



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 15, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted that due to the pandemic, the City of Dublin is currently holding public meetings online and live streaming to YouTube. The meeting live-stream can be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City desires to accommodate public participation to the greatest extent possible.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

OATH OF OFFICE

Vice Mayor De Rosa administered the Oath of Office to Planning and Zoning member re-appointee, Mark Supelak.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Jane Fox, Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier, Rebecca Call, Lee Grimes, Kim Way, Mark Supelak
Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Aaron Stanford

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Grimes seconded election of Mark Supelak as PZC Vice Chair for April 2021 through March 2023.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded re-election of Ms. Call as the PZC Chair for April 2021 through March 2023.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded acceptance of the documents into the record.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in.

Ms. Call noted that no cases are eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening; however, there is a request to amend the order of the agenda to hear Cases 4 and 5, Kitchen Social prior to Cases 1, 2 and 3, Bridge Park Block G. No member objected to amendment of the agenda order.

Ms. Call swore in individuals intending to address the Commission on tonight's cases.

4. Kitchen Social at 6767 Longshore Street, 1-037WR, Waiver Review

A request for approval of deviations to transparency and entrance requirements associated with exterior modifications for a tenant space within Bridge Park, Block D – Building D2 zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with John Shields Parkway.

5. Kitchen Social at 6767 Longshore Street, 21-021MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for approval of exterior modifications for a tenant space within Bridge Park, Block D – Building D2 zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with John Shields Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review of a waiver and a Minor Project for Kitchen Social. The site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood and is located within the Bridge Park development. Block D, which is located at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive, is the northernmost block within the Bridge Park development. This particular tenant space is located at 6767 Longshore Street, and is the northernmost, ground-story tenant space within Building D2. The east elevation of the tenant space is located along Longshore Street, and the north elevation, which the primary consideration, is located along the John Shields Parkway greenway. [Images shown of the John Shields Parkway streetscape.] Mrs. Martin stated that a significant, underground pedestrian walkway provides access to the future Riverside Crossing Park on the west side of Riverside Drive. The terrace area was approved with the base building. This is the primary area of consideration, although there are some minor tenant modifications to the primary entrance along Longshore Street, as well as minor modifications to the west elevation.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing façade/storefront modifications to the existing tenant space, which includes enclosing an existing 650-square-foot terrace located to the north of the tenant space. The proposed enclosure will create an indoor/outdoor dining space for the restaurant. The existing terrace was approved with the base building in 2018, as an open-air terrace, to allow for a transition between private space and the publically-accessible John Shields Parkway greenway to the north of the building. The primary modifications under consideration follow.

North Elevation:

The existing outdoor dining terrace would be permanently enclosed using three 10-foot tall C.H.I overhead glass garage doors, finished in a Powder Coat Gray finish. The garage doors will be located between the existing brick pilasters at the edge of the terrace, within the existing footprint of the building.

The overhead garage doors can be opened to take advantage of pleasant weather, and also allow for year-round use of the space. The applicant is proposing Nichiha Vintage Wood 1818 fiber cement panels around the garage doors in an Ash Gray finish. The applicant is also proposing a 36-inch wire railing system on the inside of the garage doors to retain a barrier when the garage doors are opened. Staff recommends a higher quality thin brick, in a color matching upper stories of the building (Glen-Gery Sioux City Ebonite), be used in lieu of the fiber cement board. The application of brick will provide a more, permanent appearance and ensure the quality and character meets the Bridge Street District requirements.

East Elevation:

On the Longshore Street, east elevation is the primary entrance to the tenant space. The applicant is proposing a new NanaWall window system on either side of the building entrance. Below the windows, Mos Metalica Pol Ret porcelain wall tiles in a blue/gray color, matching the brand aesthetics, are proposed.

West Elevation:

On the west elevation, the applicant will be adding approximately 90 square feet of storefront system to the total square footage of the west façade by expanding the façade north of the existing tenant space. The applicant is proposing to extend the existing storefront system to meet the existing brick pillar at the northwest corner of the building. A 50-square-foot louver system is proposed to be installed above a portion of the storefront system. The louvers are finished in a gray color to match the existing louvers on the building. Enclosing the space eliminates the stairway for the existing terrace, which will no longer be utilized.

Staff has reviewed the proposal against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of:

- o 2 waivers: (1) permit elimination of the entrance on the north façade, and (2) to modify the percent of primary materials and transparency; and
- o A Minor Project with three conditions.

Commission Questions for Staff

Ms. Call stated that in regard to quality of materials, Council has advised caution in approving the use of thin brick. Staff has recommended replacing the Nichiha product with thin brick, which would match the remainder of the building. Is the rest of the building finished in a thin brick?

Ms. Martin responded that she does not have that answer. However, the upper stories of many of the buildings in the District are clad in thin brick, due to the weight of full brick. Thin brick is recommended due to the limited amount of use, and because the depth of the thin brick would match that of the cementitious siding, the entire front of the storefront would not need to be redesigned.

Ms. Fox inquired if any other system was considered rather than garage doors.

Ms. Martin responded that the initial proposal did not include garage doors. It included a low wall enclosure with windows above. Staff suggested the garage door element to increase the transparency and retain the colonnade element to the extent possible.

Mr. Supelak stated that staff has recommended disapproval of the Administrative Departure in regard to meeting the 80% requirement of primary materials. Would the use of thin brick achieve the required 80%?

Ms. Martin responded that replacing the fibrous cement board, a secondary material, with thin brick would make the materials compliant with Code.

Applicant Presentation

Brian O'Malley, Kitchen Social, 6767 Longshore Street, Dublin, OH stated that they also have a Kitchen Social restaurant at Polaris. They proposed the use of fibrous cement board because it is more consistent with their Kitchen Social look, and it also would permit the restaurant to stand out on that side of the building. This would be consistent with other tenants within the development, who have individual looks, store fronts and curb appeal; it was for that purpose the secondary materials were chosen. Additionally, they initially proposed half walls with garage doors above. The Kitchen Social concept is indoor/outdoor; hence the patio. That concept is even more relevant today than when the first Kitchen Social restaurant was designed.

Commission Questions

Mr. Way requested the applicant to address the durability of the porcelain tile, which is proposed on the exterior by the entrance.

Mr. O'Malley responded that it is an indoor/outdoor porcelain tile. That material currently exists on the façade of their exterior bar at their Polaris location, which opened in November 2019.

Mr. Way stated that he noticed the elevations for the rest of the building have lights on the columns on all facades. What is the reason the applicant chose not to incorporate similar lights? He would suggest that some lighting on the columns related to this business would be beneficial.

Mr. O'Malley stated that he agrees. He believes that the lights on the columns on the rest of the building existed at the time those tenants occupied their sites. They chose not to change the existing exterior, but they would be happy to include some lights on the exterior, if possible.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the garage doors were a mutual agreement between the applicant and staff.

Mr. O'Malley responded that initially, he designed a half wall rather than metal railings; however, either railings or a wall is necessary due to Liquor Codes. They need to be able to stop people going or leaving, per Code. Staff suggested the full garage doors, which permits more light to enter the space. The existing wire railings on the building will be further extended. The garage doors are important. They can be open 75% of the year, but also permit an abundance of natural light during the winter months.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the garage doors. Is the applicant also satisfied with staff's recommendation for replacing the secondary material with thin brick?

Mr. O'Malley responded that he would prefer the secondary material, as it permits them to be more consistent with their existing storefronts. He would like the restaurant to stand out, because it has a front door in Bridge Park. However, he does not object to thin brick if it is necessary for approval of the project.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the railing is the same as what exists on the building.

Mr. O'Malley responded that it is the same railing.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the Commission was being asked to evaluate the project in context with the Kitchen Social tenant space or in context with the building.

Ms. Martin responded that the Code addresses it with two calculations, one for materials and another for transparency. For materials, the calculation is in regard to the entire north elevation, all six stories. The transparency is calculated differently for a ground story than it is for upper stories. When the base

building was approved, the transparency requirement for the ground floor was incorrectly calculated, so a waiver is requested to address the error and incorporate nominal changes based on the modifications. Mr. Supelak stated that he is unable to see a transparency shortage. Essentially, the entire building is brick. Whether it is Nichiha, thin brick or tile -- there is not much square footage involved, and it is difficult to see how that could be a 7% change on the entire north façade.

Ms. Martin responded that the nuance is that in the upper stories, windows are calculated as glass, which is a primary building material. On the ground story, they are calculated as storefronts, not as a primary building material. When the north elevation is modified to add this storefront, that deviation is seen.

Mr. Supelak responded that no credit is given for the glass, which otherwise would be considered a primary material. There are a few triggers that do not intuitively make sense. In his opinion, that deviation is an error, as glass is preferable to brick in these infill areas on this level.

Ms. Martin responded that there is some question as to whether the Administrative Departure should be approved. From a planning perspective, the intent was to ensure Code was met, ensuring the highest quality of materials on the ground floor where there is pedestrian interaction. However, there are a couple of calculations involved.

Ms. Call stated that the debate is not glass versus thin brick, but Nichiha versus thin brick. Nichiha is not a permitted primary material.

Mr. Supelak responded that the debate occurs only because the primary material calculation is not met because the glass on this floor is not counted.

Ms. Call responded that she would make the argument that glass in a garage door is not equivalent to mounted glass in a building. The spirit of the law is quality, so what is the higher quality material – thin brick and the glass garage door or Nichiha and the glass garage door? She believes the thin brick combination would be a higher quality.

Mr. O'Malley pointed out that Nichiha is used throughout the development, including across the street, over the YogaSix Studio and the apartments. Different secondary and/or primary materials are used throughout the development, allowing owners to differentiate their storefronts. Nichiha is a quality, exterior material.

Ms. Fox stated that she is struggling with the recommendation for the clear transparency of the glass rather than a knee wall. Was the more distinctive tiled knee wall eliminated to satisfy transparency requirements?

Ms. Martin responded that the purpose was to retain the appearance of the colonnade to the extent possible, as the colonnade serves as a transition between the public and the private realms. The knee wall solution would provide a division between the public and private realms. The intent is to achieve the transition but also accommodate the desires of this tenant. [Photo shown of a knee wall matching the building foundation, which was a manufactured stone.]

Ms. Fox inquired if tile were not used, would manufactured stone have been used.

Ms. Martin responded that it could have been that or a masonry unit.

Ms. Fox noted that the Kitchen Social Polaris location has a tile knee wall.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Administrative Departure

Ms. Call noted that staff has recommended disapproval of this item.

Mr. Supelak stated that he agrees with staff's recommendation to eliminate the knee wall and the garage doors to be extended all the way down, preserving the colonnade element. However, he would be willing to count the glass in the garage doors as a primary material; he sees no need to solve a primary material calculation by having a primary material wrap around that glass. He has no issue with Nichiha; it is a good product. Thin brick can just as easily prove to be problematic. He would have no objection to approving the Administrative Departure.

Ms. Fox expressed agreement with Mr. Supelak's view of the glass material. She is not in agreement with replacing Nichiha with thin brick; there is no architectural contrast or color that makes this facade distinctive. She would prefer to see even more architectural detail around the windows, as well as lights on the columns, so that the space stands out more. The dark gray Nichiha would be a nice contrast, rather than matching the red brick. The porcelain tile is nice, but she would like to see extra detail over the entranceway. This is a prime corner, across from the pedestrian tunnel and along John Shields Parkway. It deserves the extra impact that additional design elements would provide, such as contrasting color, lighting on the columns, and perhaps a canopy and additional lighting wherever it might fit.

Mr. Way stated that, ideally, the garage doors would fill the space; however, custom-built garage doors that would fit the openings perfectly are not an option. The challenge, then, is how to address the gap or infill to fit with the building. Staff believes the brick would look contiguous with the rest of the façade. He understands their perspective but also does not mind the contrast. If done correctly, it would not look like infill. He likes the simple and open elements of the plan and is supportive of what is proposed.

Alan Burge, Alan R. Burge Architecture, 43 E Market St # 200, Akron, OH 44308 stated that they are using a custom width, 18-foot garage door. The jams are as small as possible and still have the doors work.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the design as submitted. The garage doors are a great idea, even in this climate, providing a transition between the private to public realms, as well as an improved dining experience. He has no objection to either the Nichiha or thin brick materials, although perhaps the Nichiha element would stand out even more.

Mr. Fishman stated that he also has no objection to either building material; however, he is as interested in durability as in appearance. Thin brick attached to a stucco base can sometimes become loosened through pedestrian contact. Full brick, when possible, is more durable.

Mr. Grimes expressed agreement with the need for more lighting, color and interest, an important element in the entire development. Because it is north-facing, as much natural light as possible is needed. He likes the plan, but would encourage more architectural emphasis.

Ms. Call stated that she understands staff's perspective in retaining the intent of the building's architectural elements. However, the Commission is encouraging more details, such as lighting, topiaries at the base of the colonnades emphasizing the vertical element, and inviting exterior details at the entrance.

Ms. Fox requested confirmation that the Nichiha that was proposed was dark gray, which would have provided a contrast with the red brick.
Mr. O'Malley confirmed that was the proposal.

Ms. Fox stated that the BSD Code states that, "the principal entrances of all building types shall effectively address the street and be given prominence on the building façade." She would like to hear fellow Commission members' thoughts on the entranceway. She believes there is agreement that Kitchen Social should have the distinction that the architect and owner desire. What are the options for achieving that? Ms. Call invited the applicant's response.

Mr. O'Malley stated that, initially, they had included landscaping on the patio; however, Crawford Hoying informed them that they could not encroach into the adjacent City greenspace. If it were feasible, they would be willing to add two-three feet of landscaping to soften and add warmth to the north side of the patio.

Ms. Call requested clarification of improving City-owned, dedicated space, visually incorporating it into the site.

Ms. Martin responded that the John Shields Parkway greenway is different from all the other greenspaces within Bridge Park. All of the greenspaces and plazas within that development are owned by Bridge Park and accessible to the public. The greenway is a linear park owned by the City, which connects from Riverside Crossing Park to Village Parkway. A future Master Park Plan will be created for that greenway. Although the interim condition is not ideal, residents and private tenants are discouraged from making improvements to City parkland.

Ms. Fox inquired if pottery and topiary are permitted next to the façade of a building and along a sidewalk. Ms. Martin responded that they would not be permitted to encroach onto another property or into the right-of-way. It would be permitted within the bounds of the parcel; however, this building sits on the parcel line. Planning staff could discuss the options with Parks staff; however, it is desirable to avoid setting precedents.

Ms. Fox inquired if a planter against the colonnade, a trellis up the side of the building or another element within perhaps a foot of the right-of-way would be permitted – something that would enhance the building.

Ms. Martin responded that unfortunately, this is not a right-of-way; it is a lot owned by the City.

Mr. Boggs responded that the intent is to prohibit installation of private improvements within the right-of-way or in public parks, due to ownership maintenance and liability issues. A trellis against the side of a building with a base located within parkland would be a concern. In view of the future Parks Master Plan, the City does not want to account for private installations.

Ms. Call stated that lighting on the colonnades or exterior of the building would be an opportunity for creativity; there are some very artfully designed light fixtures that would complement the porcelain tile along the entranceway and soften the corner next to the greenspace. Creative lighting warming the exterior of the façade can be inviting.

Ms. Martin responded that a condition has been added that the applicant add lighting around the tenant space subject to staff approval.

Ms. Call inquired if the condition was acceptable to the applicant.

Mr. O'Malley responded that the condition is acceptable. His understanding was that they were not permitted to attach items, even a sign, to a certain column(s). Therefore, they avoided proposing any lighting. If they would be permitted, they would be very happy to work with staff to add lights.

Ms. Call inquired if attachments to columns would be a Crawford Hoying issue, not a City regulation.

Ms. Martin responded that the Master Sign Plan approved by the Commission approved conceptual sign locations, none of which were located on the greenway. However, the Master Sign Plan has been revised to allow Planning staff and Crawford Hoying some latitude to collaborate on the sign locations. However, there are no prohibitions on lighting being affixed to the building.

Ms. Fox stated that certainly a landscape plan should not include area within a public park. However, the intent in this District is to create an attractive street image. She believes there should be some opportunities to work with the tenant on how to achieve this streetscape presence. She encourages staff to find a balance that achieves that streetscape excitement within the parameters of the Code. We are looking for imagination in design and attractive lighting that will enhance the pedestrian experience. If the City is not going to be creating a park here in the near future, it should be possible to allow temporary planters until it is designed. It is essential that the desired street liveliness be achieved.

Mr. Supelak stated that the proposed sign is weak. A more substantial sign could improve the entry access. What is permitted here?

Ms. Martin responded that signs are not part of this application; however, the applicant will have the opportunity to revise their sign designs. She agrees that there is opportunity for creativity with the signs. The applicant is permitted three signs, because there is frontage on two public rights-of-way. Depending on the classification of the greenway, if there were frontage on three sides, four signs would be permitted. The applicant will need to provide a diversity in sign types. Preliminary sign designs are reviewed by a consultant, but minor revisions may be requested before approval.

Ms. Call stated that Bridge Park signage is intended to be a meeting of art and destination. There are two distinct types of signs within this District; some signs that are essentially art, while others are directional. Although, there are brand limitations, "out of the box" thinking is encouraged, such as the North Market signage. Applicants are encouraged to consider combinations of branding, usefulness and art.

Mr. O'Malley responded that they have already submitted a proposed sign package to Crawford Hoying and to the City for sign permits, which included three different types of signs.

Mr. Fishman stated that creative signs are encouraged, as long as they also meet Code. He inquired if there is a reason full brick cannot be used around the entrance.

Mr. Supelak responded that he assumes it would require a foundation to be added, which could be an issue here.

Mr. Burge stated that there would be constructional concerns; it would be necessary to break into the existing brick piers to provide support for the additional brick. There would be many technical challenges.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would be satisfied with either of the facades discussed.

Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Fox seconded approval of the Administrative Departure permitting the percentage of primary materials on the north elevation to be approximately 73 percent where 80 percent is the required percentage of primary materials (stone, brick or glass), per Code.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the two waivers:

- 1) Waiver to Zoning Code Section:
153.062(O)(5)(d)(3) — Street Facades: Number of Entrances (No building entrances on the north elevation of Building D2).
- 2) Waiver to Zoning Code Section:
153.062(O)(5)(d)(1) — Ground Story Street Facing Transparency (Building D2: ±50 percent on the west elevation, ±40 percent on the north elevation, ±47 percent on the east elevation).

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed revised conditions. The applicant indicated he had no objection.

Mr. Way noted that the lighting package should not be limited to a lighting fixture, but should permit projecting lights and factor in the lighting in the overhang.

Ms. Call challenged staff to work with the applicant, encouraging their creativity to achieve differentiation for their building.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Minor Project with four conditions:

- 1) The applicant receive approval of furniture selections by the Administrative Review Team; and,
- 2) The applicant work with Washington Township Fire Department to finalize a fire protection plan prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 3) The applicant provide an exterior lighting package, subject to staff approval.
- 4) The applicant work with staff to enhance the entry design along Longshore Street.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

[Cases 1, 2 and 3 related to the same project were heard together.]

1. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G, Conditional Use, 20-199CU

Conditional Use to permit Bridge Park, Block G, Building G2 (McCallum Garage) to be unlined along a public street, Mooney Street. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street.

2. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G, Final Development Plan, 20-045FDP

Construction of a 4-story residential building, a 4-story parking garage, and a 5-story mixed-use office building with .58-acres of open space within Bridge Park, Block G zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street.

3. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G, Final Plat, 16-044FP

Plat for ±2.28-acre site (Lot 9) establishing public access easements for open space zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that these requests seek review and approval of a Final Development Plan with Conditional Use and a recommendation for City Council approval of a Final Plat for Bridge Park, Block G. Block G is located north of Bridge Park Avenue, south of Tuller Ridge Drive, east of Mooney Street and west of Dale Drive, and zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is bounded by an existing street network. An additional area northeast of the site is also proposed for improvement with this application. The site is currently undeveloped, although it is surrounded by

development – Bridge Park to the west and the Sycamore Ridge Apartments to the east. [site photos shown.]

Proposal

There are three requests with this proposal. The first is a Conditional Use to permit a parking garage that is unlined with commercial space along the new street, which is interior to the Bridge Park Development. The parking garage is lined along Dale Drive, which is the principal frontage street. The second request is a Final Development Plan approval of the development of three new buildings:

- Building G1, a five-story 125,000-square-foot mixed use building containing restaurant, retail and office space;
- Building G2, a four-story, 327-space parking structure lined with commercial space along Dale Drive, the principal frontage street, and associated storage and utility space; and,
- Building G3, a four-story multi-family building containing 86 dwelling units (8 units with 3 bedrooms, 22 units with 2 bedrooms, 54 units with 1 bedroom, and 2 studio units) with an associated 0.19-acre amenity space (not included in the open space calculation).

A total of ±0.58 acres of public open space and associated site improvements also is included. The open space is distributed between Block G and the dog park, which is off-site. The third request is for a recommendation of Council approval of a Final Plat. The plat combines three existing parcels owned by Crawford Hoying and establishes public access easements for open spaces. The office building, Building G1, is located at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street. On the ground story of that building, there is commercial space, including opportunities for retail and restaurants, as well as a lobby to the upper-story office building. Centrally located on the site is the 4-story parking structure, which is accessed via Dale Drive and Mooney Street. The ground story of the parking structure contains a variety of support services, as well as parking spaces to support the residential and commercial tenants on this block. In the northern portion of the site is a U-shaped condominium building, which contains the .19-acre amenity space. Approval of a parking plan also is requested. The parking plan will look holistically at parking across the Bridge Park Development, including opportunities for shared parking based on peak hour use. A total of 360 parking spaces will be provided via onstreet and structured parking spaces, although 512 parking spaces are required. A parking analysis has been conducted, and a proposal is made to co-park this block with Block C, which is immediately to the west of Block G and contains a large parking structure. The combined parking of Blocks C and G would be 1,306 parking spaces. Although that number does not meet BSD Code requirement, per the parking study, it would meet the need. The open space is also calculated on a ratio basis for the combined uses. A total of .44 acres of open space is required; 0.588 acres of open space will be provided. There will be three pocket plazas, located: at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street; Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge Drive; and Dale Drive and Tuller Ridge Drive. A linear, pocket park will be located immediately north of the office building, south of the parking garage, connecting Mooney Street to Dale Drive. Due to the significant grade change between Mooney Street and Dale Drive, the linear pocket park will be tiered with the lower level being along Mooney Street and the upper level along Dale Drive. The accessible path between the two is an interior elevator within the office building, as well as an exterior stair. A scrim screen (metal panel) is proposed to clad the entirety of the south elevation of the parking garage. The screen will contain a naturalized image, which will be a unique placemaking element within the City. The applicant will coordinate with the Dublin Arts Council to select the art. Per Final Development Plan (FDP) requirements, a final landscape plan was provided; staff is recommending several plant modifications.

Offsite open space is provided via a 17,000-square foot dog park, located at the intersection of Dale Drive and Tuller Ridge Drive. The dog park contains curvilinear pods for play; artificial turf, per the Parks

& Recreation staff recommendation; walking paths and shade trees; and a six-foot fence enclosing the area, as well as perimeter screening.

Pocket plaza designs have been provided. The two smallest pocket plazas are located along Tuller Ridge Drive. The primary pocket plaza is located at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street, which will contain a water feature, movable furniture and a raised planting area. Not all of that area is designated as open space, as there will be an opportunity in the corner for a private tenant to have a private patio.

Building G1

Building G1 is a five-story, Corridor Building with the ground story occupied by restaurant/retail and lobby space associated with the office users. The upper stories (floors 2-5) are occupied by office. A fully enclosed pedestrian circulation connection between Buildings G1 and G2 is provided via a tunnel at the ground floor and by elevator lobbies on the second through fifth floors, providing office tenants on all levels with access to the parking garage. The predominant exterior building materials are a combination of brick, concrete panel, concrete masonry, and glass storefront system. Medium gray toned masonry defines the base of the building, with dark gray, medium gray, and white brick on the upper stories. The secondary materials are composite metal panel, and glass/metal spandrel. Teak metal wall panels highlight the office balconies at the southwest corner, which overlook the public open space at the corner of Mooney Street and Bridge Park Avenue.

Building G2

Building G2 is a four-story parking structure containing 327 parking spaces and ingress/egresses on the east and west sides of the building. The ground level of the parking structure includes a refuse/storage room, water meter room and a generator for support of the uses in Buildings G1, G2, and G3. The parking structure is unlined by commercial uses along Mooney Street (west), requiring review and approval of a Conditional Use application. Along Dale Drive (east) three commercial tenant spaces line the garage on the ground story. The spaces will have a warehouse aesthetic with tall ceilings and large windows. The parking structure is clad predominantly in brick and has metal window frame inserts.

Building G3

Building G3 is a four-story apartment building containing 86 dwelling units (8 units with 3 bedrooms, 22 units with 2 bedrooms, 54 units with 1 bedroom, and 2 studio units) with an associated 0.19-acre amenity space. The east and west halves of the building are offset to accommodate the significant grade change across the site. The offset design breaks down the mass and scale of the building adjacent to Block H. The building is clad in a combination of brick, stone, and fiber cement siding.

Final Plat

Approval of a Final Plat is requested in conjunction with the Final Development Plan, establishing a single, 2.286-acre developable lot (Lot 9) along with necessary public access easements for open spaces. Lot 9 is the result of the combination of three parcels.

Staff has reviewed the proposal against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of a Conditional Use; two Administrative Departures; 30 waivers; a Parking Plan; a Final Development Plan with 11 conditions; and a Final Plat.

Commission Questions for Staff

Ms. Fox inquired if the total square footage of the buildings increased since the previous review.
Ms. Martin responded that actually, the height of the office building decreased from six to five stories.

Ms. Fox inquired if the footprints of the buildings increased in size.
Ms. Martin responded that she is not aware of any increase. The site plan and the foundations have remained the same.

Ms. Fox requested clarification of the use on the corner of Mooney Street and Bridge Park. Would part of that pocket park be utilized for private dining, and would the square footage of that pocket park change?

Ms. Martin responded that the applicant has already accounted for that. The entire area at that corner is not designated as open space; it is only a portion of that space.

Ms. Fox inquired if the public open space would be where the fountain is and outside of that; anything interior would become private.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox inquired if there is an ADA-compliant ramp in the pedestrian midway.

Ms. Martin responded that is not a ramp; it is an elevator. It is necessary to enter the lobby to access that elevator to reach the upper story of the pedestrian midway.

Ms. Fox inquired if the pedestrian midway is permitted to count as open space or if it is a sidewalk.

Ms. Martin responded that a midblock pedestrian way is permitted to traverse through an open space. Open spaces are required to consist of a certain proportion, so a waiver is requested to the proportions of open space; this is consistent with waivers that have been approved in other blocks at Bridge Park.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the midway park had been compressed since the previous review.

Ms. Martin responded that she does not believe it has been, but she would defer to the site civil engineer or landscape architect.

Ms. Call stated that the staff report indicated that 512 parking spaces were required, but 360 are provided. The applicant conducted a parking study, which was submitted for review. Per the study, this Block and the adjacent block will provide a total of 1,306 parking spaces. What was the total amount originally required for those two lots?

Ms. Martin responded that a parking plan for a reduced parking plan also was approved for Block C. The original development plan for this mixed development did not anticipate development this dense. Staff has concerns about over parking Bridge Park. C Block was approved for approximately 100 fewer spaces than required.

Ms. Call stated that it appears that independently, each parcel is underparked according to Code and the design criteria. She asked the applicant to address the changes that have been made since the previous review.

Applicant Presentation

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying, Riverside Drive, Dublin, Ohio stated that the Commission has reviewed this block several times, and it has evolved both in use and shape; however, the shape of the park has not changed. Nor has the office building changed; its proportions are very specific to ensure the right sizes are provided for office spaces.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying, stated that one area that did change was the ground floor retail, which is smaller. The wall of the retail spaces was pushed back 10 feet, creating an overhang above that space for outdoor seating. This was done to create more outdoor space on Bridge Park Avenue in response to

the Commission's input at the previous meeting. The building is also smaller in relation to midblock pedestrian way, which will allow a larger open space on Mooney Street and on Dale Drive.

Mr. Hunter provided a visual presentation depicting the variety of open spaces, softening the foundations of the buildings and creating a cohesive open space from the inner section of the block to the façades of the buildings. The appropriate amount of space is provided along the building façade so that future tenants will be able to express their ideas regarding how to engage the open space. The ground-floor storefronts will not be designed, allowing a variety to develop among the tenants. He showed views of the proposed paintable scrim wall of the parking garage, which faces the interior courtyard. He has contacted Mr. Guion, Director of the Dublin Arts Museum about the opportunity for discussion of art ideas. A brief review of the revisions to the garage, dog park, service tunnel, parking and building floor plates was presented.

Mr. Yoder stated that a holistic evaluation of the parking within the District was conducted on a summer evening when restaurants and patios were full; there were 1,884 empty parking spaces. The proposed parking for Block G will add 100 surplus parking spaces every night and 200 spaces on weekends. The proposed parking plan will provide the appropriate level of parking space.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Fishman stated that he appreciates the fact that currently, the District is overparked. However, some day those buildings will have different owners. Are there cross easements to allow full use of the parking?

Mr. Hunter stated that these are public parking garages, so there will be no future issues. Anyone can park anywhere, anytime.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the use of a green material at the entrance to office building. He was looking for other uses of that color within the block, but it appears to be a single occurrence. Is that use a deliberate intent to accentuate the office building entrance?

Dan Pease, M + A Architects, 775 Yard St., Suite 325, Columbus, OH stated that the color is intended to draw attention to that offset niche.

Mr. Hunter stated that they recently held an interior design meeting for the public spaces within the office building; there are opportunities for additional use of that color and material.

Ms. Fox stated that the steps that lead to the upper plaza do not make it apparent that the destination is the midway plaza. Currently, they appear to lead into the building.

Mr. Pease responded that the area has been maximized to the extent possible, and the stairs span that space. The green color is replicated up the stairs and on the scrim of the garage, and night lighting will invite patrons to the upper plaza.

Mr. Yoder stated the green box actually is not an entrance to the offices. It is an entry to a public space and a public elevator, which provides access to the garage and plaza, traversing the distance between the lower and upper plazas.

Mr. Hunter provided further details on the green color and layout/connection of the area.

Mr. Supelak requested additional details about the scrim.

Mr. Hunter stated that a scrim also exists in Crocker Park. This is a paintable, translucent metal scrim, punctuated with holes to allow air flow. The current view to the east is the side of the hill and trees. The thought was to accentuate that green aspect within the space; however, other ideas can be entertained.

Mr. Yoder stated that it could be a canvas for public art within Bridge Park, elevating this public space with a unique idea not used elsewhere within the District.

Mr. Supelak stated that the side panels of this garage are a great opportunity, a large canvas for an idea. Is that idea bound to a flat façade, or would the Dublin Arts Council have some opportunity, perhaps with three individual panels to provide some dimension relief? Three dimensionality often is beneficial, as they can sometimes integrate light.

Mr. Way stated that there is opportunity to include a pop of color in the courtyard that would tie into the scrim. Perhaps there could be a color theme for the courtyard, reflected by the furniture and lighting.

Mr. Hunter indicated that he liked that suggestion.

Mr. Way that that in regard to the Dale Drive façade of the parking garage, it might be possible to break the parapet line into three components, rather than one flat composition.

Mr. Hunter responded that the building will reflect a warehouse architecture style, but it might be possible to break up the center line.

Mr. Yoder stated that they have already elevated the garage architecture from that of the previous open garage concept, but they would take a look at the possible opportunity.

Mr. Way that he appreciates that they have succeeded in making the structure not look like a parking garage, but the Code does contain direction about breaking the roofline periodically. This might be an area where it would make sense to do so.

Mr. Hunter stated that the Dale Drive façade probably would not benefit from that, because of the asymmetry of the liner, but the Mooney Street façade perhaps could benefit.

Mr. Way stated that he is less concerned about that façade, because there is not a view of the entire composition; on Dale Drive, it can be seen.

Mr. Yoder stated that it would be just a matter of knocking the parapet up above the black portion and below.

Mr. Way stated that he would not attempt to design it, but the long facade with no break in the parapet caught his eye.

Mr. Hunter stated that there are two primary piers in the middle, and they would not necessarily need to protrude more; it may be possible to use brick and detailing and make the parapet pop up. Creating a break might be simple.

Mr. Yoder stated that the 1919 Building west on Bridge Street also reflects a warehouse design, which is an interesting, utilitarian aesthetic. He was excited to be able to implement that look here, but there is an art to getting it right.

Mr. Way stated that he was suggesting only that they think about it. He also has a question about the corner of the residential building at Tuller and Mooney streets. The brick panel on the corner piece that extends outward looks foreign to that entire corner piece. Is it occurring for a structural purpose? It would appear that if it were "pushed back," the corner piece would read as one architectural element.

Matt Lytle, Architect, SB Architecture, architect for the residential building, responded that as the height of the grade increases along Tuller Ridge, the grade is raised above the floor line. They wanted the wall to have a grounding element; the masonry was used to accomplish that. Perhaps it would not need to reach to the bottom of the transom. It could be lowered to be at the bottom of the larger pane of glass.

Mr. Yoder stated that he would be supportive of that idea.

Mr. Lytle noted that they also wanted to provide some privacy for that particular unit, rather than pedestrians having a straight view into the unit.

Mr. Call stated that if they were going to lower the brick there, she would prefer they also maintain symmetry around the corner.

Ms. Fox stated that the individual doorways on the residential units do not have stoops, as there is insufficient room; six to ten doorways face the sidewalk. Is it possible to elevate the appearance of those doorways?

Mr. Lytel responded that the units along Mooney Street do not have direct access to the elevator, so there is a need to provide an accessible, unique entrance to each of those units. That is the reason there are no stoops leading up into those units. The units along Dale Drive have corridor access to the elevator that is shared with the garage. The doorways could be embellished with landscape.

Ms. Fox stated that her issue is not the missing stoops; however, it is important that the entrance to the building become a focal point, such as a portico. The doors should not look similar to the windows. The entrances must stand out from the flat façade.

Mr. Lytel responded that the doorways could have a covered element with columns on either side, keeping it out of the right-of-way, of course.

Mr. Fishman referred to the scrim wall of the garage. He would suggest that they attempt not only to make it beautiful, but also unusual – not just a painting on a wall, but an element that people have not seen anywhere else. It should be an element that would stand out and draw people to that area.

Mr. Supelak stated that it is essential that it not be a flat canvas. It might be possible to use hydrochromic inks, which when wet, become something different, or thermochromic inks. There are vertical, seagrass lights, almost fiberoptic, that “wander.” Looking at the surrounding space, there may be elements in that space that could be integrated with the wall. Although it would become a larger undertaking, it could be an incredible public art opportunity, if embraced appropriately.

Mr. Fishman stated that it should not be just a mural, but an attention-grabbing form of art that draws people to that area to see it.

Mr. Yoder stated that they have budgeted the ability to hide the garage behind this interesting feature, and he likes the ideas. However, some of the ideas posed would require a separate budget. Dublin Arts Council does have a separate public arts budget that perhaps could be applied. With this wall, they have provided a starting point. From there, the Dublin Arts Council potentially could use a focus group and come up with an interesting idea.

Mr. Supelak responded that the developer has budgeted a scrim, furniture, and lights, and perhaps that is the appropriate mix without the need to spend more substantial dollars. That conversation should occur soon, however, before other decisions are made and taken too far.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call reviewed the general reasons for the 30 requested waivers and requested Commission comments.

Mr. Supelak stated the revised package is very good; their efforts are apparent. The renderings and elevations shown were very helpful to the Commission’s review. He appreciates the open space; the massing is good; the stepping in the parapets is well done on the north side; and he is excited about the public art, and the other details that will be added. He has no significant issues with the design and is supportive of the project. He would suggest the inclusion of up lighting for the buildings.

Ms. Fox complimented the applicants on the re-design. She appreciates that they reduced the level of the parking garage. She has some concerns about the residential building on the other side of Mooney Street. While it is possible to screen mechanicals from the ground units, what about the upper residential units?

Mr. Hunter responded that staff and their designers looked at that aspect thoroughly.

Ms. Fox stated that particularly since we are doing noncompatible residential units in this area, it is essential that the mechanicals be screened. She also has concerns about the lot coverage. Is the combined lot coverage for Block G 90%? If so, what is the reason?

James Peltier, Engineer EMH&T, stated that the overall lot coverage is 82%. They attempted to achieve as much greenspace on the block as possible. That is always a challenge with an urban development.

Mr. Yoder stated that a contiguous dog park area was added to the project to achieve several things: one was to meet the requested open space requirement; the other was to meet the impervious surface requirements. At 82% lot coverage, they are near the Code requirement of 80%.

Ms. Fox stated that she would prefer to see them adhere to the 75% and 80% requirements. The added landscape makes it a more interesting and timeless development. However, she does not see how they can have sidewalks greater than five feet wide, without reducing lot coverage. The proposal is for six-foot sidewalks.

Mr. Peltier responded that the five-foot width sidewalk is along Dale Drive, which is along the right-of-way. The lot coverage does not take into account that sidewalk in the right-of-way.

Mr. Fox inquired if it would be possible to have a 6-foot wide sidewalk, although some landscaping will be lost.

Mr. Peltier responded that they would be able to do so, as it is within the right-of-way. It will not impact the lot coverage for the development.

Ms. Fox stated that she is disappointed with the space on the corner of Bridge Park and Mooney streets. Although the square footage is good – 1,382 square feet, some of it is being used as private space. The only public space available will have a few linear benches along the perimeter. She would encourage them to find a way in which to achieve more bulk space on the corners, not just tiny seating spaces. She inquired about the blank wall limitations waiver along Mooney Street.

Ms. Martin responded that Waiver #8 relates to the connector between Building G1 and G2; there is a stretch greater than 15 feet. The request is to permit a 17-foot length of blank wall.

Ms. Fox inquired if the reason is the grade change.

Ms. Martin responded that she believes it is to address the interior functionality of the space and the elevator shaft.

Mr. Hunter responded that to reduce the size of the connector, there was a redesign that placed the elevators against that wall. The elevators are in the area where the teak material is used.

Ms. Fox stated that she likes that material. She was thinking that it was the west elevation on McCallum Garage.

Ms. Martin stated there is a second blank wall limitation, reflected with Waiver 19, which is the garage wall on which the scrim is located.

Ms. Fox stated her primary concern is the doorway entrances. Street level entrances into the residential building need to be enhanced. In regard to the open spaces – she likes the water feature. However, she believes the open spaces on the block are simply benches that wrap the corners. Those spaces are less innovative than is typical and are lacking in the placemaking element. She requested the sample images she provided to be shown. [Images shown of linear open space, mid pedestrian ways, and outdoor dining areas.] She believes these areas need to be made more attractive and appealing, similar to what is being done with the scrim wall. Aside from that, she believes the design is very well done.

Mr. Yoder noted that the impervious space percentage has improved. In Blocks B and C, it was 97-98%; however, in Block G, it is 82%.

Mr. Fox stated that she appreciates that improvement and really likes the water features. These are the elements that will make the development timeless. However, she would ask them to attempt to ensure the open spaces are not comprised of just a bench or table and chairs. More creativity is needed in these gathering places, as was illustrated in the aspirational images she provided tonight.

Mr. Schneier stated that he believes the revised design is very good. He appreciates the applicants listening to the Commission's previous comments and making some significant changes. The development team has exhibited expertise, and they are aware of the direction of the Commission's comments. The Commission is encouraging as much as possible within the bounds of its authority and Code. However, he congratulates them on this great design.

Mr. Grimes stated that this is a beautiful project. He likes the diversity within and throughout and the changes in elevations. Block G is a gem block in this District – an excellent example is being set. He appreciates the manner in which the applicant has responded to the Commission's constructive criticism, which is focused on seeing a high degree of excellence. Although the Commission urges for more, we appreciate what they have done and will do. There is no bad side to this development!

Mr. Fishman stated that he agrees with his colleagues. He appreciates the fact that this project has evolved into something better. The applicant has listened to the Commission's comments and he is confident they will do so with today's comments, as well. The Commission is focused on achieving the best out of every greenspace, for which Ms. Fox has provided some excellent suggestions. He appreciates their efforts toward achieving excellence and really likes the project.

Mr. Way stated that the Office Building is stunning, the Residential Building is top-notch, and the way in which the Garage is addressed is unique. His remaining comments relate to three items. The staff report noted some concerns about the viability of plants in the courtyard because it will be shaded year-round. Sometimes, it is possible to use art and other elements to enliven a space. He would encourage them to work toward that goal. He loves working fountains, but there was no discussion about what happens to the fountain in the winter. He would encourage them to think about the water feature as water moving over a surface, as when the fountain is turned off, there is still something to view that is attractive and usable. Additionally, the southwest corner of this block will receive a significant level of sunlight and direct heat in the summer. Shade will be important; perhaps they are considering mechanical shade, such as umbrellas. This corner will be loved or hated, depending on the time of year. Those are his comments, but this is a great project; their efforts have produced a great outcome.

Ms. Call stated that these buildings fit within Bridge Park. They display differentiation in architecture, but work together. This project does not deviate from the high standard established in Bridge Park. She appreciates the applicants taking the feedback from Commissioners' different perspectives and creating a cohesive design that reflects the vision of Bridge Park being a unique destination.

Ms. Call stated that actions on the following items are requested:

Conditional Use, 20-199CU:

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of the Conditional Use with no conditions.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Final Development Plan, 20-045FDP

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the following Administrative Departures:

- 1) 153.062(O)(12)(a)(1) — Front Property Line Coverage

Requirement: A minimum 90 percent front property line coverage is required.

Request: 83 percent be required to be provided along Dale Drive when Buildings G1 and G2 are calculated together.

2) 153.062(O)(3)(a)(4) — Change in Roof Plane

Requirement: A single roof plane shall extend not greater than 80 feet in length.

Request: Permit a single roof plane to extend 85 feet in length along north elevation of Building G3.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Motion #3:

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following 28 waivers:

1. §153.062(O)(5), (O)(12), (O)(3) — Lot Coverage

Requirement: Maximum impervious combined lot coverage for the Corridor Building, Parking Structure, and Apartment building shall not exceed 80 percent for the Corridor Building and Parking Structure, and shall not exceed 75 percent for the Apartment Building.

Request: Combined lot coverage, for Block G, not exceed 90 percent.

2. §153.062(O)(5)(b) — Building Height, Ground Story and Upper Stories

Requirement: Ground story floor height shall be a minimum of 12 feet and a maximum of 16 feet. Upper story floor height shall be a minimum of 10 feet and a maximum of 14 feet.

Request: Ground story height for west end of the first story be permitted to be a maximum of 25 feet in height, and the fifth story be permitted to a maximum of 18 feet in height.

3. §153.062(D)(1)(a) — Parapet Roof Types

Requirement: Shall be no higher than necessary to screen roof appurtenances from view from street or adjacent building of similar height. Parapets shall be no less than 2 feet and no greater than 6 feet in height.

Request: Parapet heights less than 2 - foot minimum. (1.25 feet in height)

4. §153.065(E)(3)(b) — Mechanical Screening

Requirement: All roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened from view at ground level on all sides by one of the primary materials and colors of a street facing façade. Metal is not a permitted primary material for the Corridor Building Type.

Request: Permit rooftop mechanicals to be screened by metal.

5. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(1) — Street Facing Transparency

Requirement: A minimum 60 percent transparency be provided on the ground story of street-facing facades.

Request: Reduced ground story, street-facing transparency along Mooney Street, Bridge Park Avenue, and Dale Drive:

- Mooney Street (West) — 35%
- Bridge Park Avenue (South) — 48%
- Dale Drive (East) — 40%

6. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(1) — Blank Wall Limitations

Requirement: Blank walls are not permitted. A blank wall is an elevation with a stretch of 15 feet or greater of uninterrupted façade.

Request: Permit a 17-foot blank wall along the west elevation of the connector to Building G2 Parking Structure.

7. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(3) — Building Entrances

Requirement: The principal building entrance must be located along a Principal Frontage Street. The Code requires one building entrance every 75 feet along street facing facades.

Request: Permit the principal building entrance (office lobby) along a Neighborhood Street (Mooney Street), and to permit entrances at lengths greater than permitted:

- Dale Drive: 164 linear feet = 3 entrances required, 2 provided
- Bridge Park Avenue: 197 linear feet = 3 entrances required, 5 provided
- Mooney Street: 164 linear feet = 3 entrances required, 3 provided

8. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(4) — Vertical Façade Divisions

Requirement: A vertical façade division is required every 45 feet to ensure a varied building plane.

Request: Permit fewer vertical façade divisions than required by Code:

- East Elevation: ±89-foot increments
- North Elevation: ±96-foot increments
- South Elevation: ±97-foot and ±95-foot increments
- West Elevation: ±52-foot increments

9. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(5) — Materials

Requirement: 80 percent primary building materials (glass, brick, stone).

Request: Permit 68 percent primary building materials on the west elevation (Mooney Street).

Building G2 (Parking Structure)

10. §153.062(C)(1) — Incompatible Building Types

Requirement: Parking Structure and Single-Family Attached Building Types are not permitted directly across the street from one another or on the same block face.

Request: Building G2 (Parking Structure) adjacent to Sycamore Ridge Apartments (Single-Family Attached)

11. §153.062(O)(12)(a)(1) — Required Build Zone (RBZ)

Requirement: The front and corner-side required build zones for a Parking Structure are 5 feet to 25 feet from the property line.

Request: To permit zero feet to 25 feet required build zones to accommodate the following building siting:

- Front: 2.86 feet provided. Encroaches 2.14 feet beyond the required RBZ
- Corner Side: 1.46 feet provided. Encroaches 3.54 feet beyond the required RBZ

12. §153.062(D)(4)(a) — Towers, Location and Quantity

Requirement: Towers on Parking Structures are permitted on facades only at terminal vistas, corners at two principal frontage streets, and/or adjacent to an open space type. Where permitted by building type, only one tower is allowed per building.

Request: Northwest tower allowed to deviate from location requirement, and a total of three towers be permitted.

13. §153.062(D)(4)(b) — Towers, Height

Requirement: Tower height shall not be greater than the height of one additional upper floor of the building to which the tower is applied. The width of a tower shall not exceed its height. The maximum upper story height for Parking Structures is 12 feet.

Request: Permit deviations from height and width requirements:

- Building G2 Northeast Tower: Height 19.33 feet, width 21.33 feet
- Building G2 Northwest Tower: Height 17.33 feet, width 21.33 feet
- Building G2 Southwest Tower: Height 12.67 feet, width 18 feet

14. §153.065(B)(5)(c) — Interior Circulation, Ceiling Clearance Heights

Requirement: A minimum ceiling clearance height of 12 feet is required where the parking structure has street frontage, excluding the driveway opening, and the parking structure shall be designed and constructed to allow potential occupancy of the first 20 feet of building by a commercial or civic/public/institutional use.

Request: Permit at the Mooney Street frontage clear ceiling height at ± 10 feet.

15. §153.062(O)(12)(c) — Occupied Space

Requirement: Parking structures are required to be line with occupied space with a minimum depth of 20 feet along principal frontage streets.

Request: Occupied space along Dale Drive be permitted to be less than 20 feet at 16.83 feet.

16. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(1) — Street Facing Transparency

Requirement: A minimum 65 percent storefront transparency be provided on the ground story of facades facing a principal frontage street.

Request: 41 percent ground-story storefront transparency along Dale Drive.

17. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(2) — Blank Wall Limitations

Requirement: Blank walls are not permitted. A blank wall is an elevation with a 15 foot or greater stretch of uninterrupted façade.

Request: Permit the south façade, adjacent to public open space, to be fully screened by scrim.

18. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(3) — Building Entrances

Requirement: The Code requires one building entrance every 75 feet along street-facing facades.

Request: Permit one entrance along Mooney Street where two are required.

19. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(4) — Vertical Façade Divisions

Requirement: A vertical façade division is required every 30 feet to ensure a varied building plane.

Request: Permit fewer vertical façade divisions than required by Code:

- East Elevation: ± 102 foot increment
- West Elevation: ± 85 foot increment

20. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(5) — Materials

Requirement: 80 percent primary building materials (glass, brick, stone).

Request: Permit 35 percent primary building materials on the south elevation (open space).

Building G3 (Apartment Building)

21. §153.062(O)(3)(a)(1) — Required Build Zone (RBZ)

Requirement: The front required build zone for an Apartment Building is 5 feet to 20 feet from the property line.

Request: To permit zero feet to 20 feet required build zones to accommodate the following building siting:

- Front: Dale Drive – Minimum 0.38 feet provided
- Front: Tuller Ridge Drive – Minimum 4.75 feet provided

22. §153.062(O)(3)(d)(3) — Building Entrances

Requirement: One building entrance every 75 feet along street-facing facades.

Request: Permit one entrance along Tuller Ridge Drive where three are required.

23. §153.062(I)(2)(a) — Stoops

Requirement: Stoops shall have a minimum width and depth of five feet of open area.

Request: Three stoops provide smaller than the minimum dimensions required, and three provide an at-grade sidewalk entrance (no stoop).

24. §153.062(O)(3)(d)(4) — Vertical Façade Divisions

Requirement: A vertical façade division is required every 40 feet to ensure a varied building plane.

Request: Permit fewer vertical façade divisions than required by Code:

- East Elevation: 64.54 foot increment, 40.21 foot increment
- North Elevation: 65.63 feet, 65.04 foot increments
- West Elevation: 64.58 - foot increment, 40.29 77- foot increment

25. §153.062(O)(3)(d)(5) — Materials

Requirement: 80 percent primary building materials (glass, brick, stone).

Request: Permit 46 percent primary building materials on the west elevation (Mooney Street); 44 percent primary building materials on the north elevation (Tuller Ridge Drive); and 46 percent primary building materials on the east elevation (Dale Drive).

Open Space

26. §153.064(F)(6) — Open Space Type, Park

Requirement: Parks (minimum of 2 acres in size) provide informal active and passive larger-scale recreational amenities to city residents and visitors. Parks have natural plantings and can be created around existing natural features such as water bodies or tree stands. Parks can be used to define edges of neighborhoods and districts.

Request: Permit a dog park to be designated as a Park not meeting the intent and minimum 2-acres size defined in the Code.

27. §153.064(G)(1)(b) — Open Space Proportions

Requirement: With the exception of the Greenway, all Open Space Types shall be sized at a ratio of not more than 3:1, length to width

Request: Permit a Pocket Park between Building G1 and G2 that has a length-to-width proportion of over 6:1.

28. §153.064(G)(4)(f) — Impervious and Semi-Pervious Area

Requirement: For a Pocket Park, the maximum permitted impervious area is 30 percent with an additional 10 percent semi-pervious permitted.

Request: Permit the open space between Building G1 and G2 to be approximately 58 percent impervious.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Motion #4:

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Shared Parking Plan permitting 360 parking spaces to be provided where 526 are required.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Motion #5:

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the Following 17 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide window specifications for Building G1 for staff review prior to submitting for permits;
- 2) That the applicant provide installation details for the proposed Juliet balconies on Building G3 with the building permit application;
- 3) That the applicant submit all proposed site furnishings associated with public open spaces for staff review prior to submitting for permits;
- 4) That the applicant designate the location and quantity of required bicycle parking with the building and/or site permit applications;
- 5) That the applicant verify if parking structure security techniques and surveillance will be implemented in Building G2;
- 6) That the applicant provide the three required loading spaces on the site plan for staff review prior to submitting for permits;
- 7) That the applicant submit details of the proposed ground mounted mechanical enclosures with the building/site permit application;
- 8) That the applicant adjust the proposed site lighting plans to provide the required lighting uniformity with the site permit application;
- 9) The sidewalk along Dale Drive be revised to provide a minimum of six feet of clear sidewalk width, subject to approval of the City Engineer;
- 10) The applicant establish and execute a public access easement for the dog park prior to issuance of a Site Only permit;
- 11) The applicant work with staff to revise the landscape plan, as detailed in the staff report, prior to submittal of a Building Permit.
- 12) The applicant extend design elements of the scrim screen through to the lower level Mooney Street plaza.
- 13) The applicant revise Building G3 entries along Dale Drive and Mooney Street to provide architectural details, 153.062(I)(3)(a), for entrance design, in accordance with the Commission's discussion, subject to staff approval.
- 14) Building G2's parapet along Dale Drive be broken up in accordance with the Commission's discussion, subject to staff approval.
- 15) The applicant submit a comprehensive open space lighting package, subject to staff approval.
- 16) The brick foundation cladding on the northwest corner of Building G3 be revised, subject to staff approval.
- 17) The fountain be revised to ensure a year round aesthetic, in accordance with the Commission's discussion, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Final Plat, 16-044FP

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded a recommendation of City Council approval of the Final Plat with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission to City Council for approval.

Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Mr. Yoder and Mr. Hunter thanked staff, Commission and the consultants for all their time and tireless efforts to reach this successful outcome.

6. Specialty Hospitals Administrative Request – Code Amendment, 21-009ADM

Review and recommendation to City Council for a Code Amendment to establish requirements for Specialty Hospitals.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that at the March 18 discussion, the Commission discussed the draft Code language requested the following changes be made:

- A maximum building size be proposed for Specialty Hospitals.
- Fence specifications be omitted and if a fence is requested, those requirements would default to Code.
- Parking standard be omitted and a Parking Plan defining the parking requirements based on their operational needs be submitted.
- Addition of an emergency and perimeter security plan.
- References in the use specific standards that state “unless otherwise approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission” be omitted.
- Licensing or certification requirements be explored.

The requested modifications have been made with the exception of the licensing or certification requirements. After significant research, there is no consistent state requirement for this process; therefore, this was not included in the modification. Additionally, the Commission requested information concerning minimum lot sizes and proximity to residential uses, and that information has been provided in the packet that show that no residential areas will be negatively impacted.

Commission Questions/Discussion

Ms. Fox stated that a requirement has been included [page 9] that a Specialty Hospital must be located a minimum of 500 feet from any residential district or use; however, on the following page, the language states that the required Rear Yard “shall not be less than one-fourth of the sum of the height of the structure. In no case, should the rear yard be less than 15 feet.” This seems to be a contradiction. Mr. Rauch stated that those are two different items. A residential use cannot be within 500 feet, as measured from the rear property line. The rear yard setback addresses where the building can be located on that parcel.

Mr. Way stated that as a new member, he was not present during the previous discussion. Were the number of beds or length of stay discussed?

Ms. Rauch responded that there was significant discussion on those items, and the determination was made that no related requirement would be included.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to recommend City Council approval of a Code amendment establishing requirements for Specialty Hospitals.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch reported that:

- A joint board-commission meeting has been tentatively scheduled for Monday, May 17. Members will be polled to confirm availability.
- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, May 6, 2021.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council