



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 7, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1 **PID: 273-000867**
18-080DPR-SPR **Development and Site Plan Reviews with Parking Plan**

Proposal: A six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel and commercial building and associated site improvements.
Location: Southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive.
Request: Review and approval of a Development Plan and Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
Applicant: James Peltier, EMH&T.
Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager.
Contact Information: (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-080

MOTION #1: Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded, to approve the Development Plan Review without conditions.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: The Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION #2: Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Wilson seconded, to approve the 15 Waivers:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height.
Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high.
Request: To parapets of .5 feet and 7.5 feet in height.
2. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Expression Lines.
Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building.
Request: Expression lines distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and define the top of the parapet.



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

**PID: 273-000867
Development and Site Plan Reviews with Parking Plan**

3. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows, Projecting Sills Required.
Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one-by-four trim or brick mould casing.
Request: To permit windows to be recessed into the siding clad facades with no projecting sills.
4. §153.062 – Building Types (N)(4)(a)(5) Vents, Air Conditioners, other Utility Elements
Vents, air conditioners, and other utility elements are not permitted on street facing facades.
Request. Permission for PTAC and VTAC units grills/louvers on street facing facades and architectural louvers above restaurant storefront windows for future mechanical systems.
5. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks.
The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.
Request. Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve "B" to be setback ± 3.33 feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.
6. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.
Request. Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
7. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.
Request: To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
8. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.
Request. To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.
9. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments
Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.
Request: To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.
10. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane
Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.
Request: To permit roof planes of ± 111 feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.
11. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.
Request: To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.



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

**PID: 273-000867
Development and Site Plan Reviews with Parking Plan**

12. §153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.
One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.
Request: To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.
13. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.
A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.
Request: 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.
14. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.
The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.
Request: Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.
15. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.
Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.
Request: Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: The 15 Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION #3: Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded, to approve the Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan and eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant evaluate opportunities for provision of required publicly accessible open space;
- 2) That the applicant provide a public access easement to and over the proposed Pocket Park;
- 3) That an on-street van accessible parking space be provided based on the provision of 3 new parking spaces;
- 4) That bicycle parking spaces be provided as required by Code;
- 5) That exterior lighting specifications for all proposed fixtures be submitted with building permits;



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

**PID: 273-000867
Development and Site Plan Reviews with Parking Plan**

- 6) That exterior lighting be provided in the area of the Pocket Park to meet the minimum foot candle requirements of Code;
- 7) That details and specifications for the proposed vehicular canopy be submitted with building permits; and
- 8) That the applicant verify the proposed height of the retaining walls surrounding the open space along Winder Drive and request any necessary approvals should they exceed Code-permitted height.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: The Site Plan with the Parking Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION



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



~~being functional. Bringing a design team into this process could improve the architecture and enrich the community.~~

~~Ms. Kennedy stated that she has no concerns with the plan. Although the sign may not meet Code, the design is well integrated with the building. She is an engineer and likes the building. She finds the exterior of the building appealing and simple. She is also happy to see this business locate in the community.~~

~~Mr. Stidhem stated he likes the building and the sign. It is a good fit with the building. He appreciates the ability to convert this building to another purpose in the future. There is a demand for a venue for corporate and wedding events in this community. This is a great location for this service.~~

~~Mr. Newell concurred with Mr. Wilson's comments regarding the articulation of the façade. She would be more concerned if it was a much larger building. Overall, she likes the design of the building. She finds the sign very artistic and well blended into the building. Her only concern is with one building material. The text refers to it as aluminum siding, but aluminum siding is not a permissible material in the West Innovation District. Metal panel siding is permissible. This material is half-way between. It is installed in the same manner as a metal panel screen system would be installed. Therefore, she believes it is more of a metal panel siding. For the record, she wants to clearly state that the Commission was interpreting this material as metal panels, not aluminum siding. This is a very nice project.~~

~~There was no further discussion.~~

~~Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the three (3) Administrative Departures. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.
Motion passed: 5-0.~~

~~Ms. Stidhem inquired if the applicant is in agreement with the seven conditions.
Mr. Winkle responded that he is in agreement.~~

~~Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the Site Plan Review with seven (7) conditions. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.
Motion passed: 5-0.~~

2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1, 18-080DPR-SPR, Development and Site Plan Reviews with Parking Plan

Ms. Newell stated this request is a proposal for review and approval of a Development Plan, Waivers and a Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066, for a proposed six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel and commercial building and associated site improvements, southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive.

Ms. Newell swore in those individuals who wished to present public testimony on this case.

Background

Ms. Husak stated that this is a development plan and site plan with a parking plan for Building F1 in Bridge Park. On January 17, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) recommended approval of the plat that includes the lot for F1 as well as the private drive. On October 22, 2018, City Council approved the Basic Plan Reviews for Block F and Block G, and appointed PZC as the required reviewing body for all future applications. Tonight's review will be the final step in the development review for Block F. There will be several other buildings, but PZC is reviewing only F1 at this time. When this plan is approved, the applicant will be able to apply for building permits.

Site

This site within Block F is located on Bridge Park Avenue and is bordered by Mooney Street on the west and Dale Drive on the east. Blocks A through C are completed and Blocks D and H are being completed. Building F1 is an 86,000-square-foot hotel with approximately 9,000 square feet of commercial space. The building has six stories and 145 rooms. The south façade is adjacent to the reserve that was platted and the private drive of Winder Way, and contains a canopy-covered patron drop-off area. On the north façade along Bridge Park Avenue is the primary entrance/exit for pedestrian traffic. Dale Drive on the east side, which is anticipated to be a street similar to Bridge Street, will have some interim conditions. It also has topography changes, which were partially addressed with waivers in the Basic Plan, as there were some areas where the front property line coverage could not be met due to the layout of the existing roadway. On the west side is existing Mooney Street. Directly across from the F1 building on Mooney Street are buildings in B Block and the B Block garage.

Landscape Plan

The landscape plan for this site includes open space primarily in the area south of the hotel and west of the canopy area. Patrons of the hotel can exit and enjoy the outdoors in a comfortable setting. It is publicly accessible and the applicant is counting that as their open space. This site is slightly short of open space dedication. Overall, the Block will make up all the open-space requirement; however, for this particular site, there is a condition that the open space dedication will be deferred to the development to the south to make up the needed portion. Retaining walls and chairs and lounges are proposed to make a comfortable space. There are also areas for seating to the north along Bridge Park Avenue.

Elevation

On the northeast east side along Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, a large amount of glass and brick are incorporated into the facades. The signs depicted in the rendering are not part of tonight's application. They will be addressed in a future amendment to the Master Sign Plan, which currently encompasses Blocks A, B, C and D. On the northwest elevation along Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street are located commercial spaces with patios and a more active streetscape, along with higher windows and views into the restaurants. On the southeast elevation is Dale Drive and Winder Drive -- a proposed private street through the block, which has the canopied drop-off area. The applicant is present and can explain the changes that were made to address the direction shared at the previous Council and PZC meetings. The plan has been revised to increase the width of Winder Drive and the inclusion of passenger drop-off spaces and delivery areas. Winder Drive has also been revised to be one-way only.

ART Recommendations

Three motions are recommended.

- Development Plan with no conditions.
- Waiver Review – Approval of Waivers to permit the following deviations from Code:
 1. **§153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height.**
Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high.
Request: To parapets of .5 feet and 7.5 feet in height.
 2. **§153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Expression Lines.**
Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building.
Request: Expression lines distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and define the top of the parapet.
 3. **§153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows, Projecting Sills Required.**
Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one-by-four trim or brick mould casing.
Request: To permit windows to be recessed into the siding clad facades with no projecting sills.
 4. **§153.062 – Building Types (N)(4)(a)(5) Vents, Air Conditioners, other Utility Elements**
Vents, air conditioners, and other utility elements are not permitted on street facing facades.
Request. Permission for PTAC and VTAC unit grills/louvers on street facing facades and architectural louvers above restaurant storefront windows for future mechanical systems.
 5. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks.**
The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.
Request. Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve "B" to be setback ± 3.33 feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.
 6. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.**
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.
Request. Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
 7. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.**
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.
Request: To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
 8. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.**

No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.

Request: To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.

9. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments.**

Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.

Request: To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.

10. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane**

Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.

Request: To permit roof planes of ± 111 feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.

11. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.**

80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.

Request: To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.

12. **§153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.**

One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.

Request: To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.

13. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.**

A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.

Request: 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.

14. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.**

The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.

Request: Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.

15. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.**

Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.

Request: Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

- Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan with eight conditions

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

Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman inquired if the square footage of the pocket parks was reduced or were they only reoriented.

Ms. Husak responded that the square footage was not reduced, but it is not on a principal frontage street. It is the street orientation that does not meet the Code.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the square footage remains the same as originally intended.

Ms. Husak responded the pocket park size requirement is met. However, the Code has several different open space types, and the space in this plan qualifies as a pocket plaza.

Ms. Kennedy requested clarification. Although F1 does not meet the open space requirements, she asked whether the other buildings in F Block would provide the additional space that was required.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. Overall, the applicant intends for F Block to meet the open space requirements. If the anticipated office space should be unable to provide the additional square footage needed, it will be dealt with that application review.

Mr. Fishman stated that the City does not want payment in lieu.

Ms. Husak stated that with the Basic Plan, the applicant showed where the open space would be provided throughout the block, which met the requirement.

Mr. Wilson stated that it is important that these open spaces are designed to be usable spaces. In the areas that are already designed, the spaces are wider and can be used as gathering spaces. He said what is occurring between Building F2 and Building F4 are hallways or corridors that permit pedestrian traffic instead of being gathering spaces. As the design continues for Building F2 and F4, that should be considered. The spaces should be made into something that the public will remain in for a time and enjoy, not just aisles to move people.

Mr. Wilson asked about construction sequence. He stated he assumes the hotel application is currently being reviewed will be built before the parking lot that will be across the private street.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. The only application currently online is the hotel.

Mr. Wilson stated that he assumes the parking for the hotel would initially be provided by the existing parking structures, but he asked if that will be enough space and sufficiently close for the hotel guests. He inquired whether there is an expectation that F2 garage will be built within a few months.

Ms. Husak stated the applicant would address the timing/phases of this project; however, in terms of the availability of spaces, staff is comfortable with the research and resulting numbers for this parking plan. Code does not require a certain linear distance.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the ownership of the pocket park is changing.

Ms. Husak responded that because the open space parking plaza is located on the hotel property, it is owned by that property owner – either Crawford Hoying or Springhill Suites, not by the City. However, the public will use the open space. Code requires the open space to be owned by the City. A waiver will be needed to permit it to be owned by the hotel.

Mr. Fishman inquired if it would remain open space in perpetuity, and the hotel not be permitted to identify it for hotel use.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman inquired if that understanding would be clearly reflected in a deed or elsewhere.

Ms. Husak stated that the record will reflect the Commission's approval that the space fulfills the City's open space requirement. If the nature of that open space were to change, it would no longer be consistent with the Commission's approval.

Mr. Boggs stated the Condition suggests that with the Waiver, the property owner would provide a public access easement, which would provide public access in perpetuity.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is concerned the hotel might put a kiosk there.

Mr. Boggs responded that would be in violation of the Commission's approval and the City's rights under the easement that would be granted as a Condition of the Commission's approval.

Mr. Fishman stated it is important to ensure projects are providing the required open space and not receive waivers of that requirement or be permitted to pay a fee in lieu.

Ms. Husak stated that only 700 square feet is being waived.

Mr. Fishman stated he is concerned the future project is expected to supply that additional amount but will object that it is not their responsibility.

Ms. Kennedy requested clarification of the bicycle rack requirement for a certain number of spaces.

Ms. Husak responded that it is a Code requirement.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if one of the waivers or conditions was related to that.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. Code requires the provision of bicycle parking spaces. The Condition language is not specific in terms of where these bicycle spaces must be located, so they could be located in the garage or on the site.

Ms. Kennedy stated that because there is no garage in proximity, the bicycle parking spaces will be on the sidewalks.

Ms. Husak responded that there are bicycle parking spaces on Bridge Park Avenue that are in the City right-of-way. There are also spaces in the Block B garage.

Ms. Newell invited the applicant to speak.

James Peltier, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus stated that he would like to address the open space requirement. He pointed out a hatched area on the rendering that indicates that space. Previously, the plan proposed a pool in that area that would be associated with the building. The pool was removed and a wall was pulled back approximately 20 feet to provide more open space here. The F1 Building is required to provide 1800 square feet of open space. The plan provides 1200 square feet, making it 600 square feet short of the requirement. They will be building and providing additional open space across the street; which will be well in excess of the open space requirements.

Mr. Fishman stated that these spaces are not public gathering spots. He asked if the one particular space was for the restaurant.

Ms. Husak responded that it is not for the restaurant, but it likely would be a patio space.

Mr. Peltier clarified the patio space is not for the restaurant. It is intended to be an open space similar to other public open spaces within the area, such as the public space between Buildings C1 and C2, where Cap City Diner is located.

Mr. Peltier summarized the results of the parking analysis, which was included in the Commission packets. The existing B Block garage across Mooney Street has 142 spaces in excess of the City Code requirements. Code requires 187 spaces for the hotel and restaurant. There are 107 spaces in the garage dedicated for B Block office use. On weekends, those spaces are not being utilized. Therefore, during the peak hours for the restaurant and hotel, those unused spaces dedicated for office would be available for hotel and restaurant use.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if there would be signs that identifies those spaces as reserved for office use Monday – Friday during specified hours.

Mr. Peltier responded that no specific spaces are reserved for office.

Mr. Fishman inquired if an additional garage is anticipated.

Mr. Peltier responded affirmatively. It would be south of the F1 Building.

Mr. Fishman inquired the anticipated timeframe for the additional garage.

Don Brogan, Crawford Hoying Development, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated the additional garage is expected to be included with the next office building project. However, the hotel will have sufficient parking with what is available at this time. When the next office building is constructed, the garage will be built, as well.

Mr. Fishman stated the parking garage across the street is a free, self-park structure, and asked if it will remain as such when the hotel is completed.

Mr. Brogan responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman inquired if valet parking of hotel vehicles would not be required.

Mr. Brogan responded that there would be no need for valet parking. The garage is directly across the street.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the bike rack design and location.

Mr. Peltier referred to images provided in the Landscape Plans. There are existing bike racks on Mooney Street and Bridge Park Avenue, which are included in the required bicycle parking count. Additional bike racks will be included on this site, as well.

Mr. Stidhem encouraged using interesting bike racks. Throughout the plan, he would like to see interesting features to draw people in along Winder Drive. For the last three years, the Commission has been discussing the use of artistic features that will draw people to this space.

In Hilton Head, for example, the bike racks reflect a "fish" architectural feature. He said there are many interesting features in Bridge Park already, but he asked what, if anything, is planned here.

Ms. Husak responded that the City bike racks utilize the same, circular design. Staff has discussed the need to expand that palette. They can work with the applicant to do so here, and staff can focus on expanding the effort Citywide.

Mr. Peltier stated the bike racks in Bridge Park already show a variety in design. As he understands the conversation, in addition to the bike racks, the Commission is encouraging incorporation of more interesting features within this open space.

Chris Meyers, Meyers & Associates Architects, 232 North Third Street, Columbus, stated the intent is to create charisma throughout the Bridge Park venues through the use of fixed objects and materials. In addition, they have attempted to seek areas in which to add a charisma of activity, such as outdoor musicians. The goal is to create spaces that encourage people to gather and sit. The landscape element next to the hotel is intended to energize the appearance of the front entrance.

Ms. Kennedy stated that, as a resident, she cannot envision wanting to sit down outside a hotel. It does not seem to be a space that will be utilized by the general public. Adding the vibrancy does bring the back side of the building to life.

Mr. Meyers stated it is challenging because it is difficult to differentiate which is the front and which is the back. With all the activity that is planned around this site and what is currently in place, a hotel visitor may exit to the north or the south and interact with the entire development. An additional benefit to Bridge Park will be the new park to the west, which will provide a large outdoor gathering space and amenity for the City. These smaller pocket spaces add to the identity of a particular building. This small space may be utilized more by hotel guests, but it is not exclusive to their use.

Mr. Fishman encouraged the incorporation of artwork, such as sculptures, in the area.

Mr. Meyers stated that the discovery of interactive sculptures adds an unexpected element of surprise. Throughout Bridge Park, there is an effort to look for opportunities to add interactive elements. Likewise, their intent is not to extend buildings to the street, but allow a transitional space between the public right-of-way and the façade for such opportunities.

Mr. Fishman noted that there has been previous discussion about the intent to add sculptures and elements to attract people. He asked if it their intent to do so.

Mr. Meyers responded affirmatively.

Mr. Wilson inquired about the reason the internal road on the site must be private. He asked if the hotel is permitted to block that road and prevent through traffic.

Mr. Peltier responded that it would be treated like a public road, and built to the same standards. There are private roads on Block A, as well, such as Longshore Loop. The intent would not be to block them off or make them inaccessible to the public.

Mr. Boggs stated that at the previous PZC meeting discussion regarding the plat, it was clarified that this area is set forth in the plat as a Reserve for purposes of providing public access into the site.

Ms. Husak responded that it would not be a neighborhood street, which would provide connectivity through the blocks; its primary purpose is to provide access to the hotel and the garage. It is not a through street like the north/south streets.

Mr. Peltier stated the street will meet fire and emergency access requirements.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if the developer would be responsible for the maintenance.

Mr. Peltier responded affirmatively.

Ms. Newell inquired if the cement board siding is prefinished.

Mr. Meyers responded affirmatively. It has a factory prime and one coat finish. In the event that any marks occur to the finish during shipping, a final finish application would be added. There are other examples of this commercial grade product within Bridge Park.

Mr. Stidhem stated that the building is attractive and will be a great addition to the District. He is hopeful that this site will encourage pedestrian traffic in the area. He asked if there is rooftop access for the hotel or restaurant.

Mr. Meyers responded that there is rooftop access only for the maintenance of the mechanical equipment. There will be no interactive public area.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if any environmental sustainability feature would be incorporated.

Mr. Meyers responded that a significant amount of environmental sustainability has been incorporated in the building, which is consistent with Crawford Hoying's standards and is also a requirement of the Marriott brand.

Ms. Newell inquired if any of the mechanical equipment on the roof would be screened, given that waivers are requested to permit parapet heights.

Mr. Meyers responded that all of the mechanicals are positioned out of the sight line and have screening. The conditions for the parapets are related to the form of the building, not to add any visibility. They have considered the potential views from the elevations of the adjacent buildings, and any need for screening has been addressed.

Ms. Newell stated that she appreciates that response, because, in with some of the other buildings in Bridge Park, assurances were made that the mechanical units would be screened. However, they are very visible in certain locations, particularly when there is a change in elevation.

Mr. Meyers noted that the specifications of each of the units was included in the materials.

Mr. Stidhem stated that, whenever possible, he would encourage rooftop access for play, not only for access to mechanical units. The AC Hotel provides evidence of the level of draw that is created. It may not be advisable for this location; however, due to its more limited view.
Mr. Meyers responded that it also is not consistent with the Marriott brand.

Mr. Wilson inquired if street lighting is being provided.
Mr. Peltier responded that a plan for street lighting was included in the materials. Three light poles are proposed along Winder Drive, which are consistent with other street light poles utilized in the District.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the awning for the main entrance would be an open, flat style that would not provide rain protection.
Mr. Meyers responded that the awning would be translucent but it is a solid acrylic panel.

Ms. Newell stated that a waiver has been requested regarding the primary materials on the building. She has a concern about the amount of cement board siding being used, in particular on the Dale Drive/Winder Drive corner. It creates an impression of a very large mass on that corner in comparison to the articulation that is expressed elsewhere on the building. She is uncomfortable with the size of that mass; however, she defers that issue to the Commission. There was no further discussion.

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the Development Plan Review without conditions. Ms. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.
Motion approved: 5-0.

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the 15 waivers:

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

5. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks.**
The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.
Request. Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve “B” to be setback ± 3.33 feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.
6. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.**
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.
Request. Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
7. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.**
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.
Request: To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
8. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.**
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.
Request. To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.
9. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments.**
Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.
Request: To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.
10. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane.**
Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.
Request: To permit roof planes of ± 111 feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.
11. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.**
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.
Request: To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.
12. **§153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.**
One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.
Request: To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.
13. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.**
A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.

Request: 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.

14. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.**

The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.

Request: Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.

15. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.**

Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.

Request: Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.

Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.

Motion approved: 5-0

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the Site Plan Review with Parking Plan with eight conditions:

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

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant is in agreement with these conditions.

Mr. Meyers responded that they are in agreement.

Ms. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; yes; Ms. Newell, yes.

Motion approved: 5-0

Mr. Stidhem thanked the applicant for their presentations.



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, January 17, 2019

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

3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1 PID: 273-008867
18-080DPR/SPR Development & Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan

Proposal: A six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel and commercial building and associated site improvements.
Location: Southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive.
Request: Review and approval of a Development Plan and Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
Applicant: James Peltier, EMH&T
Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager
Contact Information: 614.410.4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-080

REQUEST 1: ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTURES

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

Determination: The three Administrative Departures were approved.

REQUEST 2: DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Request for a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan without conditions.

Determination: The Development Plan was forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission with a recommendation of approval.



REQUEST 3: 15 SITE PLAN WAIVERS

Request for an approval recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 15 Waivers:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height.
Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high.
Request: To parapets of .5 feet and 7.5 feet in height.
2. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Expression Lines.
Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building.
Request: Expression lines distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and define the top of the parapet.
3. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows, Projecting Sills Required.
Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one-by-four trim or brick mould casing.
Request: To permit windows to be recessed into the siding clad facades with no projecting sills.
4. §153.062 – Building Types (N)(4)(a)(5) Vents, Air Conditioners, other Utility Elements
Vents, air conditioners, and other utility elements are not permitted on street facing facades.
Request. Permission for PTAC and VTAC units grills/louvers on street facing facades and architectural louvers above restaurant storefront windows for future mechanical systems.
5. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks.
The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.
Request. Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve "B" to be setback ±3.33 feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.
6. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.
Request. Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
7. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.
Request: To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
8. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.
Request. To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.
9. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments
Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.
Request: To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.

10. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane
Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.
Request: To permit roof planes of ± 111 feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.
11. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.
Request: To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.
12. §153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.
One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.
Request: To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.
13. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.
A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.
Request: 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.
14. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.
The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.
Request: Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.
15. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.
Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.
Request: Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

Determination: The 15 Site Plan Waivers were recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

REQUEST 4: SITE PLAN REVIEW

Request for a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Parking Plan to allow for an adjustment to required vehicle parking through shared parking calculations within the Site Plan Review with the following eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant evaluate opportunities for provision of required publicly accessible open space;
- 2) That the applicant provide a public access easement to and over the proposed Pocket Park;
- 3) That an on-street van accessible parking space be provided based on the provision of three new parking spaces;
- 4) That bicycle parking spaces be provided as required by Code;
- 5) That exterior lighting specifications for all proposed fixtures be submitted with building permits;


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

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

- 6) That exterior lighting be provided in the area of the Pocket Park to meet the minimum foot candle requirements of Code;
- 7) That details and specifications for the proposed vehicular canopy be submitted with building permits; and
- 8) That the applicant verify the proposed height of the retaining walls surrounding the open space along Winder Drive and request any necessary approvals should they exceed Code-permitted height.

Determination: The Site Plan with a Parking Plan and was forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission with a recommendation of approval with eight conditions.

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Vince Papsidero, FAICP
Planning Director

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**25 North Street
Minor Project Review**

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

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

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

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

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

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

CASE REVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Husak noted the signs will be addressed later.

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

Minor Project Review

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

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

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

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

Ms. Martin presented a photograph of the existing site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTRODUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**6329 Sawmill Road
Minor Project Review**

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

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

October 22, 2018

Page 24 of 30

Held _____

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

Ms. Husak stated that G Block is just north of F Block. Council reviewed this block previously, but significant changes have made to the point where it is appropriate to have a second Basic Plan review. The applicant is requesting review and approval of a Basic Plan Review for a ±2.38-acre development between Dale Drive to the east and Mooney Street to the west and north of Tuller Ridge Drive containing three new buildings and open space:

1. Office space building on south side with restaurant space at the ground story. A waiver is requested to permit a seventh story;
2. Parking garage (291 spaces)
3. Multi-family residential space (109 units)
4. Open space (private and public) in the interior of the Block.

[Showed character images]

The Administrative Review Team has reviewed the Basic Plan and recommends City Council take the following actions:

Approve the 4 Waivers:

1. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (Building G2)
2. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (Building G4)
3. Building Types – Ground Story Use (Building G2)
4. Building Types – Maximum Permitted Building Height (Building G1)

Approve the Basic Plan with 7 Conditions:

1. That the applicant be request approval of a curb cut along a principal frontage street (Building G2 along Dale Drive) by the City Engineer at Final Site Plan Review;
2. That the applicant work with staff to ensure that the internal circulation of the parking structure meets building applicable code requirements at the Final Site Plan Review;
3. That the proposed design of the plaza and streetscape extension adjacent to Building G1 be revised to meet Code to provide adequate pedestrian space;
4. That the applicant provide additional information to evaluate the actual relationship between the existing and proposed building G1 to the building in Block H prior to submitting for Final Site Plan Review;
5. That the applicant will have to address inconsistencies between the plans prior to applying for a Final Site Plan Review;
6. That the setback along the shopping corridor along Bridge Park Avenue meet Code requirements; and,
7. That the applicant revises the plans to eliminate door swings into the ROW.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she is not opposed to a taller building, but questions why a waiver is requested at this point when Council has no idea of the theme of the building, other than it is Office. What will it look like? A waiver is requested prior to having the ability to be aware of the architectural style.

Mr. Hunter stated that they have leased 100% of the existing office space. There are larger tenants looking at Bridge Park in particular. They tend to require 150,000 - 180,000 square feet. Those require big buildings that can't be accomplished without height. However, they wouldn't build a 180,000 square foot office building on spec. That tenant would need to be identified. They could ask for the waiver later; the only reason they have requested it now is that it helps in the discussions they are having with potential tenants. There is one, in particular, who would be a new office tenant for the Dublin community that has requested 150,000 – 200,000 square feet. Their schedules align, but they would need certainty and can't wait six months. Crawford Hoying has engaged Myers & Associates to help with the planning on this Block. They are doing the residential building, the hotel and the Garages. This Office building (G1) will be handled by a different architect, in order to have some architectural variety. If another firm is designing it, it will look different, which they believe is important.

Mayor Peterson stated that if one tenant would occupy the building and even needed eight floors, Council's approval might depend on the intent for the building. Could Council waive the six-story limitation and the developer clarify the height needed later?

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

October 22, 2018

Page 25 of 30

Mr. Hunter responded that if Council is comfortable with that amount of height and density, provided that it is supported with the infrastructure and the identified reviewing body to approve that building at Final Site Plan, that is fine.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired if it would be possible to make it a Condition versus a Waiver – a Condition that additional stories would be permissible if they meet the architectural standards.

Ms. Husak responded that it would require a Waiver since it is a Code requirement.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that when Council votes to determine the Lots and Blocks, we are tied to this footprint of all these buildings, including those on which they are prepared to move forward. In order to have that amount of square footage, a bigger footprint might be needed even if there are seven or eight stories. Approval tonight will set that footprint.

Mr. Hunter responded that is correct; however, this plan is based on what they are experiencing with the current market. If the plan has to change significantly in a way that cannot be approved with the Final Site Plan, they would bring another Basic Plan to Council for consideration. It is a calculated risk, but they need to make certain judgments so that they can move forward, knowing that the market changes.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired at what point does the City accept their greenspace as the actual greenspace? If this greenspace were to be eliminated, then where does it come back, as we haven't conditioned "fee in lieu" on any of this. How is that recaptured if some of this greenspace were to be eliminated?

Ms. Husak responded that the required reviewing body, as determined by Council, would make all those decisions. There is no requirement in the Code that certain waivers have to be approved at certain stages of development or by certain reviewing bodies. Council could deny the waiver for the height, for example; the Planning Commission would review Council minutes and understand Council's concerns about architectural quality, and when they are faced with that waiver, the Commission would take Council's concerns into consideration. That is the same for the Open Space. Some of the open spaces are dependent on the number of units and number of bedrooms within units, and at this point, those numbers aren't available. It would be determined later.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that those greenspace calculations are provided in the staff report.

Ms. Husak stated that those calculations are based on the information available at this time.

Mr. Reiner stated that the developer is clearly shopping for clients. Office use is good for the City because of the tax base. He understands the desire to condition it upon architecture that meets Council's expectations.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that is what the City has always done, if more density is requested.

Mr. Reiner stated that Council is interested in working with them, because they have been a good partner.

Mr. Hunter stated that they attempted to determine what was necessary to obtain Council's feedback on at this point in time. Making the building wider if needed seemed possible, but if it needed to be higher, that seemed to be difficult. That is the reason they requested it at this time to make sure that Council understood, as they dealt with the market, what the parameters were.

Mr. Reiner stated that Council is trying to be supportive, but is concerned about the architecture.

Vice Mayor Groomes stated that Council is far more concerned about the architecture than the height.

Mayor Peterson stated that the height isn't necessarily a concern, if it's the right building and the right tenant.

Vice Mayor Groomes stated that, in addition, this building will be located on Bridge Park Avenue.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

October 22, 2018

Page 26 of 30

Held

Ms. De Rosa stated that the greenspace here is very important, as well. Once the building is built and we see it all in context, it is viewed differently. However, but she believes more greenspace is needed in and around the site. The congregating space will become increasingly important. She would be more concerned about removing greenspace than about the height.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that if this Block consisted of great greenspace, a parking garage, and an eight-story office building surrounded with nice plazas, and the residential building was eliminated, that would be a possibility.

Mr. McDaniel inquired about the potential of having a park on top of the parking garage.

Ms. Fox stated that was discussed by PZC.

Mr. Reiner stated that the developer is seeking clients, and Council does not want to tie their hands in those efforts.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that this plan would actually tie their hands more than Council desires to do.

Mr. Reiner stated that the applicant will return to Council if they identify a different client.

Mayor Peterson stated that perhaps Council could approve this waiver, and based on Council's input, the applicant could return and request approval for eight stories.

Mr. Hunter stated that if a client were to come to them and request 250,000 square feet that doesn't fit within these parameters, it would certainly warrant returning to Council for consideration.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that having parking lot exits onto Dale Drive will be problematic, according to the Engineering Division.

Ms. Husak stated what was indicated is that it would require Engineering approval, but in Planning's reviews, it seemed likely to be approved.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that would not be desirable. Next to Riverside Drive, Dale Drive will be the City's next major north-south connector. She would be surprised if that is approved. It makes much more sense to enter and exit on Mooney Street versus Dale Drive. Mooney Drive is built for that type of purpose; Dale Drive is not. She would not support the first condition of a curbcut on Dale Drive.

Mr. McDaniel stated that it was his understanding that the character of Dale Drive will begin to change at some point. Dale Drive, as it is currently constructed, is as a temporary treatment.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired what it would look like going forward. It has been her understanding that it would look more like Bridge Park Avenue than Mooney Street.

Mr. McDaniel stated that would be why Engineering might approve it – if the character of that road will change as intended.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the attempt has been to keep curbcuts off Bridge Park Avenue and put them on the arterial streets instead. Therefore, she is not supportive of the first condition.

Ms. Alutto asked if it would create another difficulty if there were to be two exits.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that it would require a different layout.

Ms. Fox stated that there is an entrance for the parking on the west side of G2 and also one on Dale Drive.

Mr. Hunter responded that is correct. He believes that is what Council was discussing regarding the F Block, as well.

Ms. Fox stated that there is no other option for location of the exit, and it is necessary to be able to exit the garage in two ways. PZC did consider the exit for Mooney Street, but in order that it did not look like a parking entrance, some interesting architectural features would be needed, providing a glimpse into the private greenspace for the residential building.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that once the building is designed, the applicant can request a waiver from the reviewing body. If the design has been completed and no other way to accomplish this has been identified, the reviewing body has the ability to grant that waiver. If Council grants that waiver at this point, that is how it will be designed from the outset. She would prefer that Council's message be to design it

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

October 22, 2018

Page 27 of 30

differently so that it is effective without needing that. At this point, the plan is so conceptual that it doesn't seem appropriate to grant a waiver.

Ms. Husak clarified that it is a Condition, not a Waiver.

Mayor Peterson asked if the remaining Conditions were acceptable to Council. Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she has no objection to the others.

Mayor Peterson moved to approve the four waivers:

- Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (Building G2)
- Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (Building G4)
- Building Types – Ground Story Use (Building G2)
- Building Types – Maximum Permitted Building Height (Building G1)

Ms. Alutto seconded the motion.

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

Mayor Peterson moved to delete Condition 1 and to approve the remaining six conditions:

- ~~1. That the applicant request approval of a curb cut along a principal frontage street (Building G2 along Dale Drive) by the City Engineer at Final Site Plan Review;~~
2. That the applicant work with staff to ensure that the internal circulation of the parking structure meets building applicable code requirements at the Final Site Plan Review;
3. That the proposed design of the plaza and streetscape extension adjacent to Building G1 be revised to meet Code to provide adequate pedestrian space;
4. That the applicant provide additional information to evaluate the actual relationship between the existing and proposed building G1 to the building in Block H prior to submitting for Final Site Plan Review;
5. That the applicant will have to address inconsistencies between the plans prior to applying for a Final Site Plan Review;
6. That the setback along the shopping corridor along Bridge Park Avenue meet Code requirements; and,
7. That the applicant revise the plans to eliminate door swings into the ROW.

Ms. Alutto seconded the motion.

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

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

Mr. Reiner seconded the motion.

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

STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. McDaniel introduced the new Director of Building Standards, Brad Fagrell. Mr. Fagrell has previously worked with the Ohio Department of Transportation, the City of Lancaster, and has had Chief Building Official experience. The City of Dublin welcomes his expertise and experience.

Council welcomed Mr. Fagrell to the City.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Public Services Committee Report re. Recommendations on Aging in Place

Ms. Alutto, Public Services Committee Chair, requested that, due to the lateness of the hour, this item be deferred to the next Council meeting.

Council consensus was to defer this item to the November 5 Council meeting.



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, October 11, 2017

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

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F 18-060BPR** **PID: 273-000867**
Basic Plan Review
- Proposal:** The construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, a parking structure with a residential liner, and an additional building as part of the Bridge Park Development. The site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood.
- Location:** West of Dale Drive, southwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue.
- Request:** Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
- Applicant:** Crawford Hoying Development Partners, represented by James Peltier, EMH&T.
- Planning Contact:** Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner
- Contact Information:** 614.410.4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us
- Case Information:** www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-060

REQUEST 1: ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTURE

1. §153.062—Building Type Requirements (O)(5)(a)(1) Corridor Building Type. Building Siting. Front Property Line Coverage: Minimum 75% front property line coverage required; 71.9% requested for F3 at Dale Drive.

Determination: The Administrative Departure was approved.

REQUEST 2: WAIVER REVIEWS

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

1. §153.062—Building Type Requirements (C)(1) Incompatible Building Types - Unlined Parking Structure (F2) across from unlined Parking Structure (B5) required; requested - To permit Parking Structures unlined with occupied space to be located adjacent. Building F2 is directly across Mooney Street from an existing unlined Parking Structure on Block B.
2. §153.062—Building Type Requirements (O)(5)(a)(1) Corridor Building Type. Building Siting. Front Property Line Coverage required: Minimum 75% front property line coverage; requested - Building F1 to be 66.7% at Dale Drive.



**1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F
18-060BPR**

**PID: 273-000867
Basic Plan Review**

3. §153.062—Building Type Requirements (O)(12)(a)(1) Parking Structure Building Type. Building Siting. Front Property Line Coverage - Minimum 90% front property line coverage required; requested - Building F2 to be 52.4% at Mooney Street.
4. §153.062—Building Type Requirements (O)(5)(b) Corridor Building Type. Height. Ground Story Height required - Minimum 12 feet, maximum 16 feet ground story height; requested. 20-foot ground story height at Building F1.
5. §153.062—Building Type Requirements (O)(12)(a)(3) Parking Structure Building Type. Parking Location & Loading. Entry for Parking within Building- required - Entries for parking structures is permitted only from rear, side, or corner side facades on non-principal frontage streets; requested - Building F2 parking entrance to be located on front façade of building.
6. §153.065—Site Development Standards (B)(5)(a)1. Parking and Loading. Parking Structure Design. Entrance and Exit Lanes - One entrance lane shall be required for each 300 spaces or part thereof and one exit lane shall be provided for each 200 spaces or part thereof; requested - The F2 Parking Structure provides 288 parking spaces, requiring one entrance lane and two exit lanes. Parking Structure includes one entrance lane and one exit lane.

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


REQUEST 3: BASIC PLAN REVIEW

Request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review with seven conditions:

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

Determination: The Basic Plan Review was recommended for approval to City Council with seven conditions.

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Vince Papsidero, FAICP
Planning Director



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, October 11, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Ray Harpham, Interim Building Official, Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; and Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Hunter Rayfield, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: James Peltier, EMH&T; Pete Scott, Meyers + Associates Architecture; and John Woods, MKSK (Cases 1 & 2).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the September 20, 2018, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented. He made note of the following Minor Modifications:

1. Bridge Park, Fado – Other modifications deemed appropriate by the Planning Director.
2. Bridge Park, Block H – Modifications to building material or color of equal or higher quality.
3. 250 W. Bridge – Modifications to the location and layout of parking lots.

RECOMMENDATIONS

**1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F
18-060BPR**

**PID: 273-000867
Basic Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this application is a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, a parking structure with a residential liner, and an additional building as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, southwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation for approval to City Council of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak presented the Bridge Street District (BSD) process and said the final approval will be made by City Council as there is an Economic Development Agreement in place. She said this application will be reviewed at their meeting on October 22, 2018, where City Council will make a determination on the Basic Plan Review and the future required reviewing body.

Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of Blocks F & G and the layout of the labeled blocks to illustrate context within the Bridge Park Development. She noted that Block G is directly across from Block H and Blocks A, B, C, D, and H have all been approved while Blocks D & H are still under construction.

Ms. Husak presented the general layout proposed for the three buildings in Block F. She said the applicant has proposed building F1 to contain a hotel and a restaurant, F2 as a parking garage, F3, which is a liner for the parking garage for hotel/commercial use, and F4 that is intended for office space in the future. She indicated details for the hotel such as the number of rooms, footprint, and architecture will come later as



this application gets developed. She noted the private access drive that will provide a drop-off area for guests and provide movement throughout the block. She said Dale Drive serves as the principal frontage street with this all being illustrated on the basic plan presented. She indicated that Staff has had some concerns about pedestrian circulation around the access drive as they envisioned it to be similar to A Block and asked the applicant to work with Staff to develop this area appropriately.

Ms. Husak said Staff had identified an Administrative Departure regarding front property line coverage, which is due to the shape for the block, especially for building F3. She said the Code requires 75% front property line coverage but the applicant is requesting 72% at Dale Drive.

Ms. Husak presented the intended massing and how the buildings relate to each other. She said the hotel (F1) would be the tallest building on this block and most likely the first building submitted for a final site plan review.

Ms. Husak presented the western elevations of F2 & F3 that showed the unlined portion of the parking garage along Dale Drive. She presented inspirational images for the proposed contemporary design characteristics for the block, which were very similar to the established character of the development.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed open space for Block F and said the applicant is meeting the open space requirements and should not have to request a Fee-in-Lieu.

Ms. Husak explained the six Waivers associated with Block F:

1. Building Types – Incompatible Building Types (F2).

Ms. Husak said this Waiver has to do with the unlined parking garage in Block F facing an unlined parking garage in Block B, which is appropriate given the location and design of each garage.

2. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (F1).

Ms. Husak said the proposed access point at Mooney Street to the north and mid-block pedestrianway to the south of Building F2 combine to reduce the ability for the front property line coverage requirement to be met on the Mooney Street frontage.

3. Building Types – Front Property Line Coverage (F3).

Ms. Husak said the required mid-block pedestrianway proposed to the south of F3 reduces the ability for the front property line coverage requirement to be met on the Dale Drive lot frontage.

4. Building Types – Maximum Ground Story Height (F1)

Ms. Husak said the increase in ground story height is due to the change in grade from east to west. The ground story height at the east end of the building is 14.25 feet and 20 feet at the west end of the building.

5. Building Types – Entry Location for Parking within Building (F2)

Ms. Husak said the Mooney Street elevation is the front façade of the Parking Structure (F2/F3) and is the only façade of F2 accessible from a public right-of-way that is not a principal frontage street.

6. Site Development Standards – Parking Structure Design: Entrance and Exit Lanes (F2)

Ms. Husak said the Parking Structure (F2) is fairly small and based on the surrounding mix of uses proposed to utilize these parking spaces, the need for additional exit lanes for a peak simultaneous vehicle exiting is unlikely. The entrance and exit lanes are aligned with an existing parking structure across Mooney Street and meet the maximum 30-foot opening requirement. Additional lanes in this location would be detrimental to both the character of Mooney Street and the Parking Structure.

Ms. Husak stated Staff is comfortable with the seven conditions identified for the recommendation of approval of the Basic Plan Review as all of the conditions are site related and can be addressed at the final site plan review. The conditions are as follows:

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

James Peltier, EMH&T, inquired about condition #3. He confirmed Bridge Park Avenue is the shopping corridor but asked how far the 12-foot clear sidewalk extended on Bridge Park Avenue. Logan Stang explained the 12-foot clearance is a neighborhood standard that extends the full length of Bridge Park Avenue as part of the Scioto Neighborhood District. Ms. Husak said Staff will hold the applicant to that standard due to feedback received over time from the Commission for ensuring enough room for pedestrians is made available.

Donna Goss asked if the private access drive was a one-way or a two-way street and Mr. Peltier answered two-way. She expressed her concern in the potential conflicts between two-way traffic, pedestrian crossing, and the hotel drop-off.

Aaron Stanford encouraged the applicant to think about hotel guests coming out of that entrance and the garage parking circulation. Vince Papsidero suggested the applicant consider different paving materials to help guide the pedestrians and keep them out of harm's way. He said a change in materials can be aesthetically pleasing, as well. Shawn Krawetzki inquired about the landscaping in that same area as it is now shown as ornamental.

Mr. Stanford asked if the applicant intends to use a street wall lining. Mr. Peltier answered he was not sure yet.

Ms. Goss asked if the access drive will also be used as a service entry for deliveries. Mr. Peltier said the service/delivery is on the south side of the hotel.

Mr. Stanford inquired about refuge pick-up. Mr. Peltier answered there will be a trash compactor in the parking garage (F2) in the northwest corner at Mooney Street and they plan to provide nice screening. He noted that corner is notched out of the building and the transformer will be located adjacent to the compactor.

Ray Harpham said the trash compactor will create more traffic across the street and in his experience, a grease trail will be left behind from the restaurant space to the compactor. Mr. Krawetzki said he became concerned about the exterior noise of the compactor as well as the smell it would generate on the street. He indicated he did not see this sort of setup anywhere else in the development. Mr. Papsidero said these details could be addressed later. He said the applicant has always placed the compactors in their garages but this one will be visible from up above unless the screening addresses this concern. John Woods, MKSK, said the applicant could put something over the trash compactor to alleviate visibility. Mr. Papsidero asked that the applicant select something decorative for that purpose.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion to approve the Administrative Departure Review as follows:

1. §153.062—Building Type Requirements (O)(5)(a)(1) Corridor Building Type. Building Siting. Front Property Line Coverage: Minimum 75% front property line coverage required; 71.9% requested for F3 at Dale Drive.

Ms. Goss motioned, Mr. Harpham seconded, to approve the Administrative Departure as written and it was passed, unanimously.

Mr. Papsidero called for a vote to recommend approval to City Council for the six requested Waivers:

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

The vote was taken and everyone was in favor of the six Waivers to be recommended for approval.

Mr. Papsidero called for a vote to recommend approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review with seven conditions:

- 1) That Building F3 be located within the required build zone and comply with the front property line coverage requirement to the maximum extent possible, for verification with the Site Plan Review;
- 2) That Building F2/F3 be relocated within the required build zone of 5 feet to 25 feet for Parking Structures, for verification with the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the proposed patio space and seating areas located between the existing tree grates in the Bridge Park Avenue right-of-way and the façade of Building F1 be revised to provide the minimum 12 feet of clear sidewalk width;
- 4) That the applicant provide a Parking Plan with the Site Plan Review to the satisfaction of the Planning Division;
- 5) That the applicant continue working with Staff to ensure the private access drive located between Buildings F1 & F2/F3 can accommodate appropriate pedestrian circulation to the satisfaction of the Engineering & Planning Divisions;

- 6) That the applicant provide all final details regarding open space and site development standards with the Site Plan Review; and
- 7) That the applicant continue to refine architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review.

The vote was taken and everyone was in favor of the Basic Plan Review to be recommended for approval to City Council with seven conditions, as stated.

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block G
18-061BPR**

**PID: 273-012471
Basic Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this application is a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a residential building, a parking structure with a liner, and an additional corridor building as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, northwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation to City Council for approval of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak noted that City Council reviewed Block G when Block H was reviewed but the proposal for Block G has since been changed, which requires another Basic Plan Review.

Ms. Husak presented the basic plan for Block G. She said the proposal is for three new buildings with 170,000 square feet of office, 16,000 square feet of commercial, 110,000 square feet of residential, 0.43 acres of open space, and associated site improvements on the ±2.28-acre site. She said there is potential for residential liners on the garage similar to other blocks.

Ms. Husak presented a basic drawing to depict massing as viewed from the southwest corner. She said Staff had identified five Waivers, including one requested for the office building (G1) to be seven stories where six stories is the maximum permitted in the Code and Staff is recommending approval. She presented similar drawings for east, west, north, and south elevations and noted this will not be the tallest building in the development. She said the variety of heights on this block was supported by the Commission.

Ms. Husak presented the inspirational images for the proposed character for Block G. She said these designs seem appropriate to what has been approved. She reported the Commission conveyed they welcomed the images with the intent for something different.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed open space for Block G and pointed out the area in G4 of a private amenity space the size of ±7,667 square feet. She said 0.43 acres of on-site open space is proposed for Block G. She reported the Commission discussed open space, specifically how much should be turf versus hardscape with planters, especially given the amount of pets in the area. Vince Papsidero encouraged the applicant to look for inspiration at the small pet park in Cincinnati, which is just one of the amenities offered as part of Washington Park.

Ms. Husak stated the applicant is requesting one Administrative Departure:

1. Building Types – Parking Structure, Required Building Zone (G2)

Ms. Husak explained the applicant is requesting for building G2 to be 4.66 feet from Dale Drive right-of-way, encroaching beyond the required building zone. She said Staff is not recommending approval as the building



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 20, 2018 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F
18-060BPR**

**PID: 273-000867
Informal Review**

Proposal: The construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, a parking structure, residential units and a future office building as part of the Bridge Park Development. The site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood.

Location: West of Dale Drive, southwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue.

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

Applicant: Crawford Hoying Development Partners, represented by James Peltier, EMH&T.

Planning Contact: Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II.

Contact Information: 614.410.4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-060

RESULT: The Planning and Zoning Commission provided informal feedback on this proposal and generally welcomed the proposal. Feedback centered on the usability of the proposed open spaces, the pedestrian realm, particularly at the private drive between the proposed hotel and garage, the appropriateness of shared parking and the continuation of the development as a destination point. The Commission welcomed the variation in the intended architectural character of the proposal.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**3. Perimeter Center, Subarea E – McDonald’s Sign Modifications
18-035AFDP**

**6830 Perimeter Loop Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said this application is a proposal for the installation of a digital menu board sign for an existing McDonald’s restaurant located in Perimeter Center, Subarea E, which is northeast of the intersection of Avery-Muirfield Drive and Perimeter Loop Road. She said this is a request for a review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She said the Commission is the final authority for this case and witnesses would have to be sworn in.

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

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

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

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

CASE REVIEWS

7. **BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F 18-060BPR**

**PID: 273-000867
Basic Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, a parking structure with a residential liner, and an additional building (likely to be office) as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, southwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation to City Council for approval of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Claudia Husak suggested the applications for Blocks F and G be reviewed together. Ms. Burchett introduced Block G, next.

8. **BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block G 18-061BPR**

**PID: 273-012471
Basic Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a residential building, a parking structure with a liner, and an additional corridor building as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, northwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation to City Council for approval of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett reported since there were many changes to the original plan and there is a development agreement associated with this project, the final approval will be made by City Council. She explained the applicant had requested a brief meeting with the ART to present materials in a basic form and receive feedback.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of Blocks F & G and the site plans for both blocks within the Bridge Park Development to illustrate their location in relation to all other blocks. She presented the general layout proposed for the three buildings in Block F with a possible future building. She said the applicant has proposed building F1 to contain a hotel and restaurant, F2 as a parking garage, F3 which is a liner for the parking garage for hotel/commercial use, and F4 that is intended for office space in the future. She noted Dale Drive serves as the principal frontage street.

Ms. Burchett presented basic shapes of the buildings illustrating the intended massing as these buildings face northwest. She explained the scale and heights within the block as well as the general layout of the buildings on the site with the street network throughout. She said the hotel (F1) would be the tallest building on this block. She presented another graphic that illustrated another massing view of the proposed hotel highlighting the access drive and canopy drop-off area.

Ms. Burchett presented the western elevations of F2 & F3 that showed the unlined portion of the parking garage that face Dale Drive, which is the principle frontage street. She presented inspirational images for the proposed contemporary design characteristics for the block, which are very similar to the established character of the development.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed open space for Block F as the applicant is proposing to provide 0.35 acres where 0.09 acres would be required. She indicated the applicant would be submitting a Parking Plan

as they will be requesting less than Code requires based on the parking garage on Block C that is underutilized based on preliminary calculations.

Ms. Burchett presented the basic plan for Block G. She said the proposal is for three new buildings with 170,000 square feet of office, 16,000 square feet of commercial, 110,000 square feet of residential, 0.43 acres of open space, and associated site improvements on the ±2.28-acre site.

Ms. Burchett presented a basic drawing to depict massing as viewed from the southwest corner. She presented similar drawings for east, west, north, and south elevations. She indicated the applicant will need to request a Waiver to allow for the requested 7 stories for the office building (G1) where 6 stories is the maximum permitted in the Code. She noted this will not be the tallest building in the development and noted the variety of heights on this block.

Colleen Gilger asked if building G1 would appear taller given the increased grade change to which Ms. Burchett responded the AC Marriott Hotel should still appear taller.

Ms. Burchett indicated the unlined parking garages will require Waivers as well.

Ms. Burchett presented the inspirational images for the proposed character for Block G. She noted the images included brick, glass, and metal details. She said the proposed design is contemporary with multiple projections and a defined first floor. She said the images show glass as a predominant material with a complementary brick or stone material.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed open space for Block G and pointed out the area in G4 of a private amenity space the size of ±7,667 square feet. She said 0.43 acres of on-site open space is proposed for Block G with 0.16 proposed as an off-site public open space on Block F, to meet the open space requirement of 0.59 acres.

Ms. Burchett stated the proposed uses require a minimum of 435 parking spaces for Block F and 669 parking spaces for Block G. She said the applicant is providing 288 structured parking spaces and 11 on-street parking spaces. She said the applicant is proposing to use 136 parking spaces from the garage on Block C to close the deficit for Block F and 355 parking spaces from the Block C garage for Block G. She reported that a study provided by the applicant revealed there is an excess of parking in Block C with a minimum of 506 parking spaces and a maximum of 740 parking spaces available.

Vince Papsidero confirmed the proposal for parking is below the parking requirement and would require approval of a Parking Plan, which he thought was feasible per the applicant's studies.

Ms. Burchett said a few Waivers have been identified for the project such as allowance of the seven-story building (G1), front property line coverage, and occupation of corner (G4 & F4).

Ms. Burchett shared the discussion questions she planned to use for the Planning and Zoning Commission review:

1. Does the proposal effectively meet the intent and purpose of the walkability standards and promote the principles of walkable urbanism?
2. Is the proposed open space treatment appropriately located, sized, and designed?
3. Do the provided images achieve an appropriate design direction; and are there any architectural design consideration or variety in materials and colors that should be applied to these two blocks?

4. Are there additional design considerations that should be made for the unlined portions of the parking structures, particularly as it faces the principal frontage street (Dale Drive)?
5. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Claudia Husak inquired about the lack of building liners for G3. Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the detail was not shown but the plan was approached similar to C Block.

Ms. Husak asked how the liners would work for the hotel proposed on Block F. Mr. Hunter explained the Marriott offers an Exec-U-Stay like a studio apartment, which is different from the AC Marriott Hotel. He explained the Exec-U-Stay apartments will be managed out of the F1 hotel, which is an interesting concept.

Mr. Papsidero asked if the Marriott ExecuStay was nationwide. Mr. Hunter answered it was specific to commercial users. Mr. Papsidero asked if there would be use issues for this type of operation. He said adding this use would be appropriate for the Bridge Street District.

Colleen Gilger asked if there would be a bed tax issue and asked for confirmation that this building would be four levels. Mr. Hunter responded in the affirmative on the building height.

Mr. Hunter said F1 will be ready to be constructed first. He said in the long term they will rely on the B Block garage for Block F but there is not an elevator on that side so they would eventually need to modify that garage for easier accessibility. Mr. Papsidero asked if improvements would only be internal. Mr. Hunter answered that they hope not to touch the skin. Mr. Papsidero inquired about zoning clearance. He indicated a Parking Plan would need to be approved before F1 was built. Ms. Gilger suggested the garage on B Block could be used during the construction of F1 and to leave F2 & F3 free.

Ms. Husak asked if hotel vents would be needed under the windows. She indicated there could be a separate grill but it would need to be integrated into the architecture. She referred to the Heartland of Dublin and said they did a good job with their vents and it appears purposeful.

Mr. Papsidero said service to the buildings is an issue for the Boards and Commissions, which will need to be addressed.

Aaron Stanford stated there needs to be more space for pedestrian circulation around the hotel. Ms. Burchett clarified the pedestrian crossing from F1 to F2 along a private drive.

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. He announced this was Lori Burchett's last ART meeting as she is moving back to Seattle, WA for a job opportunity.

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 3:20 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on October 11, 2018.

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F
18-060BPR**

**PID: 273-000867
Basic Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, a parking structure with a residential liner, and an additional building (likely to be office) as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, southwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation to City Council for approval of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Claudia Husak suggested the applications for Block's F and G be reviewed together. Ms. Burchett introduced Block G, next.

**3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block G
18-061BPR**

**PID: 273-012471
Basic Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a residential building, a parking structure with a liner, and an additional corridor building as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, northwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation to City Council for approval of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented the site plans for both blocks and reported since there is an Economic Development Plan (EDA) associated with this project, this requires review and approval by City Council. She presented the general layout proposed for the three buildings in Block G and the two buildings with a future building proposed for Block F. She explained the applicant had requested a brief meeting to present materials in a basic form and still receive feedback from the ART.

Ms. Burchett pointed out existing roadways have been established that surround these blocks. She noted the private drive between Mooney Street and Dale Drive to service the hotel. She said there is concern regarding the amount of pedestrian clearance around the private drive, especially near the hotel entrance. She said she would let the applicant describe the intent behind these blocks.

James Peltier, EMH&T, presented the utility plan map and reported utility wise, these plans are in good shape.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Development Partners, noted the hotel occupies all upper floors and some space on the first floor. He explained all public-facing amenities would face Bridge Park Avenue and noted the slab step to accommodate the grade change. He said there is a separate restaurant planned on the west side but it is not affiliated with the hotel. He pointed out that the liners on the garage have not been programmed so they may become optional liners or an enhanced architectural façade. He said they are seeing interest from larger office users.

Vince Papsidero asked if the height and capacity was influx for the parking garage. Mr. Hunter answered to some degree because they still have to base the size on specific tenants, which are unknown at this time. He indicated they will need a comprehensive parking study. He reported the parking garage in Block C has never been 100% full and there are lots of open parking.

Ray Harpham asked what is driving the timing for these blocks. Mr. Hunter answered he wants these two blocks constructed as quickly as possible. He said currently, the view east from the Local Cantina is barren because there is no construction started yet on Blocks F and G and he wants to see that changed.

Mr. Papsidero asked why the applicant is not able to confirm the third building proposed for Block F. Mr. Hunter answered they are holding off due to market forces. He indicated the building will be used as office space but he does not know yet about the size and it is dependent on the sizes/footprints that may fluctuate for the other two buildings.

Mr. Papsidero asked how large the parking structure is in Block G. Mr. Hunter answered four levels more or less are set. He said once two restaurants go in, he will be able to determine the amount of parking that will be needed as they can offset parking to existing garages.

Shawn Krawetzki asked if enough green space had been proposed. Ms. Husak answered the plans only include some green space but since no number of residential units has been provided it's difficult to determine. She suggested additional open space where the garage space is not lined. Mr. Hunter agreed and said it should feel like a public space but they are not able to count it toward the open space requirement.

Colleen Gilger asked if there will be restaurants on the first floors. Mr. Hunter answered affirmatively; there is restaurant space planned in Building G1 facing Bridge Park Avenue and office use planned for the backside facing the proposed green space.

Mr. Papsidero asked how the G2 parking garage and the corridor Building G4 will work architecturally. Pete Scott, Meyers + Associates Architecture, answered there will be two different skins on the exterior and they are considering some sort of live green screen. He said G4 will be a four-story, podium type building and the G2 Parking Garage will be four to five stories tall. Mr. Hunter cited buildings in an urban environment are usually right up against each other. Mr. Scott pointed out the facades of buildings G4, G2, and G3 are not in line with the property line on Dale Drive. He said they will be recessed in such a way as to change the building massing. Mr. Hunter said there are too many unanswered questions. He indicated if a certain single large tenant were to come through for Building G1, needing X amount of square feet, then maybe it would need to be a seven-story building. Ms. Husak said at that point, a Waiver would need to be requested for the height.

Mr. Harpham asked the applicant if they felt comfortable for review by City Council. Mr. Hunter said they will continue to develop the plans in the meantime. He indicated the plans will have the same amount of detail as Block B when it was presented. He said they plan to provide inspirational images for Building G1 since the plans are so loose. He indicated a wall may need to be shifted, which would impact the other buildings. Ms. Burchett recommended the applicant provide a dotted line for those variables so the Commission can respond. Mr. Hunter said they do not know at this point; they are trying to navigate without losing a tentative tenant. Mr. Harpham emphasized that leaves a lot of room for questions.

Aaron Stanford indicated he anticipated Block F to be an area heavily traveled by pedestrians and not enough space is allocated so far. Ms. Husak inquired about how the private drive would be treated from a platting perspective. She asked if this would become a reserve to which Mr. Peltier answered affirmatively as it was done on Block A. Mr. Stanford reported that had worked out really well and if the applicant were to set it up in the same manner, then Engineering would be supportive.

Ms. Husak asked how the roadway on Block H was treated on Dale Drive and if this would be a similar discussion. Mr. Peltier clarified Block F is the same as Block H but they will need more space on Block G along Dale Drive since they will retain the existing ditch.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns for this proposal by the ART. [Hearing none.] He said a recommendation by the ART is scheduled for September 20, 2018

CASE REVIEWS

4. **BSD HR – Christensen Property** **18-058ARB-MPR**

56 Franklin Street **Minor Project Review**

Richard Hansen said this application is a proposal for exterior modifications, an attached garage addition, a detached garage addition ±840 square feet in size, and associated site improvements to an existing home within the Historic District. He said the property is zoned Bridge Street District - Historic Residential and is east of Franklin Street, ±400 feet south of the intersection with West Bridge Street. He 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*.

Mr. Hansen presented the Minor Project Review process that entails the applicant returning to the ART on September 20, 2018, for a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for their meeting on September 26, 2018.

Mr. Hansen presented an aerial view of the site. He reported when the Historic and Cultural Assessment was completed, this property was deemed non-contributing. He presented the proposed site plan that included three additions and a new front porch for the existing house. He noted the applicant is permitted to have one driveway but two driveways are requested, which will require Administrative Approval by the Planning Director. He added the existing pool will be utilized by the property owner. He said the siding on the existing house is proposed to be updated and presented the existing conditions of the home looking west from the backyard and the front looking east from Franklin Street. He said the applicant has provided inspirational images for the architecture including material selections and colors.

Andrew Christianson, property owner, said this home had been neglected for a number of years, especially the exterior and lesser quality windows were used to replace original windows. He said the proposal for the changes are to achieve a uniform look. He said they plan to use white horizontal siding, white six-inch smooth HardiePanel siding, white vertical board and batten, white trim, dark frame windows throughout, new black lighting fixtures, new dark gray asphalt roof as the old roof consisted of three different shingles, and a dark gray, standing seam metal roof for the front porch.

Lori Burchett said further review of this application against the Code, such as lot coverage, still needs to be completed. She stated these proposed changes will improve the overall aesthetics of the home allowing it to complement the district. She restated that two drives are being requested whereas historically, only a single driveway would be permitted for a single-family home. Vince Papsidero agreed this will look very attractive in the neighborhood.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns for this proposal by the ART. [Hearing none.] He said a recommendation by the ART is scheduled for September 20, 2018

5. **BSD HR – Vessels Residence** **18-059ARB-MPR**

63 S. Riverview Street **Minor Project Review**

Mike Kettler said this application is a proposal for a second-story addition and exterior modifications to an existing home within the Historic District. He said the property is zoned Bridge Street District - Historic