. There will be another 112,000 square feet of office in E Block.

Mr. Keenan inquired if some of that office will be condominiums.

Mr. Yoder responded that at this point, the office space is not condominiums. The condos are all residential.

Ms. Amorose Groomes:

1. The 43 units in D1 are all condominiums. There are 175 units overall, so the balance are all apartments.

Mr. Yoder indicated that was correct.

2. The block immediately to the north of D block -- D2, is referred to as a bookend, but there really is another block to go in the District before reaching Tuller Road. Is there an indication of what is planned there?

Mr. Yoder responded that Al Vrable owns that land, and currently, he is not willing to develop it. They have spoken to him about expanding the project to the north, and discussions are ongoing. Whether or not that develops, the bridge across John Shields Parkway will provide a frame between that roadway and SR 161. Creating this visual composition between the two bridges makes sense. If something eventually occurs on the other side, it can also be made to fit.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the developer of that next parcel might feel differently about where the bookend belongs.

3. There are problems with making Buildings D1 and D2 six stories. The staff report states that because it sits low, it will not appear bigger than the building immediately to the east. She does not know if the view will be palatable from Riverside Drive, which is where the public will experience that height. Just because there is an office user for a building does not mean that the building should necessarily get taller. Perhaps there could be three stories of residential, retail on the bottom and office on the second floor rather than just making the building larger in general.

Mr. Yoder stated that they are already on the small side of a condo development. In this case, they would simply remove the office use. If height is a major concern, that would be their response. Removing a floor of the office building would actually make the office building less expensive. They could do that. They had assumed the City would appreciate addition of office space to the project, but if that is not the case, it can be eliminated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the Code and the vision for this space are the controlling factors. She understands why they proposed the additional office space, but she does not see a compelling reason to abandon the Code.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

September 11, 2017

Page 24 of 30

Held

Ms. Husak clarified that D2 is permitted to be six stories. The requested waiver for the additional story is for Building D1.

Mr. Yoder stated that a six-story height was approved for the entire Riverside neighborhood. He does not know if the building type is a factor.

Ms. Husak stated that the D2 building is the corridor building type, which is permitted to be a maximum of six stories. The mixed-use, D1 building has a five-story maximum height.

Mr. Yoder inquired if it would be possible to make the D1 a corridor building.

Ms. Husak responded that it is a possibility, but would have to be evaluated to ensure that would not create other issues.

Mr. Yoder noted that Buildings B1 and B2 are mixed-use with ground-floor retail, second floor office and four floors of residential above.

Ms. Husak stated that discussions with the applicant have focused on the desire to create something that was not generic in this location. There was an effort to set this block apart from what is present in Buildings C and B, a similar building type and height in a very arranged pattern. This Block was intended to create a break from that pattern and add more interest. On that basis, staff and ART looked at this as an approvable waiver.

Mr. Yoder stated that they started with the design used for the five-story building – ground story retail and four stories of condominiums above. When the design was changed to add the additional office height, the building proportions and appearance significantly improved. The aesthetics of the building improved and it adds office space for the City. Perhaps there is an alternate way to handle the building type and avoid the need for a waiver. They would prefer not to defer this, however. The building stands on its own merits to justify a waiver tonight, and they can look for a way to eliminate the need for a waiver before Final Development review.

Ms. Amorose Grooms inquired as to the ART granting an administrative departure for lot coverage on Buildings D4-5.

Ms. Husak clarified that it was Building D-3.

Ms. Amorose Grooms clarified that it was Building 3 that had ART approval for 90% lot coverage.

Ms. Husak stated it was actually 88% from 80%.

Ms. Amorose Grooms stated that the applicant is requesting a waiver for D4-5, which is the parking garage, from 80% to 90%. Ms. Amorose Grooms stated that these two adjacent buildings will have lot coverage in excess of what code permits.

Ms. Husak stated that was correct.

Ms. Amorose Grooms stated that she has a few concerns regarding the D3, D4-5 buildings. The first concern is there are no compatible uses across the street from these buildings. She stated that she understands that this is one of the waivers being requested, but she wanted to know what is being done to mitigate that impact. She is concerned they will have a negative impact on the townhomes being built.

Mr. Yoder stated that it is across the street from a four-story residential. They are similar architecture and the current design has done everything to transition from owner-occupied to residential.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked for clarification on the waiver for incompatible uses.

Ms. Husak stated that the applicant has to pick a building type and the building type picked is considered incompatible in the Code.

Ms. Amorose Grooms clarified that a portion of D3 along Mooney Street on the ground floor is residential.

Ms. Husak stated that was true.

In response to Ms. Amorose Grooms' question regarding access, Ms. Husak stated the access is from the interior.

Mr. Yoder stated there are porches so there can be interaction with Mooney Street, but no access.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

September 11, 2017

Page 25 of 30

Held _____

Mr. Lecklider inquired as to whether or not the building heights presented at this meeting were the same building heights presented to Planning and Zoning Commission at the informal review.

Mr. Yoder stated they were exactly the same and the reception was very positive.

Mayor Reiner complimented Mr. Yoder on the change in architecture. He believes it will be an improvement to the overall façade of the street. He stated that he understands the waivers that are being requested.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired as to what the ceiling heights will be if the waiver is for a ten-foot height floor to floor.

Mr. Yoder stated that the ceilings would be nine-foot ceilings. The waiver being discussed is actually for the garage where there were some smaller spaces with lower ceilings created.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired about the overall 749 parking spaces being created and how many of those would be dedicated to the apartments and condominiums.

Mr. Yoder stated that the condos will have two spaces per unit bringing the total to 86. The apartments will be allowed one space per unit and the balance will be shared by office, retail, etc. He is confident that there are the right number of spaces. The condos will have a gated access to their part of the garage, but the apartment users will share with the office and retail.

In response to Ms. Amorose Groomes' question regarding the apartment spaces, Mr. Yoder stated that the upper floors would be dedicated to the apartment users. The space will be marked by a sign stating that it is reserved.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired as to how many spaces are assigned 24 hours per day. Mr. Yoder stated that one space per apartment and two spaces per condo unit; 216 of the 749 spaces are dedicated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated there are 533 spaces left for office users and retail.

Mr. Yoder stated that those numbers do not include the on-street parking.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated there has been a lot of pressure regarding traffic in the area and in the roundabout, and they have been trying to address those problems with signage and markings. The development that requires this level of parking poses a problem because the traffic study assumed a 40% capture rate. When this level of parking demand comes in, it is concerning that there will be more people traveling by automobile than the traffic study initially contemplated. It is Council's responsibility to make sure that the development is sustainable from a traffic impact standpoint.

Mr. Yoder stated that construction on the Bridge Park extension to Sawmill Road will begin September 18, and it will be open by the end of the year. This will be a completely new road running parallel to SR 161.

Ms. Salay stated that Council has always expressed their support of higher density in this area, so it is up to the City to complete the traffic network in partnership with the developers.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the PZC minutes reference the use of the swimming pool on the fifth floor. Therefore, someone who lives elsewhere in the community is able to drive up to the fifth floor, park on the fifth level and walk through a gate to the pool. She believes this is the antithesis of what the City is trying to develop as urban and walkable. The traffic study certainly did not contemplate those uses. She is concerned about whether the kind of development the City is doing meets the capture rate of the traffic study.

Mr. Yoder stated that he works in Bridge Park during business hours all week, eats at Bridge Park, works out at Mesh and does not have to leave during the day. He believes that lifestyle will continue to build.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held _____

September 11, 2017

Page 26 of 30

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that her final issue relates to lot coverage and bumping the allowable 80% up to 88% and 90%. She spoke of her experience having dinner and what made this a welcoming pedestrian area is what Cap City has done on the exterior of the building. Her concern is that the City is losing the ability to have those kinds of spaces by having the building occupy all the buildable area. There are no spaces remaining for relief along the streetscape. The feel of the buildings from the street level is very massive, and the best way to break that up is for those kinds of uses on the exterior. She asked Ms. Husak what the options would be for relief at the ground level. Ms. Husak stated that the City has requirements for buildings being close to the street, with front property line coverage. If you maximize those areas, the lot coverage increases.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated she believes these were more like cafeteria items and the answer to this question was basically, "yes, we like all of them."

Mr. Yoder stated regarding the area that Cap City has created that there are spaces designed for both tenants on each side of the open space. He stated that indoor/outdoor space can be created in other unique ways.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the 90% coverage means the City loses a significant amount of open space.

Mr. Yoder stated that grass can be planted in that open space.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted on a drawing provided the areas marked for park space and inquired as to whether that counted toward the 10% or was it part of their open space requirements.

Ms. Husak responded that the space where the waiver was requested is in a different block. The Code does not state that the remaining percent could not double as park and open space to fill that requirement also. The 10% remaining that Ms. Amorose Groomes is inquiring about does not have a green space associated with it that would be dedicated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated she noticed some of the dedications are on Riverside Drive on City-owned land, so she assumes that would be fee in lieu of parkland donation, and that would be the portion their fee would be attributed to.

Ms. Husak stated it is almost both. If there is open space existing within a certain distance of a development, the developer may be able to use that open space to fulfill their requirement. However, a fee in lieu of dedication is still required for what is not being provided.

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested clarification for a drawing of the building where the waiver was requested.

Ms. Husak illustrated on the drawing the building that had a waiver request for 90% lot coverage.

In response to Ms. Amorose Groomes' question regarding the available options, Mr. Yoder stated there is a .3-acre space that they would like to make into a dog park that would be all green space. They are working with MKSK to improve the area and make an off-leash dog park area.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that these buildings are massive and she would like to know what options are available to provide some relief at the ground floor level with a 90% lot coverage.

Ms. Alutto stated that there is no green space at C4-5 and D4-5. Visually, there are two massive buildings and nothing else.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that there may not be anything that can be done, given the 90% lot coverage.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held _____

September 11, 2017

Page 27 of 30

Ms. Husak stated that the 10% open space would not be impactful. The applicant has provided meaningful exterior open space accessible to the public and interior to the building for the residents.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated she is concerned about the pedestrian experience. Mr. Yoder stated that if one looks at the whole area in context, there is a beautiful open space in the park area.

Ms. Salay stated that in looking at only this site, the 90% could be objectionable; however, looking at it in context as a whole, it does make sense. Mr. Lecklider agreed.

Vice Mayor Reiner asked if there will be bicycle parking. Mr. Yoder responded there is secured bicycle parking within the garages for residents and for the public.

Mayor Peterson asked whether there will be more establishments with outside areas such as those at Cap City and Ram.

Mr. Yoder stated they are encouraging establishments to include these features because it adds to the experience.

In response to Mayor Peterson's question, Mr. Yoder stated they estimate between 12-15 restaurants will be developed in total.

Mayor Peterson reiterated Ms. Amorose Groomes' point about the outdoor spaces and that this is what the City is looking for.

Mr. Yoder stated he understood.

Mayor Peterson clarified that the 90% in this one block area does not necessarily prevent having more outdoor space attractions.

Mr. Yoder stated that is correct.

Mr. Yoder also stated that he agrees with Ms. Salay and that the high quality, well-executed open spaces that are within this development are something not usually seen in cities.

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested a particular drawing be displayed so she could clarify her point. The Ram outdoor dining is in this portion of the buildable area that was not built on. With 90 percent lot coverage, these are not possible for other establishments. Ms. Husak stated that it is more about the usage of the building than the lot coverage.

Mr. Yoder pointed out the residential condos and the storefronts on the drawing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that there was not anything to break up the massing of the buildings.

Mr. Yoder stated there will be storefronts, with awnings and such.

Ms. Salay moved to approve the nine waivers.

Vice Mayor Reiner seconded the motion.

A procedural question arose about the vote on the waivers.

Ms. Readler responded that Council can separate the waivers if Council desires to vote on them individually. However, the motion currently on the floor is for approval of all nine waivers as requested.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, no; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

Mayor Peterson moved to approve the basic plan with the four conditions as listed.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held _____

September 11, 2017

Page 28 of 30

Mayor Peterson moved to designate Planning and Zoning Commission as the reviewing body for future development applications for Block D.

Ms. Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor Reiner, yes.

- **Aging in Place – Strategic Plan**

Ms. Crandall stated that presented for Council consideration tonight is an Aging in Place Strategic Plan. Council had the opportunity to preview this plan last year during a Council workshop, and at that time, referred the plan to the Community Services Advisory Commission (CSAC) for further review. Over the course of several months, the Commission heard from a variety of guest speakers with expertise related to this topic. Presenters included representatives of Ohio University's College of Health Science and Professions, Syntero and the Central Ohio Agency on Aging. In Council's packet is a redlined version of the plan that shows the Commission's recommended changes. Present tonight are Mindy Carr, CSAC Chair and Ann Bohman, CSAC member.

Ms. Carr thanked Council for giving CSAC the opportunity to review the plan. These are the types of projects they enjoy reviewing. They found the plan to be well thought out and comprehensive. After review, CSAC has recommended a few changes. In the plan, several themes are covered that they would like to highlight to raise their level of priority in addressing current and future service gaps related to aging in place. These are as follows:

- Establishment of an Information and Assistance "One-Stop-Shop" – Both older adults and their caregivers can find it difficult to be aware of, locate and understand services and programs that may be available. Having one place or point of contact to navigate services and programs should be explored and options determined to address this issue. Several agencies provide services directly to the caregivers, even though they may not live in the same area as the older adult.
- Co-location of Services – Closely related to the idea of a one-stop-shop is the co-location of certain services, if possible, such as Central Ohio Area Agency on Aging and Syntero (Dublin Counseling Center) to have conveniently located "case managers" from each agency. Both agencies currently provide older adult services and could cross-refer individuals when appropriate. Ohio University has expressed interest in working with the City to explore this idea as their campus and adult focused health/wellness programming continues to expand. The City could facilitate this process and provide links at the City website.
- Solving the Transportation Gap - Older adults who are no longer able to drive face great challenges to access basic needed services as well as social and civic opportunities. Isolation can be devastating to physical, behavioral and emotional health. Identifying those in need and ensuring accessible and affordable options are available for all types of transportation needs throughout the City, including to socially/civically engage and volunteer, is critical. CSAC is aware that there is a Mobility Study in progress, and they look forward to reviewing those recommendations, as well, to determine if they might help with this need.
- Establishing a Village-to-Village Program - These programs connect residents in need with those willing to assist. This could entail a significant expansion of the City's trial "Yard Squad" program to facilitate a variety of needed connections. There could possibly be a need for a non-profit to be formed to manage that program.
- Partnerships are Imperative – The City is not the expert when it comes to many of the service and educational gaps. Multiple agencies exist in Dublin and central Ohio that are the experts and are already providing the needed services. The City

~~Victoria Newell said overall she liked the building and the massing but there are little things that do not sit well with her. She said she is not comfortable with the canopy entry as it just feels tacked onto the building and not really integrated into the design. She said the entry should be pulling us into the space. She noted that on the east, west, and north sides there is a nice play of metal panels on the building but they are not on the south elevation. She said this end should be the most prominent view and yet it was not interesting. She concluded by checking the discussion questions to make sure the Commission had covered them all.~~

~~Mr. Brown reinforced the north elevation and how it integrates with the neighborhood. Mr. Yoder reported that boulders are being placed right now.~~

~~Mr. Yoder concluded he received great feedback.~~

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D
17-022BPR/PP**

**PID: 273-012703
Preliminary Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for the subdivision of ±5.3 acres into five lots and a public right-of-way to facilitate the future development of Block D of Bridge Park with three buildings containing 174 residential dwelling units, approximately 125,000 square feet of commercial uses, and a parking structure. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. She stated there was one condition of approval and asked if the applicant had agreed to the condition as follows:

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

Claudia Husak reported this is a standard condition to which the applicant had agreed.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat with the following condition:

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

The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Recommended for approval 7 – 0)

COMMUNICATIONS

Claudia Husak said Vince Papsidero and several Planners will be attending the ULI awards dinner.

Ms. Husak said she brought copies of the application for the Insight 2050 Academy that MORPC facilitates. She explained this would be a commitment for three evenings (Tuesdays) in October for a nominal fee, which the City would cover, if anyone is interested; the application needs to be submitted to MORPC by September 25th.

Ms. Husak said the packets are being moved to the OneDrive platform that is available on a mobile device as well as a desktop. She said there will be dual meeting packets – in Dropbox as before but also now in OneDrive for two meetings as a test run and then go live with just OneDrive. She asked the

Commission if there was anything staff could do to assist the members to get started and trained. Lori Burchett showed the Commission the OneDrive and said the folders could be set up similar to Dropbox.

Ms. Husak indicated staff would do a dummy version on an I-Pad and would print step-by-step instructions for how to access it for the Commissioners.

Victoria Newell inquired about projects that had been tabled and have not come back before the PZC. She asked if there was a status report available that possibly included a timeline. Ms. Husak answered Motel 6 submitted materials so they would be eligible for the meeting on the 21st of September. She said the cell tower on Rings Roads are still working through the plan with the neighbors and church for different alternatives. She said they have a deadline of sometime in November.

Ms. Husak noted the West Innovation District project is coming forward to the PZC in October.

Ms. Newell reported she had attended several meetings for Legacy and wanted to know when they are coming forward. Ms. Husak answered they will be going to a Council work session first.

The Chair asked if there were any additional comments. [Hearing none.] She adjourned the meeting at 7:30 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 2, 2017.



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 7, 2017 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D
17-022BPR/PP**

**PID: 273-012703
Preliminary Plat**

Proposal: The subdivision of ±5.3 acres into five lots and public right-of-way to facilitate the future development of Block D of Bridge Park with three buildings containing 174 residential dwelling units, approximately 125,000-square-feet of commercial uses, and a parking structure.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Applicant: Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying.

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

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

Case Information: <http://dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/17-022>

MOTION: Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve this Preliminary Plat because it is consistent with all of the applicable review criteria and the Subdivision Regulations, with one condition:

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

*Nelson Yoder agreed to the above condition.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: This Preliminary Plat will be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

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



~~Victoria Newell said overall she liked the building and the massing but there are little things that do not sit well with her. She said she is not comfortable with the canopy entry as it just feels tacked onto the building and not really integrated into the design. She said the entry should be pulling us into the space. She noted that on the east, west, and north sides there is a nice play of metal panels on the building but they are not on the south elevation. She said this end should be the most prominent view and yet it was not interesting. She concluded by checking the discussion questions to make sure the Commission had covered them all.~~

~~Mr. Brown reinforced the north elevation and how it integrates with the neighborhood. Mr. Yoder reported that boulders are being placed right now.~~

~~Mr. Yoder concluded he received great feedback.~~

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D
17-022BPR/PP**

**PID: 273-012703
Preliminary Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for the subdivision of ±5.3 acres into five lots and a public right-of-way to facilitate the future development of Block D of Bridge Park with three buildings containing 174 residential dwelling units, approximately 125,000 square feet of commercial uses, and a parking structure. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. She stated there was one condition of approval and asked if the applicant had agreed to the condition as follows:

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

Claudia Husak reported this is a standard condition to which the applicant had agreed.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat with the following condition:

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

The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Recommended for approval 7 – 0)

COMMUNICATIONS

Claudia Husak said Vince Papsidero and several Planners will be attending the ULI awards dinner.

~~Ms. Husak said she brought copies of the application for the Insight 2050 Academy that MORPC facilitates. She explained this would be a commitment for three evenings (Tuesdays) in October for a nominal fee, which the City would cover, if anyone is interested; the application needs to be submitted to MORPC by September 25th.~~

~~Ms. Husak said the packets are being moved to the OneDrive platform that is available on a mobile device as well as a desktop. She said there will be dual meeting packets – in Dropbox as before but also now in OneDrive for two meetings as a test run and then go live with just OneDrive. She asked the~~



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, August 31, 2017

The Administrative Review Team made the following determinations at this meeting:

- 1. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Block D 17-022BPR** **PID: 271-012703**
Basic Plan Review
- Proposal: A mixed-use development on approximately 5.3 acres, including three buildings containing 119 residential units, approximately 78,000 square feet of office space and 48,000 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and a parking structure lined with 55 residential units.
- Location: East of Riverside Drive, south of John Shields Parkway, west of Mooney Street and north of Tuller Ridge Drive.
- Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
- Applicant: Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners
- Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner
- Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

REQUEST 1: ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTURES

Request for a recommendation of approval.

1. §153.062(O)(5)(a)(2) - Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage – Required: 80% maximum; Requested: 88% for building D3.
2. §153.062(O)(5)(b) - Height, Ground Story Height - Required: 14-feet maximum; Requested: 15.5 feet.
3. §153.062 (O)(5)(b) - Height, Upper Story Height - Required: 12 feet minimum; Requested: 10.7 feet.

Determination: The three Administrative Departures were approved.

REQUEST 2: WAIVERS

Request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for nine Waivers:

1. §153.060(C)(2)(a) - Maximum Block Size (requested: 583 feet) (required: 500 feet maximum)
2. §153.062(C)(1) - General Building Type Layout and Relationships (requested: incompatible building types, corridor to single-family attached) (required: no incompatible buildings)
3. §153.062(O)(6)(a) - Building Siting, Street Frontage, Front Property Line Coverage (requested: 83% property line coverage) (required: 95% minimum coverage)
4. §153.062(O)(6)(a) - Right-of-way (requested: pedestrian bridge between D1 and D4/D5) (required: awnings, canopies, eaves, patios, and projecting signs only)



**2. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Block D
17-022BPR**

**PID: 271-012703
Basic Plan Review**

5. §153.062(O)(6)(a)(3)(b) - Building Height (requested: six stories) (required: five stories, maximum)
6. §153.062(O)(6)(c) - Uses and Occupancy Requirements (requested: parking in ground story of D3) (required: parking within buildings permitted in rear of the first three floors or fully in any basement)
7. §153.062(O)(6)(f) - Uses and Occupancy Requirements (requested: Parking on ground floor facing John Shields Parkway, Longshore Street, and Larimer Street for Building D3.) (required: Occupied space requirement a minimum of 30 feet depth facing streets)
8. §153.062 (O)(5)(b)(5) - Buildable Area (requested: 90% for Building D4 and D5) (required: 80% maximum)
9. §153.065(B)(5)(a)(1) - Entrance/Exit Lanes (requested: three exit lanes) (required: One exit lane shall be provided for each 200 spaces)

Determination: The nine Waivers were recommended for approval to City Council.

REQUEST 3: DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND BASIC PLAN REVIEWS

Request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for Development Plan and Basic Plan Reviews with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant record an easement for the encroachment of the bridges to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 2) That the applicant revise the building plan to recess all entrances within 5-feet of the property line to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(6)(3);
- 3) That the applicant file a conditional use application for the podium parking for buildings D3 and D5; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the building plan to ensure all door swing areas will not encroach into the public right-of-way to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(5)(b)(4).

Determination: The Development Plan and Basic Plan Reviews were recommended for approval to City Council with four conditions.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Vince Papsidero, FAICP
Planning Director



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, August 31, 2017 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Ray Harpham, Interim Chief Building Official; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Alan Perkins, Fire Plans Examiner; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Tammy Noble, Senior Planner; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: James Peltier, EMH&T (Cases 1, 2, & 5); Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan (Case 1); Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T (Cases 2 & 5); Tracy Perry, NBBJ; (Case 2) and Linda Menerey and Steve Nixon, EMH&T; Denise Valenta, Embree Asset Group, Inc. [*participated by phone*] (Case 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the August 24 meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Block D
17-022BPR**

**PID: 271-012703
Basic Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for a mixed-use development on approximately 5.3 acres, including three buildings containing: 119 residential units, approximately 114,117 square feet of office space; 38,361 square feet of retail; 12,850 square feet of restaurant uses; 0.96 acres of open space; and a parking structure containing 749 parking spaces to be lined with 55 residential units. She said the site is on the east of Riverside Drive, south of John Shields Parkway, west of Mooney Street and north of Tuller Ridge Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted block D is on the northern edge of the Bridge Park Development with frontage on John Shields Parkway to the north but the prominent façade is on Riverside Drive.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed plan and said the site layout for block D includes four buildings on three blocks created by the extension of Longshore Street and Larimer Street. She said the applicant is proposing to extend Larimer Street west and terminate at building D2; Longshore Street is proposed to be extended through the block to John Shields Parkway.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and highlighted building D1, which is a 6-story, mixed-use building with an overall height of 80 feet. The first two floors will consist of retail/restaurant and office space, she said, with condominium units on the upper stories; a pedestrian bridge will connect to building D5 to provide access to parking.

D1 Administrative Departure:

Maximum upper story height 14 feet (permitted); 15.5 feet (requested)

D1 Waivers:

1. Awnings, canopies, eaves, etc. permitted to encroach; pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street to building D4/5 (requested).
2. Maximum building height (five stories); six stories (requested).

While specific materials have not been selected, Ms. Burchett presented inspirational images provided by the applicant and described the examples as having a contemporary aesthetic with brick and glass and storefront style windows on all floors, similar to building B3 in the Bridge Park Development.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and highlighted building D2, which is at the corner of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway that is at the northern boundary of the Bridge Park Development. This building, she said, consists of six stories with an overall height of 90 feet. She said retail is on the first floor with five floors of office above. The 6th floor, she explained, steps back to create an outdoor terrace on the west and south elevations. No residential uses are proposed, she noted.

Ms. Burchett presented contemporary images for this building, which have a predominantly glass and metal panel building facade, similar in character to building A3 (AC Hotel). She said the architectural intent for this building will reflect but not mimic the AC Hotel as it serves as a bookend for the overall development on Riverside Drive.

D2 Waiver:

1. Requirement: Minimum 95% front property line coverage; Request: 83% front property line coverage

Ms. Burchett highlighted building D3 on the proposed site plan that fronts John Shields Parkway. Due to the change in grade from Mooney Street to Longshore Street, she explained, this building is five stories in height on the west side and four stories on the east side. She said the first floor is comprised of a partially below-grade podium parking deck that contains a pharmacy in the northwest corner with a drive-thru integrated into the parking area. Although further review is needed, she said podium parking may require a Conditional Use, which would be reviewed by the Commission. Residential units are proposed for the four upper floors and a pedestrian bridge will connect to building D5 at the third floor.

D3 Administrative Departures:

1. Maximum of 80% impervious lot coverage (permitted); 88% impervious lot coverage (requested).
2. Minimum ground story height of 12 feet (required); 10.7 feet (requested).

D3 Waivers:

1. Requirement: incompatible building types are not permitted directly across the street from one another or on the same block face; Request: corridor building D3 across from single-family attached buildings (block H).
2. Requirement: parking within building permitted in rear of first three floors and fully in any basement; Request: parking on ground story.
3. Requirement: Minimum of 30 feet depth facing streets for occupied space; Request: parking on ground floor facing John Shields Parkway, Longshore Street, and Larimer Street.

Architectural complementary details will be forthcoming, Ms. Burchett reported, and then she presented inspirational images that reflected predominantly brick and metal panel/cementitious panel building facades, similar in character to buildings B1, B2, and C1 in this development.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and pointed out building D4, which is the Corridor Building Type portion of building D4/D5. She stated it is a five-story building with an overall height that varies from ±60 feet at the west elevation to ±45 feet at the east elevation. She said the first floor facing Larimer Street is comprised of retail, lobby space, bike parking and support space, and is partially below grade at the eastern end of this wing of the building. Residential units are proposed on all other floors, she said, including the first floor of the wing facing Mooney Street.

Building D5, Ms. Burchett explained, is the Parking Structure Building Type portion of building D4/D5. She stated it is a five-story building with an overall height of ±47 feet. Retail use is proposed on the first floor facing Longshore Street, she said, as well as a portion of Tuller Ridge Drive.

D4 Administrative Departure:

Requirement: Minimum ground story height of 12 feet; Request: 10.7 feet.

D4/5 Waivers:

1. Requirement: Incompatible building types are not permitted directly across the street from one another or on the same block face; Request: Corridor building (D4) across from single-family attached buildings (block H).
2. Requirement: awnings, canopies, eaves, etc. permitted to encroach; Request: pedestrian bridge over Longshore Street to building D1.
3. Requirement: Maximum impervious lot coverage is 80%; Request: 90% impervious lot coverage.

Ms. Burchett presented inspirational images that reflected predominantly brick or stone and glass building facades, similar in character to other buildings in the development.

Ms. Burchett concluded the Development Plan and Basic Plan Review criteria were met and the Waiver Review Criteria was met as well.

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

1. §153.062(O)(5)(a)(2) - Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage – Required: 80% maximum; Requested: 88% for building D3.
2. §153.062(O)(5)(b) - Height, Ground Story Height - Required: 14-foot maximum; Requested: 15.5 feet.
3. §153.062(O)(5)(b) - Height, Upper Story Height - Required: 12 feet minimum; Requested: 10.7 feet.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to City Council for nine Waivers:

1. §153.060(C)(2)(a) - Maximum Block Size (requested: 583 feet) (required: 500 feet maximum)
2. §153.062(C)(1) - General Building Type Layout and Relationships (requested: incompatible building types, corridor to single-family attached) (required: no incompatible buildings)
3. §153.062(O)(6)(a) - Building Siting, Street Frontage, Front Property Line Coverage (requested: 83% property line coverage) (required: 95% minimum coverage)
4. §153.062(O)(6)(a) - Right-of-way (requested: pedestrian bridge between D1 and D4/D5) (required: awnings, canopies, eaves, patios, and projecting signs only)
5. §153.062(O)(6)(a)(3)(b) - Building Height (requested: six stories) (required: five stories, maximum)

6. §153.062(O)(6)(c) - Uses and Occupancy Requirements (requested: parking in ground story of D3) (required: parking within buildings permitted in rear of the first three floors or fully in any basement)
7. §153.062(O)(6)(f) - Uses and Occupancy Requirements (requested: Parking on ground floor facing John Shields Parkway, Longshore Street, and Larimer Street for Building D3.) (required: Occupied space requirement a minimum of 30 feet depth facing streets)
8. §153.062 (O)(5)(b)(5) - Buildable Area (requested: 90% for Building D4 and D5) (required: 80% maximum)
9. §153.065(B)(5)(a)(1) - Entrance/Exit Lanes (requested: three exit lanes) (required: One exit lane shall be provided for each 200 spaces)

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to City Council for a Development Plan and Basic Plan Reviews with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant record an easement for the encroachment of the bridges to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 2) That the applicant revise the building plan to recess all entrances within 5-feet of the property line to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(6)(3);
- 3) That the applicant file a conditional use application for the podium parking for buildings D3 and D5; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the building plan to ensure all door swing areas will not encroach into the public right-of-way to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(5)(b)(4).

Ms. Burchett presented the overall open space for block D and stated the following:

- Based on the proposed square footage, 0.88 acres of publicly accessible open space is required with this application.
- A .20-acre segment of the John Shields Greenway is proposed on the north side of building D3.
- A .07-acre segment of the John Shields Greenway is proposed on the north side of building D2. This area coincides with a Gateway location as described and illustrated in the Scioto River Neighborhood Standards. The design of this open space will be developed in the future as the City explores design and functionality of the greenway space in its entirety.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the three Administrative Departures were approved by the ART. He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the nine Waivers were recommended for approval by the ART and forwarded on to City Council. He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Development Plan and Basic Plan Reviews were recommended for approval to City Council with four conditions and would also be forwarded on to City Council for their meeting on September 11, 2017.

**2. BSD P - Columbus Metropolitan Library, Dublin Branch 75 N. High Street
17-088DP/SPR Development and Site Plan Reviews**

~~Jennifer Rauch said this is a proposal for the construction of a new 46,000-square-foot library and associated site improvements located on the northwest corner of the intersection of North High Street and North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Development Plan and Site Plan Review under the provisions of the Zoning Code Section 153.066.~~



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 24, 2017 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Block D
17-022BPR-INF**

**PID: 271-012703
Basic Plan Review**

Proposal: A mixed-use development on approximately 5.3 acres, including three buildings containing 119 residential units, approximately 78,000 square feet of office space, 48,000 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and a parking structure lined with 55 residential units.

Location: East of Riverside Drive, south of John Shields Parkway, west of Mooney Street, and north of Tuller Ridge Drive.

Request: Informal review and feedback of a Basic Plan Review prior to review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.

Planning Contacts: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager; and Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us; or (614) 410-4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission informally reviewed this proposal for a mixed-use development in Block D of the Bridge Park Development. They commented on architecture, site layout, open space, and amenity areas. The Commission was supportive of the overall design and layout. The Commission recommended creating a visual impact with the prominent entrance on Building D2 and further enhancing the open space areas with how the spaces connect throughout the entire development.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Absent
Chris Brown	Absent
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II





MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 24, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Block D** **PID: 271-012703**
17-022BPR **Basic Plan Review (Discussion only)**
- 2. Tuttle Crossing West Corridor PCD – Motel 6** **5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard**
17-072FDP **Final Development Plan (Tabled 5 – 0)**
- 3. NE Quad PUD – Emerald Fields** **4040 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard**
17-080AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Victoria Newell, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, Stephen Stidhem, and Bob Miller. Amy Salay and Chris Brown were absent. City representatives present were: Vince Papsidero, Lori Burchett, Logan Stang, JM Rayburn, Lia Yakumithis, Michael Hendershot, Shawn Krawetzki, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Mitchell moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes, Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated the NE Quad PUD – Emerald Fields case is eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening. She determined that case would be heard first based on staff's recommendations followed by the Motel 6 case and Block D to be heard last. However, she said the minutes are recorded in the order of the agenda.

- 1. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Block D** **PID: 271-012703**
17-022BPR-INF **Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for a mixed-use development on approximately 5.3 acres, including three buildings containing 119 residential units, approximately 78,000 square feet of office space, 48,000 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and a parking structure lined with 55 residential units. She said the site is east of Riverside Drive, south of John Shields Parkway, west of Mooney Street, and north of Tuller Ridge Drive. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback of a Basic Plan Review prior to a review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.



Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site followed by the process and schedule for this application. She explained City Council will be the final reviewing body on this project and they will take into account the feedback received during this evening's informal review as well as the reviews from the Administrative Review Team (ART). She indicated the tentative schedule is for a recommendation from the ART on August 31 and the project to be heard by City Council on September 11, 2017. She added City Council will determine a reviewing body for future applications, which has historically been the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed development plan where she highlighted Block D for context of the overall Bridge Street Development. Blocks A, B, and C, she reported, are currently under construction with Block C nearing completion. She said Block A is at the south end of the project and will have a hotel and events center and Blocks B and C will be mixed-use development with residential, office, and retail. She said three public parking garages are located within each block. Block H she said was approved for townhome units and are currently under building permit review. Additionally, she said Block G received Basic Plan Approval for a mixed-use development with residential and commercial components.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan for Block D that includes four buildings on three blocks created by the extension of Longshore Street and Larimer Street. She said the applicant is proposing to extend Larimer Street west and terminate at Building D2; Longshore Street is proposed to be extended through the block to John Shields Parkway.

Ms. Burchett noted building D1 on the proposed site plan presented with the prominent façade on Riverside Drive. She explained building D1 is proposed as a 6-story, mixed-use building with an overall height of 80 feet. She said the first two floors will consist of retail/restaurant and office space, and the upper stories will contain condominium units. She said a pedestrian bridge will connect to the third floor of building D5 to provide access to parking.

While specific materials have not been selected, she said, the applicant is proposing a contemporary aesthetic with brick and glass with storefront-style windows on all floors, similar to building B3 also within the Bridge Park Development. She provided some inspirational images from the applicant.

Ms. Burchett noted building D2 on the proposed site plan which is located at the corner of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway that is the northerly boundary of the Bridge Park Development. She described building D2 as having six stories with an overall height of 90 feet. She said no residential uses are proposed for this building. Retail space is proposed for the first floor, she said, with five floors of office space above. The 6th floor, she explained, steps back to create an outdoor terrace on the western and southern elevations.

Again, she provided inspirational architectural images from the applicant. This building she said has a predominantly glass and metal panel building facade, similar in character to building A3 (AC Hotel), at the southerly end of the overall development acting as bookends on Riverside Drive for the Bridge Park Development.

Ms. Burchett pointed out that building D3 fronts John Shields Parkway. Due to the change in grade from Mooney Street to Longshore Street, she explained this building is five stories in height on the west side with only four stories on the east side. She described the first floor as a partially, below-grade podium parking deck with a pharmacy proposed for the northwest corner with a drive-thru integrated into the parking area. Although further review is needed, she indicated that podium parking may require a Conditional Use, which would be reviewed by the Commission. She said residential units are proposed on the four upper floors and a pedestrian bridge connects to building D5 at the third floor level.

The inspirational architectural images provided, she said, reflect a predominantly brick and metal panel/cementitious panel facade, similar in character to buildings B1, B2, and C1 all included in the Bridge Park Development.

Ms. Burchett presented the open space details for the private open space terrace that includes seating areas and landscaping that is proposed for the third story of building D3.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan where building D4/D5 is highlighted on the screen. The D4 portion of the building, she explained, is the Corridor Building Type consisting of five stories and the overall height varies from ± 60 feet at the west elevation to ± 45 feet at the east elevation. She said the first floor faces Larimer Street and is comprised of retail use, lobby space, bike parking and support space, and is partially below grade at the eastern end of this wing of the building. She said residential units are proposed on all the other floors, including the first floor of the wing facing Mooney Street.

Ms. Burchett stated building D5 is the Parking Structure portion of the building. It is a five-story building she said with an overall height of ± 47 feet. She indicated retail use is proposed for the first floor facing Longshore Street as well as a portion of Tuller Ridge Drive. She presented the open space details for the fifth floor of the parking structure and noted in the northwest corner a private amenity space, including two pools, a bar, a party room, and restrooms that are proposed. She indicated a portion of this space may be rented for event use by non-residents.

Ms. Burchett presented the inspirational architectural images for building D4/5 that reflect a predominantly brick or stone and glass building facade, similar in character to the other buildings in this development.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic showing the overall open space for block D. Based on the proposed square footage, she noted, 0.88 acres of publicly accessible open space is required with this application. A 0.20-acre segment of the John Shields Greenway is proposed on the north side of building D3 and a .07-acre segment of the John Shields Greenway is proposed on the north side of building D2. She said this area coincides with a gateway location as described and illustrated in the Scioto River Neighborhood Standards. The design of this open space, she indicated, will be developed in the future as the City explores design and functionality of the greenway space in its entirety.

A 0.16-acre 'Public Open Space' is proposed between buildings D1 and D2, she said. She presented the proposed design of this space that includes 'Outdoor Dining' spaces adjacent to both buildings, a central 'Bocce Court' flanked by trees and other plantings, with moveable tables and chairs on decorative paved areas.

The remaining 0.28 acres proposed to meet the open space requirement, she said, is utilizing nearby Riverside Crossing Park. She noted, the applicant will continue to work with the City on these details.

To summarize, Ms. Burchett stated the applicant is proposing four buildings on three blocks created by the extension of Longshore Street and Larimer Street. She concluded her presentation by presenting the following discussion questions for the Commission's review this evening:

1. Is the overall proposed block arrangement consistent with the surrounding context?
2. Is the proposed architectural mass, form, and conceptual character of each building appropriate?
3. Is the proposed open space for public dedication appropriately located and sized?
4. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Bob Miller asked what happened to the proposed grocery store discussed at previous meetings. He asked what concerns staff may have had with building D4/5. Ms. Burchett indicated a much of the discussions with staff and the ART have been regarding the layout, how to best work the prominent corner across from residential units and how the building would interact with the street level activity. The questions raised, she said, had been about the location and screening of mechanicals as well as a way to avoid a blank wall space and those details have not necessarily been worked out.

Mr. Miller said when one is coming down Riverside Drive, he noted D2 is critical to be an entryway to Bridge Park from the north. Ms. Burchett agreed. He said that building has to be special just like the AC Hotel is pretty special.

Mr. Miller inquired about the pool/bar area as he did not have a full understanding on if it was public or private. Ms. Burchett indicated it is going to be a predominantly private space as an amenity space for the residential units throughout Bridge Park but the applicants can better address that question.

Steve Stidhem inquired about a drive-thru pharmacy proposed in the parking garage. Ms. Burchett said the applicant can speak to the flow of traffic through there and other details. She explained it is a smaller space in the corner and it can be associated with another business where it is just the drive-thru portion of it.

Mr. Stidhem thought the original plan was to have office space in that building and then he heard access to the parking is going to be for the condominiums or apartments. He asked where the people that are working there are going to park. Ms. Burchett said parking is accounted for within the parking structure as far as how they would access the building but the applicant could speak to that as well.

Cathy De Rosa requested clarification on all of the green space next to buildings D2 and D3; did it all belong to the City. Ms. Burchett confirmed the entire space belongs to the City and extends in front of block H and through Tuller Flats.

Victoria Newell inquired about the community space. She said in the Planning Report it stated that the text needed to be reviewed in order to account for that open space. Ms. Burchett explained the open space is being proposed as part of this project. She stated our Code allows for using open space that is available near the development and having that contribute to the total open space area required for each block. She said there have been some interpretation concerns with what the applicant would need to do as far as using that space to count towards their open space requirements. She said the Development Agreement speaks to dedication for specific Blocks but there is also some language about paying a fee-in-lieu. She indicated that staff and the legal team are looking into that further as to how to properly account for open space off-site.

Ms. Newell asked staff if they believe it is otherwise compliant with the text to which Ms. Burchett agreed. Ms. Burchett explained 0.28 acres are designated in that off-site location to account towards the open space requirement, likely with a fee-in-lieu. She said they are continuing to work with the applicant to define what that area would look like. Ms. Newell asked Ms. Burchett if she knew exactly where that 0.28 acres was located. Ms. Burchett said the overall requirement is 0.88 acres and the 0.28 acres they are using off-site has not been specifically addressed yet.

Ms. Newell asked have included private outdoor seating areas that will be included in the open space for the other developments and the other parks.

Ms. Burchett noted that when staff saw the first proposal for block H, she recalled a portion of that was going to be a private space that included a pool area that has since been removed as part of a separate application.

Ms. Newell clarified for all of the other blocks that are currently under construction, within open spaces there are not private dining areas. Ms. Burchett said she did not recall any. She added the proposed dining space between the buildings D1 and D2 would be public.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, said he would try to answer the Commission's questions but then would like to hear feedback from the Commission. He introduced others from his team to also answer questions. Mr. Yoder noted the Pedestrian Bridge between the parking garage and the condominium building is for the residents of the condominiums only so they will have reserved parking on the upper levels. He added the office employees will park in the general open garage, just like they do currently over on C block. He indicated they are not interested in pampering the office worker on their way to and from the spaces but they do the condominium dwellers.

Mr. Yoder addressed the question about open space. He said they will not count seating areas that are private seating areas for restaurants as public open space. He explained the way they work all of the blocks is there is a public use access easement to enable the public to be able to go through there. He said when you get behind a patio rail, where the public cannot flow through, those spaces cannot be counted anymore. He indicated they are going to be purchasing from the City, about a 0.3-acre parcel right up the road to be traded. He said a dog park is proposed there in Sycamore Ridge to accommodate the people in Bridge Park that are having trouble crossing Riverside Drive with their dogs. He said that will be counted towards open space as well.

Mr. Yoder addressed the question about the grocery store. He said the large format grocery store that they started working with ended up not wanting to go into this particular location which turned out to be a real blessing for the project. He said that was the 'tail wagging the dog' on this entire block. Everyone concerned decided the issues over having tractor trailers backing up right across from residential areas was not preferable. He said they would still like to get a grocer into this area that is walkable but it will be a smaller format version so the block was split in half to allow Longshore Street to continue all the way through. He indicated that one of the happy accidents now is when one stands on Longshore Street now, when standing in different parts of Bridge Park, the road curves so that the view corridor is cut off and one would feel like they were anywhere.

Mr. Yoder said they agree that building D2 has to be something special, which is why it appears curvy and tries to serve as a bookend to the development. He said they will be careful to ensure D2 does not look too much like the other end. He indicated they would use a lot of glass and a sculptural shape will be appropriate to bring some pizzazz to that corner.

Mr. Yoder addressed the earlier question about a drive-thru pharmacy. He explained a lot of smaller format grocery stores still have a pharmacy component to them so they wanted to make sure they preserved the flexibility to cover that very important programmatic need. He said it is a big profit center for some of them so they found they needed that in order to get them to sign a lease. The circulation was then explained by Mr. Yoder.

Mr. Yoder reported he has been inundated with questions about a pool in this development. He said they are proposing it for the D garage and by putting it up on this level and positioning it in the gap between the buildings, one will be able to see a framed view of the Scioto River. With it being on the fifth floor, for someone that lives somewhere else in the community, they are able to drive up to the fifth level of the parking garage, park, and walk directly through a gate, into the pool area. He said it is set up so there is two different zones: 1) a reserveable private party area; and 2) the rest is open to the community members' pool. He said there is a sizeable population at Bridge Park now, and this is not the typical apartment complex by any stretch. He said 64 condominiums on block H are coming online and 43

condominiums along Mooney Street. He said this is a Bridge Park-wide amenity for both condominium owners and apartment owners. To answer why at this location – he said there is really no ground space they want to take up with this and being at this height, it allows for more privacy as cars cannot drive by and support some pretty decent views. He said they are trying to build some excitement that can be generated from below that cannot be physically seen.

Mr. Miller noted there was a pool in block H which was eliminated. He indicated this rooftop pool may be a larger financial commitment than that pool would have been. He asked how locked in they are to this concept. He said Mr. Yoder already stated the demand is there. He did not see any revenue being generated from this, so he asked if the pool is real or just on a wish list. Mr. Yoder answered as far as he knows it is real and having it as a community-wide amenity to 700+ residential units is the intent, which is different than a pool at block H, which only had 64 residential units. He added a community-wide fee would be collected.

Mr. Stidhem said he loves the curve on D2 and he is interested to see how close it goes to the pedestrian tunnel area. He asked if there would be an overhang on that. Mr. Yoder said they could use a cantilever overhang but this has yet to be determined. Mr. Stidhem said he would like to see something really interesting.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, explained one of the massing studies showed that is an idea to provide a covered plaza to that area to be very functional off of John Shields Parkway.

Mr. Yoder presented a graphic with columns for the same visual impact and make that area wider as the overhang without columns did not work.

Mr. Miller said he cannot believe how many people are asking where to park. He asked Mr. Yoder if he is hearing that in the development. He asked him if he had an opportunity to redo the parking signs, if he would do them differently. He said he does not even see those parking signs that are up high.

Mr. Yoder indicated when people pull in, they are overwhelmed, and the parking signs up high go away, it is completely out of their view shed. He said they are more concerned with not hitting a pedestrian, etc. He added we have to over sign the parking in order to have the impact that we want and that goes outside the current Master Sign Plan that has been approved. He said the parking sign is 8 feet wide and 60 feet tall that reads "PARKING" and we need to do that to get someone in there. He indicated it is a learning curve for everyone on what the user experience is like coming into Bridge Park and they will try to get that corrected on the next phases.

Mr. Miller suggested the sandwich boards are effective, he would assume. But as much time and effort that went into the parking signs from staff, the Commission, and the applicant, do not seem to be effective and we should learn from that. People need to know where to go, he added; we as a Commission need to understand that.

Ms. Newell said height is not always the solution for signage because if a person gets too close to a building when starting to look for the parking space, you are no longer looking up, there is a roof and trees in the way so putting signs up high is not always the best solution. Mr. Yoder said that was a very nice way to say "I told you so" but it is true. Ms. Newell said she meant it politely.

Vince Papsidero added the City has put in temporary wayfinding signs along Riverside Drive because complaints were coming into the City that people could not find a parking garage. He said there is a permanent wayfinding system to be installed shortly. He suggested that as we are trying to find signs for the Historic District Garage, this issue will be revisited.

Mr. Yoder noted that people visiting the area now are coming for the very first time but next time they will figure it out. He said they hope to get a lot of first-time visitors in here.

Ms. Newell said it is a nice compliment for the architecture if people are looking at the buildings and they cannot tell which ones are the parking garages. She said, somewhere along the line, we all did our job.

Ms. De Rosa asked how many other lessons has the applicant learned that are going to be applicable here. Mr. Yoder said for the earlier phases in Bridge Park, he would say no thin brick as they have had a terrible time with that. He suggested the lack of skilled labor that exists right now is really causing a problem, beyond the fact that there is a huge amount of construction going on. He reported that they do a very diligent job of making sure that everyone that is on their projects is a legal immigrant and he thinks what is going on is there are some awesome artisans that are not legal immigrants in the country and they are not on our projects. He said they are limiting their talent pool on their projects, unintentionally. He said the labor shortage is at least region-wide. He said it is harder to stick on brick then it is to lay it and they have had to tear off huge walls of brick and replace on several buildings so that is a big problem.

Mr. Yoder said they are starting to put in the liner retail into the ground floor of parking garage so the street feels more double-loaded on day one (Longshore Street).

Deborah Mitchell said the dog park is a great idea. She encouraged the applicant to talk to pet owners as they design the park because things like shade and drainage are really important. She said it is a huge blessing that the large format grocery is not coming in because retail trends are such that they would be an albatross pretty soon. She indicated that all the retail experts are saying that very soon, anything that are sold in the internal aisles of the stores (packaged) will be attained through Amazon or other delivery mechanisms. She suggested that people are going to visit grocery stores to buy items they cannot get delivered to their house such as fresh food and things that people in Bridge Park would love but you do not need a large format grocery for. She said we are not going to need all those big trucks unloading a zillion boxes of cereal. She pointed out that D2 not mirror the hotel at the other end but that they complement each other but be really different. She underscored D2 on the north end has to be striking and beautiful but it has to be unique, too. She said sort of like it is a member of the family but different from what is located on the south end.

Mr. Stidhem said a lot of positives were expressed this evening and the applicant has done a good job and applauds what they have done with the roads like Longshore and Larrimer Streets. He said he likes the views that will come from the pool that include the river as well as the open space there. He said he is really interested to see the design for D2 because there is a lot of potential there, as well as some challenges. He added he likes the idea of keeping the open space that runs all the way up John Shields Parkway is consistent. He concluded this looks like a pretty project within the big project.

Ms. De Rosa wants to see D2 reflects the hotel at the end of the day but not mirror images. She said she worries a little bit that it is all going to start to feel the same but if there are interesting bookends, then she could recognize this as a complete community. She emphasized the applicant not shy away from what was accomplished on the south end. She reported she has been to the development a couple of times now. She understands they want the ability to pull people through and get them to walk around. She said the green spaces and the pocket spaces are going to be so important to that. Maybe it is because they are not completed yet, but she said when she has been down there and there is not a lot finished yet, she does not feel the urge to walk around and explore. She recognizes it is a timing thing but it is an important part of this.

Mr. Yoder said it is also going to be important the people want to be in those open spaces is why they programmed this one a little bit differently. He said they are proposing a Bocce Court that could also be

used as a Corn Hole Tournament. He said they are investigating 'Best of Class' examples around the country. He said they are considering having a chalkboard at the side where someone could sign in and reserve a time would be useful, why they are waiting for their table. He said it would give people more of a reason to be in that space. He noted the Pavilion space over by Cap City Diner and the (future) Fado restaurant/bar currently provides live music at different times. He said the other space that has the charismatic boulders in it, should be open within 60 days at the outside. He said we will begin to start watching people. He said it is kind of like the Oval at The Ohio State University where you can see where people are walking from place to place.

Ms. De Rosa said it would be interesting to hear what they have learned about that when they return to this Commission. She has been questioning how those pocket parks are going to engage with the building itself. She said it is going to do a lot with whether one enters the garage (once they found it), do what I want to do and then I am going to leave or one is going to find their way to do what we need to have happen in that space. She said that is as important as the architecture.

Ms. De Rosa said the granite curbs have been causing tire damage.

Mr. Miller said he witnessed a driver doing a really bad parallel parking job and then all of a sudden, WHAM!

Mr. Yoder said that was a city-wide issue.

Mr. Papsidero reported Engineering has been going back and grinding the edges off the granite that has been installed. He indicated reflectors are being installed now at the bump outs. He said part of the problem is behavior, as we adjust to an urban setting plus when the parking is not full, and people are going too fast, they drive into bump-outs. He suggested that once there is more activity and the place gets full, behavior will change, people will slow down and pay more attention. Due to what they have seen, they will update the Code to pull back the bump-outs a little bit and the lane width, especially on secondary streets so there may be some tweaks in terms of the standards but they will be minimal.

The speed limits were briefly discussed, which may be changed per the traffic study.

Mr. Miller stated he absolutely loves the project and he cannot wait to see it and hopes they take buildings D1, D2, and D3 and put their stamp on it. Unfortunately, he said he does not have any feedback to provide that the applicant could take back and use. He said he is pleasantly surprised to see the office demand is so high; that is great for the City. He concluded, overall, the project is really cool and awesome.

Mr. Stidhem said rooftop amenities like what he has seen in other cities and what the applicant has done with the pool, etc. would be awesome. He suggested a building could be neat but the experience could be awesome when something attracts people to the rooftops.

Mr. Yoder said the office building on the corner, by stepping the massing back, they can open up the rooftop. He said they did it on their office building and it is a great experience for everybody that is in the office and people on the lower levels can have that kind of experience since we have stacked it back.

Ms. Newell addressed the discussion questions. She said overall, the arrangement of the block is fine. She said she understands staff's concern about the one drive and why it was eliminated. In terms of architecture, she said it is a little hard to make a comment on it because she has some great photographs in front of her that are inspirational images but not the final design of the building. She indicated she has confidence that great designs will come for the buildings. She said when she looks at all the images, they take brick all the way up to the top of the buildings and almost all of the buildings presented for this

project have a steel back up to the skin. She said she does not know how the applicant plans to do the other development but encouraged them to do cold-form framing on the exterior wall and if the interior is framed with wood, it will give better variety in architecture and maybe the applicant will not struggle with the details they have been. She said she wanted to see D2 as a bookend to the other at the south end and she is confident a great design will come forward. She emphasized the building should be uniquely different but complement the other building. She concluded she loves to take her large dogs to the dog park and but the current dog parks are mud pits. She recommended the applicant consider using synthetic turf instead of putting in grass which turns to mud that the dogs will track through. She explained synthetic turf has anti-microbial properties to them. She said they use this material in Arizona in their dog parks because they can clean it and replace it and move it periodically. She said it is good for the dogs and it would be good for the development; it will also look nicer in the long term in a very public setting.

Mr. Yoder said they want to make sure they get the massing right so if there is more feedback you would like to share, please contact staff and they will be in contact and try to factor that into their design process as they go along.

**2. Tuttle Crossing West Corridor PCD – Motel 6 5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard
17-072FDP Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for the development of a three-story, 42,000-square-foot hotel with 100 guest rooms on an approximately 2.8-acre site. The site is on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Britton Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

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

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site for context and noted it is on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Emerald/Britton Parkway. He pointed out the site is heavily wooded and contains an existing residential dwelling on the southwestern property. He explained the proposal includes a total of three properties amounting to approximately 2.8 acres. The zoning for this property is unique, he said, as the planned district encompasses the majority of the properties on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard with the exception of one. As such, he said the Development Text speaks to a lot of cross access between the sites due to the existing design of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and the only full-service intersection being located at the southeastern corner of the site.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed site plan for the three-story, 100 guest room hotel. The hotel, he highlighted, is on the west side of the property with the main covered entrance on the east façade. He said the site is served by a single shared-access point with Extended Stay to the east with a cross-access easement being established from the existing entry to the western property line to allow for future connections. He stated 112 parking spaces are proposed in the center of the site, which meets Code, with a small storage shed and dumpster enclosure located in the northeast corner of the parking lot. Running along the northern property line is a Stream Corridor Protection Zone, he said, that prohibits development to ensure preservation of the natural features within this area.

Mr. Stang presented the tree preservation and landscaping plan and explained that due to the existing conditions of the site, the applicant is removing a total of 34 trees, which amounts to 549 caliper inches. The proposed landscaping plan, as shown, he noted, replaces 26 trees or 65 caliper inches, leaving the remaining amount of 484 inches to be paid for with a Fee-in-Lieu. He indicated that Staff is conditioning

~~Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated the ART would make their recommendation to City Council at the meeting on August 17 to be forwarded to City Council for their meeting on August 28, 2017.~~

**3. BSD SRN - Bridge Park, Block D
17-022BPR**

**PID: 271-012703
Basic Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this is a proposal for a mixed-use development on approximately 5.3 acres, including three buildings containing 119 residential units, approximately 78,000 square feet of office space, 48,000 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and a parking structure lined with 55 residential units. She said the site is located east of Riverside Drive, south of John Shields Parkway, west of Mooney Street and north of Tuller Ridge Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak reported Staff received the submission earlier this year but Staff and the ART had lots of issues. She said the applicant continued to work on a revised plan throughout summer, meeting weekly with Staff for this submission. She said this would go to City Council and they would designate a final reviewing body.

Ms. Husak presented Block D, which is on the north side of the Bridge Park development that includes three buildings approved in Block A, all the buildings in Blocks B & C, and six buildings in Block H. She said the two public streets that are proposed to extend into this block are Longshore Street (north/south), and Larrimer Street (east/west) that cross between the four buildings proposed.

Ms. Husak said this is the most southern building within the block and it fronts Riverside Drive. She described the buildings as follows:

Building D1

- Corridor Building
- 6 stories
- Retail/Restaurant - 1st floor
- Office - 2nd floor
- 43 Residential condominiums - floors 3-6
- Elevated pedestrian bridge connection to the parking garage - 3rd floor

Building D2

- Corridor Building
- 6 stories
- 97,000 square feet
- Retail - 1st first floor
- Office – floors 2-6
- Terrace component for the Riverside Drive side

Building D3

- Corridor Building
- 5 stories
- 76 Residential apartments - floors 2-5
- Retail/Parking (52 parking spaces) - 1st first floor retail includes drive kiosk (one way in/one way out) option for a possible drive through that could accommodate a pharmacy as an example
- Terrace - 2nd floor
- Bridge to D4/5 – 3rd floor

D4/5

- Corridor Building
- 5 stories
- Parking Garage/Residential Liners
- 637 Parking spaces
- 55 Apartments on floors 2-5
- Retail/Restaurant - 1st floor
- Pool/Amenity Space – 5th floor offered to all residents of Bridge Park

Ms. Husak reported Staff's latest reviews that identified a number of issues. She asked if there was a way to eliminate the exit function or move the entry/exit to align more with the open space across street. Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, explained the condominium floor is 2 feet higher than grade at H block so headlights might not go into the residential windows across the street. Lori Burchett said the lowest window is at 1.3 feet. Ms. Umbarger said she is still investigating that and noted the grade changes.

Ms. Husak suggested that John Shields Parkway be restricted in some way. Aaron Stanford explained a design such as the one shown will require a significant amount of frontage that disrupts the streetscape. He said they will need to work on an appropriate design for this intersection.

Ms. Husak reported Staff is suggesting to move the D2 building to the south to open up more room and the City would provide programming for that corner, not the applicant. She added the intersection interrupts the greenway and it is tight between the building and the pedestrian tunnel walls. Donna Goss stated the stairs leading to the pedestrian tunnel have been constructed. Vince Papsidero suggested the applicant consider modifying the building footprint by adding another story on the proposed office building. Ms. Husak emphasized shifting the building is the preference as this would decrease the size of the green space between building D1 and D2 so the green space at the corner can be increased and improved.

Ms. Husak noted that now that the C garage is open, there is a growing concern with pedestrian crossings. Mr. Stanford said there is too much access to the parking garage along Longshore Street and suggested consolidating the access points. He noted the curb is wide that leads to the compactor space so vehicles take that corner at a higher speed than is recommended and yet the entrance aisle is narrow. He said smaller van-type deliveries in the compact area would not be appropriate. He asked if detail could be provided.

Ms. Husak questioned what happens between the sidewalk and the area seven feet up. She asked if these are intended to be garden spaces or used for storage, perhaps. She requested building renderings of the elevations and to provide material samples for the design of the block.

Ms. Husak pointed out that the generators along Larrimer Street are adjacent to residential units and should be relocated elsewhere on-site.

Ms. Husak explained that the D3 terrace open space is a private area for D3 residential units. She indicated there would be trees in pots, etc. She presented the pool on top of the parking garage that is accessible to all Bridge Park residents but noted a party room with a smaller pool for special events.

Ms. Husak indicated the tentative next steps are an informal review at PZC on August 24th, ART recommendation to City Council on August 31st, and City Council review on September 11th. Ms. Husak noted the Preliminary Plat will not require an ART review but will go to PZC and City Council for reviews.

Steve Stidhem, Planning and Zoning Commissioner, asked if the Pedestrian Bridge was accessible for office employees or just residents. Ms. Umbarger answered it was mainly for the residents and not the office employees.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, explained the entry/exit for the garage is located where it is because the grade drops quickly as well as having a path to the ramp inside the building needing to be accessed. He asked if the exit could be eliminated while adding an exit to Longshore Street. Staff said the ramp needs to work on the interior while entering the garage as well. Mr. Gonzalez suggested a median at the south entry.

Mr. Stanford suggested there should be additional street parking because there current layout provides few spaces on the Longshore Street connection.

Ms. Umbarger indicated the applicant would consolidate entrances/exits like the D3 garage in block D.

Ms. Husak said she expects to see requests for Waivers because at a minimum, one will be needed for the length of this block.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said they had received a Waiver in 2014 for the block length and size so what is currently being requested is not out of the ordinary.

Mr. Yoder explained the northwest corner building is taller and tighter and the smaller it gets, the units get decreased in size. He said they may even need more elevators if they added a story. He said there are a lot of factors to consider. Mr. Gonzalez added the open space had to do with views to the pool. He said positive open space is a better size than found on blocks B & C. He suggested eliminating the top floor and making it a rooftop terrace. Ms. Husak said to consider public open space vs private just for a limited number of residents at the pool view.

Brad Conway said this corner space is located at an intersection of two really busy streets - John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. He suggested keeping the inner open space larger (between D1 and D2) because people would rather hang out there where they would feel more comfortable. He said shifting D2 south, still may not increase the size on the corner enough. He said he did not see people wanting to be on that busy corner.

Ms. Goss said she agreed with the exception of the tunnel area and suggested that corner may be more of a gathering space than one might think. Ms. Umbarger suggested carving away the first floor to integrate more space. Matt Earman said he would like to know what tenant goes in there because that could determine how busy that corner will be. If it is like a Starbucks, he said it would be heavily used.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated the ART would make their recommendation to City Council at the meeting on August 31 to be forwarded to City Council for their meeting on September 11, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:18 pm.

Approved by the Administrative Review Team on August 17, 2017.

~~Mr. Stanford reported that EMH&T is doing a traffic study, concurrently and they will meet with staff to work out the layout for streets early.~~

~~Mr. Tyler asked the applicant to consider trash pick-up, emergency services, and mail pick-up and delivery as these will need to be addressed sooner rather than later.~~

~~Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross LLC, indicated the Zoning Code could change and asked where staff is in the process. Ms. Husak answered they have prepped for the City Council meeting on April 17 and the materials are being disseminated tomorrow. She explained the Code piece will be presented at a high level and the approach is going to be for areas affected by Code rewrites. She said Planning is hoping for Council to sign off on the process so it can move forward. She said Code rewrites will include changing "shall" to "should" and the consultant is recommending changes to the general use table. She emphasized that Mr. Goodwin will need to work within the current Zoning Code. She indicated that the West Innovation District will be the first to see changes to the Code.~~

~~Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to consider early on how they will deal with screening/fencing for patios and accessory structures since the lots are so close together and what will be allowed for accessory structures on individual lots. Mr. Suiter said those issues would be solved in the Homeowner Association documents. Mr. Suiter said marketing will be for sustainable living. Mr. Tyler said they should consider how to handle rain barrels and if trash cans should fit in garages because those have been big issues in other parts of the city.~~

~~Mr. Krawetzki suggested patios should be planned instead of being left open to interpretation due to the building design and proximity to neighbor's back doors. Mr. Suiter added that while this is a manufactured community, sometimes people want the option for privacy away from the more public spaces.~~

~~Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]~~

**5. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, D-Block
17-022BPR/PP/FP**

**Riverside Drive & John Shields Parkway
Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

Claudia Husak said this is a request for the development of three mixed-use buildings containing approximately 223 residential dwelling units, 76,000 square feet of retail space, and a parking structure. She said the site is on the southeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Husak said four buildings are proposed for this block counting the garage structure and the residential liners separately. She said ultimately, City Council has the decision-making responsibility for all three parts to this application: Basic Plan Review, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat. She explained the Preliminary and Final Plats will be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission to be forwarded to Council and that the plats are not under the ART's purview. She added that if the applicant and staff were prepared, an informal review of the Basic Plan would be conducted by the PZC on April 20th and their findings would be forwarded to City Council for review and determination of the Basic Plan.

Ms. Husak presented the aerial view of the site as well as the proposed Basic Plan and noted the three buildings, the greenway proposed, the tunnel under Riverside Drive, and the residential liners along Mooney Street. She pointed out where the grocery is currently proposed in Block D. She reported there has been a lot of discussion regarding the proposed extension of Longshore Drive. She said a development plan was approved that included all of the Bridge Park development but shortly after, additional development plans

were approved for each block separately due to the Zoning Code amendments. She added Block D was one of the outstanding blocks that needed to be revisited based on all the additional changes.

Ms. Husak asked the applicant why a Final Plat is part of this application. Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, answered the Final Plat can be postponed to a later application, which is probably more appropriate. Ms. Husak asked if the City was an applicant as the greenway along John Shields Parkway is currently owned by the City of Dublin. Mr. Quackenbush said the plat can be revised to both include the greenway and bring Dublin on as an applicant or adjusted to remove it completely.

Ms. Husak described the buildings in Block D.

Building D1: Floor 1 - restaurant, retail, commercial space; Floors 2 – 5 residential condominiums

Building D2/D3: Floor 1 - grocery and residential liner; Floor 2 - residential and terraces

Building D4/D5: Floor 1 - parking garage and retail; Floor 2 – parking garage and residential

Ms. Husak noted the following list of issues or concerns identified at a high level on the first pass:

- No meetings with staff regarding Block D to identify potential issues prior to submitting an application, which is unlike all the other blocks in this development.
- Building D1, Floor 1: currently has one lobby on (proposed) Longshore Street with a corridor that runs to Riverside Drive. She asked if a dual lobby makes more sense by adding a lobby at Riverside Drive directly across from the current one shown.
- Building D1: PZC was concerned that multiple buildings throughout the development look similar to other buildings in the Columbus area and they want to see a unique design that provides variety.
- Proposed Longshore Street as a thru street: Traffic and Engineering have concerns with the circulation and people trying to make a right turn onto Riverside Drive and crossing multiple lanes to connect to the (future) John Shields Parkway Bridge.
- Grocery and needs: in an urban development; movement of patrons and deliveries; and carts.
- Longshore Street should line up with Larimer Street. The proposed location for the loading docks would require the trucks to pull up to Larimer Street and then jog back into the loading docks across Mooney Street.
- Loading area/drop off areas for groceries appears large in front of the grocery store.
- There are condominiums located in Block H across from the proposed location of the loading docks and noise and visibility is a concern for those units impacted by this area.
- The open space proposed between building D2/D3 and building D4/D5. There is a retaining wall and reflecting pool with a 12-foot drop and only accessible if one maneuvers through the garage.
- Open space dedicated on areas separate from this site need to be documented; there needs to be a map of areas that are already designated for other blocks in the development.
- Tuller Ridge Drive is treated like 'back of house' as that is where all the transformers and generators are currently proposed. Screening walls would be required along Tuller Ridge Drive making this unfavorable to pedestrians.
- Residential units attached to the garage appear to have first floor access only through the garage and a "back door" area on Tuller Ridge Drive, which will not be very safe.

- Façade transparency and lack of information for the D2/D3 building.
- Number of entrances and proposed locations for residential and commercial areas.
- Proposed grocery does not yet have a tenant and therefore not able to be finalized. Possibly phasing this project may be appropriate. Some pieces are finalized and some are not.

Ms. Husak said Planning does not feel comfortable taking this to the Commission on April 20th and that would not be the best strategy as further review is needed.

Jennifer Rauch recommended that staff go through the additional list of concerns.

Aaron Stanford said the loading dock has major issues. He said that maneuvering into the public street that goes north (Larimer Street) would cross a pedestrian crossing, which would disrupt that path.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said they looked at many different location options for a loading dock and they were all negative but this plan was the least negative. She said with the grade issues they are facing it makes it a challenge to find a place for the loading dock because the trucks cannot maneuver a steep grade of roughly a 12% slope. Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, added he had previously expressed concerns about the path the trucks would have to take to enter and exit the loading docks and that this was not the first time Planning had seen this plan. He said they are not sure if they want a street there or not and finding a dock space has been a challenge.

Jeff Tyler said he understood the challenge as this building requires four-sided architecture so there is no 'back of house'. Obviously, he said this needs to be resolved before moving forward.

Ms. Rauch said more discussion needs to happen between the applicant and staff regarding these details. She said the proposed grocery location does not have a specific tenant and the grocery store space is driving the design of the block.

Mr. Stanford asked why there is not a T-connection to Larimer Street. He asked how the site will be serviced because the area does not currently have water, hydrants, or fire access. Mike Altomare said without water and a way to get in and out, he cannot commit a truck to that area immediately.

Mr. Quackenbush asked if a fire truck could pull into open space. Mr. Altomare said there is still the issue of no water service. Mr. Quackenbush asked if a hydrant could be added to the open space like a private hydrant. Mr. Stanford said Riverside Drive does not have a water main servicing this building and there cannot be a dead end main line from Tuller Ridge Drive.

Ms. Husak suggested moving transformers and generators from Tuller Ridge Drive and make Tuller Ridge Drive a more interesting street for pedestrians to promote activity.

Ms. Husak asked for clarification on what the support area includes within the parking structure. Ms. Umbarger said support would be provided the same as on buildings C4/C5.

Mr. Stanford suggested the entrance on Riverside Drive be one way up to Longshore; catching the person going north on Riverside Drive without having to go all the way around John Shields Parkway. Ms. Husak answered this is more than what we normally give comments on and that traffic engineers need to weigh in on these issues more thoroughly.

Ms. Husak said staff would compile a list of additional items needed for the review. She said currently the number of planning analysis waivers required is in the 40s because staff does not have enough information.

She said this can be provided on paper or staff can meet regularly to work these issues out. She restated that this application is not ready for a public meeting. She added taking this to City Council on May 22, 2017, might be aggressive and suggested the applicant go before the PZC, informally, to ensure all concerns are being addressed upfront.

Mr. Hunter said the elephant in the room is access and how the extension of Longshore will work for this site.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

ADJOURNMENT

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 3:45 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on April 20, 2017.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

**3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, D-Block
17-022BPR/PP/FP**

**Riverside Drive & John Shields Parkway
Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

Claudia Husak said this is a request for the development of three mixed-use buildings containing approximately 223 residential dwelling units, 76,000 square feet of retail space, and a parking structure. She said the site is on the southeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Husak said four buildings are proposed for this block counting the garage structure and residential wrap separately. She said ultimately, City Council has the decision-making responsibility for all three parts to this application: Basic Plan Review, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat. She explained the Preliminary and Final Plats will be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission to be forwarded to Council and that the plats are not under the ART's purview. She said the Basic Plan will be reviewed by General Staff next week and the ART will review it on April 6th and make a recommendation. She added an informal review of the Basic Plan will be conducted by the PZC on April 20th and their findings will be forwarded to City Council for review and determination of the Basic Plan.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, presented a site plan for D Block that contains four buildings. She explained Building D1 is a five story building with retail on the first floor and four upper floors of condominiums. Building D4/5 is a parking garage with a residential liner and retail elements. Building D2/3 is intended for a grocery tenant on the first floor with residential along the greenway. She noted the loading dock area on the southwest corner that has a 15-foot slope to its entry to be flattened out to be in line with the grocery and the walk-up residential units on the northwest corner. She said they are adding a variety of aesthetics. She indicated the 6-floor building is viewed as one book end for the development with the hotel being the other end. She noted John Shields Parkway and the greenway along the northern end of D Block.

Ms. Husak indicated there may need to be additional space left along the terrace area and pedestrian tunnel for maintenance along with an easement.

Ms. Umbarger said there is a pedestrian tunnel/patio off the grocery as well as rooftop terraces that include a pool for the entire community. She added the terrace for the residents serves more as a respite space. Lastly, she pointed out the reflecting pool between buildings D4/5 and D2/3 in the open area.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, said the open space between the grocer and the parking garage has a small retail space to help activate the open space.

Ms. Umbarger said Sullivan Bruck Architects designed Building D1 with a similar look as the B3 warehouse building with patio spaces that are capable of opening using accordion style windows. She said the building is mainly brick on Riverside Drive and the entry piece projects a small amount. She noted the Longshore Street view is similar but broken up with fiber cement and a darker rich brick on the north and south elevations.

Ms. Husak expressed concern over the similarity of the buildings. She said she liked the color but saw an issue with the box form as the similarity of buildings was discussed at length by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the other blocks. She indicated the building needed additional character. Vince Papsidero suggested breaking up the roof line of the 5-story building.

Ms. Umbarger said the architect wants a warehouse appearance on Riverside Drive and that the patio spaces will create a unique design when they are open.

Ms. Husak questioned the layout for the open space. Ms. Umbarger said this is unique for the property and they went through several iterations of footprints. She explained the first floor was for retail and the resident lobby was on the east side for access to the upper stories of residential units, which each has its own storage room; two parking spaces are designated in the garage for each unit; and a Club room is for tenants/owners.

Ms. Umbarger said that the grocer layout would depend on the tenant but that they have provided potential layouts to be reviewed. She said this could include a coffee shop or wine bar along the northwest plaza as the east side would be for back-of-house elements. She said the pool and open space on the upper level would be for the development and that public access was shown near the main entrance to the grocery store.

Ms. Umbarger stated that although it's a 6-story building, the fifth story is the last full plate story due to the grade change. She said the sixth story would be located along Riverside Drive to create a book end for the development. She said the design is more contemporary utilizing more glass than in previous blocks.

Mr. Papsidero asked if a story could be added to the grocery to enhance the book end element. Ms. Umbarger replied she would inquire if the City was supportive. Ms. Umbarger indicated the budget may be an issue because if they go higher the building would then require different construction.

Rachel Ray inquired about the look of the loading dock. She said it is a difficult piece to incorporate but is necessary for the proposed use. Ms. Umbarger said they would use glass garage doors or could incorporate frosted glass to help screen the loading area. She said trash would also be located in this area with a compactor placed on the inside wall.

Mr. Gonzalez said that cart storage is incorporated into the first floor of the garage with additional spaces on the upper floors. He said most likely one elevator near the main garage entrance would be a freight elevator to handle the carts.

Ms. Umbarger said handicap access is provided from the upper terrace area through a breezeway that runs adjacent to the open space between buildings D2/3 and D4/5.

Mr. Gonzalez noted the retail areas in Building D4/5. He said the trash compactor is located on the first floor along with trash for the adjacent building. He said they are proposing two pedestrian bridges from the garage to building D2/3.

Shawn Krawetzki asked why the two bridges were different. Mr. Gonzalez explained one bridge is similar to what has been approved for the other blocks and the other is an open bridge to fade into the façade as opposed to drawing more attention above the open space.

Ms. Ray inquired about the first floor of building D4/5 as it appears to be treated differently. Mr. Gonzalez said it is a more contemporary look to correspond with H Block across Mooney Street. Ms. Husak said she has requested more elevations from a street view to put the development into context.

Ms. Husak said the next step will be to have a General Staff Review March 30th and the applicant to return April 6th for further review and final comments.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]