



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 7, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**3. 4012 W. Dublin-Granville Road
21-129CP**

Concept Plan

Proposal: Construction of a 14,600-square-foot, two-story, mixed-use building on a 1.08-acre site.

Location: Northeast of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with David Road and zoned Bridge Street District, Office.

Request: Review and approval of a Concept Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Applicant: Don Brogan, Crawford-Hoying Development Partners

Planning Contact: Chase Ridge, AICP Candidate, Planner II

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-129

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded, to table the Concept Plan.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Concept Plan was tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|----------------|--------|
| Jane Fox | Yes |
| Warren Fishman | Yes |
| Mark Supelak | Yes |
| Rebecca Call | Absent |
| Leo Grimes | Yes |
| Lance Schneier | Yes |
| Kim Way | Yes |

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded, to table the request for a combination of the review and approval of the Preliminary Development Plan and the Final Development Plan.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The request for the Preliminary Development Plan and the Final Development Plan to be combined and reviewed was tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|----------------|--------|
| Jane Fox | Yes |
| Warren Fishman | Yes |
| Mark Supelak | Yes |
| Rebecca Call | Absent |
| Leo Grimes | Yes |
| Lance Schneier | Yes |
| Kim Way | Yes |

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Chase Ridge, AICP Candidate, Planner II



~~No public comments on the case were received.~~

~~Mr. Boggs inquired if the applicant had indicated that he wished to table the case.
Mr. Yoder responded affirmatively.~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded to table the Concept Plan.
Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion carried 6-0]~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded to table the request for combination of the review and approval of the Preliminary Development Plan and the Final Development Plan.
Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes.
[Motion carried 6-0]~~

3. 4012 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 21-129CP, Concept Plan

A request for the construction of a 14,600-square-foot, two-story, mixed-use building. The 1.08-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Office and is located northeast of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with David Road.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Concept Plan for the construction of a two-story, mixed-use building in the Bridge Street District. The applicant is proposing an approximate 14,600-square-foot loft type building, sited in the southern one-third of the site. Approximately 400 square feet of open space is proposed on the west edge of the proposed building, where 290 square feet is required. 53 parking spaces will be located centrally on the site, where 54 spaces are required. Access to the site is provided on the north side of the site from Banker Drive. Two patios are proposed adjacent to the building, and sidewalks are proposed along the David Road and Banker Drive frontages. Some of the infrastructure improvements will be on a City-owned parcel; therefore, the applicant will need to work with staff to determine the most appropriate siting. There is a portion of an existing overhead utility easement on the east side of the site, which constricts the site of the building and the parking. The proposed Loft Building Type is a permitted building type in the Office District. The building is required to be sited within 0-15 feet of the right-of-way line and to occupy 75% of the front property line width. With the Preliminary Development Plan, a full building type analysis will be required. The applicant has provided rendering of the proposed building massing. It is a primarily a 2-story massing with a 1.5-story element and rooftop amenities. The primary entry from the parking lot is on the north elevation. Architectural inspiration images were also provided. The buildings will be contemporary in design with straight lines and flat roofs. The buildings utilize glazing, transparency, wood, metal and masonry elements. The proposed open space will be comprised of hardscape with vegetation and seating elements provided. The Concept Plan was reviewed against applicable criteria and staff recommends approval with two conditions, as well as approval of the request to combine the Preliminary and Final Development Plan reviews.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox that the building is required to be 0-15 feet from the right-of-way. In addition to the building footprint, that could also be either patio or an outdoor structure. With those spaces, the building itself could be located further back from the property line.
Mr. Ridge responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way stated that the City owns a section of land along Banker Drive. He is not sure what the City could do with that, unless it is intended for a future realignment of Banker Drive. If lying unused, it would be preferable incorporate the land into this project.

Mr. Ridge responded that at some point in the future, that section of roadway would likely be improved to a Bridge Street District roadway. The City would ensure that the appropriate right-of-way is provided in said parcel. Because that is identified as a Neighborhood Street, it makes sense to front this building along the West Dublin-Granville Road frontage.

Mr. Way stated that as Banker Drive extends to the west, it is a City street and is likely to remain so. What is the intent with the leftover piece of land? If Banker Drive remains where it is, it may become wider, but it will not use all that land.

Mr. Henderson responded that Engineering would have further discussions regarding Banker Drive on that parcel, but likely, the existing section to the west, which is a public street within right-of-way, would be improved to be a similar condition on the City-owned property. Staff would work with the developer regarding location of the sidewalk, should it be placed on the City-owned property.

Mr. Grimes inquired if this part of Banker Drive was private. It has not been dedicated and accepted. It appears to extend to the future Village Parkway, and after that, becomes private.

Mr. Hendershot responded that Banker Drive has an unusual configuration from west to east. Shamrock Drive on the west boundary is an existing public street within the public right-of-way. Moving from there along Banker Drive to the east, David Road marks the limits of the public-right-of-way. Further to the east is a City-owned parcel, which contains a street. If this project moves forward, there would be discussions about the character of the street and location of the sidewalk, which likely will be on the City-owned parcel.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification that this section of Banker Drive is on a City-owned parcel.

Mr. Hendershot responded that it is on a City-owned parcel but is not currently right-of-way. Moving east from there, it becomes a private drive on the Lowe's parcel.

Applicant Presentation

Brian McNally, Myers & Associates, 232 N. Third Street, Columbus, OH stated that the two-story building would be comprised of two separate tenant spaces, one larger than the other. Rooftop terraces will be provided off the second-floor space. The smaller tenant space will be utilized a retail, food and beverage use. A sidewalk along the front façade will provide pedestrian engagement. [Provided description of the proposed building layout/design.]

Commission Questions

Mr. Way observed that the proposed location of the open space on a side street is not a place where people would logically gather – there is nothing happening there. The open space should be where there will be activity. In addition, the SR161 entrance to the office tenant space seems to be underplayed, not welcoming. There appears to be an opportunity there to do something more special.

Ms. Fox stated that the inspiration images are great, and she believes this will be an exciting addition here. However, she also agrees with Mr. Way's observation. It still appears to be an office building located on SR61. There is a great opportunity to add the same energy to the restaurant that there is on rooftop and the side patios to the front of the building. People will not stop here, if there appears to be nothing to stop for; so she would like to see the inviting energy moved to the front of the building. Looking at the inspiration images, she believes the wall of glass has too strong of an impression; it is not pedestrian friendly. It is similar to a downtown office building. Although the transparency presents a view inside, it

does not include the viewer. A desire should be created to linger. She would encourage them to look at the glass element, moving the open spaces to the front façade, and possibly inviting evening lighting. If more effort were invested in creating a warm feeling to the front façade, with the materials being used, she believes they will achieve what is desired.

Mr. Yoder stated that he believes it may be possible to swap some of the 49-foot grass strip at the rear of the property to the SR161 front of the building, and the building could be moved back from SR161 somewhat. There would still be plenty of room remaining for the required 60 to 65-foot right-of-way. Swapping .25-acre of open space with the City could make this happen.

Ms. Fox stated that as Mr. Way has pointed out previously, there are better ways to address parking lots. It should be possible to create pedestrian friendliness from Banker Drive with sidewalks that extend to the rear of the building, eliminating the small tree islands. Adding a garden of trees with a pedestrian-friendly extension would be more inviting. Along with the attractive building and wonderful spaces, make it walkable all the way around it. She would add a condition relocating the patio spaces, and developing the middle of the building to be more inviting and pedestrian friendly at the streetscape. She also would encourage a different design for the parking and pedestrian connectivity.

Mr. Yoder responded that if the City would be willing to give away some City land, the parking lot could be re-oriented. Currently, they are short one parking space.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the City had plans for the greenspace at the rear of the site.

Mr. Hendershot responded that there were no current plans for improvements on Banker Drive. Staff would have to take a look at what a future section of Banker Drive would look like there, and what space might be left over for any potential development opportunities. It would be necessary to consider those details.

Ms. Rauch responded that any land donation would require City Council action, so this project would need to be elevated to City Council in some aspect.

Mr. Supelak stated that it might not be necessary. If the Commission had a better understanding of future plans there, we might be able to identify an opportunity to waive a five-foot minimum rear-yard setback.

Ms. Rauch responded that if there is a zoning requirement on the parcel that the applicant owns, then modifications could be made. Staff can investigate if there is an opportunity to do something with the City-owned parcel.

Mr. Way stated that it would be necessary to change the property line so that the applicant would have the ability to shift the elements back.

Mr. Supelak moving five feet to the other side of the building might not solve the parking issue, but it would be adding some space to the other side of the building, where it is wanted, in lieu of adding on to a 50-foot greenbelt.

Mr. Yoder responded that the best solution would be to have the ability to cross behind, but even the partial solution of adding 5 feet along SR161 would be important. They would be willing to either request a sideyard setback or trade some land with the City.

Mr. Boggs inquired, given this conversation, if the applicant was hoping to obtain a vote on the Concept Plan this evening, or table it.

Mr. Yoder responded that he would prefer for it to proceed to vote tonight, if the Commission believes it can write conditions that would encapsulate their desires. However, if that would be difficult for the Commission or staff, it can be tabled.

Mr. Boggs responded that he asks because, if a land swap versus waiver of setback are contemplated, he would prefer that those conditions not be written without appropriate consideration.

Ms. Rauch responded that it would also alter the review process, as well. If a development agreement is required, City Council must approve the Concept Plan.

Mr. Boggs stated that his preference is not to attempt to write conditions tonight, but give the applicant all the feedback needed and to table the case tonight. That would allow time for a conversation regarding whether this should involve a development agreement and ultimately an application to be decided by City Council.

Mr. Way stated that Engineering also needs time to identify the right-of-way needs, so we can know how much space remains with which to work.

Mr. Hendershot confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Supelak requested any remaining Commission comments to be shared.

Mr. Schneier echoed other Commissioners' comments regarding the public space. Although the amount of that space exceeds what is required, it has been placed in the least attractive part of the property with a large wall behind it. He would recommend that space be relocated in a more desirable portion of the plan and as close to SR161 as possible.

Mr. Fishman stated that when he reviewed the renderings, his impression was that the architecture has drifted from the Dublin look. Perhaps the restaurant tacked onto the side of the building could be integrated more into the façade. In regard to the parking lot, Dublin has seas of parking lots. Rather than incorporating clumps of trees, it might be possible to incorporate a tree-lined path from the back street to the front. He would also like to see the façade made more interesting and welcoming.

Ms. Fox stated that the renderings were interesting, but there are a couple of elements she would like clarified. While large amount of intersection between horizontal awnings against strong vertical elements of glass and entryways, she does not see that happening in the plan. The vertical element is apparent, but the horizontal elements are not strong. Perhaps those are not shown on a Concept Plan, but texture changes and open lattice spaces within the large canopies can soften the appearance. She would encourage inclusion of such elements.

Mr. Myers responded that such features typically are not shown with the Concept Plan. They are finishing materials.

Ms. Fox stated that, at this point, the plan shows primarily verticality, glass and solid mass and lacks an intersection with horizontal features.

Mr. Fishman stated that the overhang and porch elements appear thin. They do not look as though they would stand a test of time. The main horizontal line running through the front of the building appears to be approximately 8 inches thick. A three-foot thickness would give an impression of longevity. Even if the elements were hollow, they would provide a more substantial look. As he has already noted, the restaurant looks like an afterthought.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the 37-foot easement on the east side is a utility easement, or would encroachment be permitted.

Mr. Hendershot responded that it is a private utility easement. The developer will need to work with the utility company to learn the stipulations of the easement and if encroachment might be allowed. There was a similar condition on the other side of the property line with the previous case heard this evening.

Mr. Way requested clarification that the 37 feet is not an easement; it is the dimension from the proposed road to the parking lot.

Mr. Hendershot affirmatively. However, there is also a utility easement for the overhead electric line.

Mr. Way noted that the utility easement is not 37 feet wide.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there is more space, then, on that side of the parcel.

Mr. Hendershot displayed the site plan and clarified that the 37 feet encompasses the entirety of the 30-foot easement on the site. The additional 7 feet includes the space from the pavement to the property line.

Mr. Yoder stated that AEP recently had replaced the previous towers with monopoles. When that occurred, they too another 6-7 feet along that edge, so it might be part of the new AEP easement. When the case returns for review, they will be able to clarify that item.

Mr. Supelak stated that if the revised plan incorporates a different consideration on the back side of the site, he would be curious of any long-term expectations of greenspace and setbacks.

Mr. Way stated that he also does not see what public right-of-way would be reserved. There is no designation of a right-of-way line, only a proposed edge of curb. Along with the proposed clarification, those dimensions should be included.

Mr. Hendershot responded that Engineering would work with the applicant to ensure those are designated appropriately on the future submittal.

Mr. Supelak stated that the possibility of finding five additional feet to allocate somewhere around the building could be very beneficial. It presents options that could resolve the issue with the public space location. That five feet might also better activate the restaurant, as the patio would be able to wrap around the corner to the front. He agrees with the comments about the main entry of the larger tenant space. Most of the massing is appropriate, but the sequencing of the entry and/or the corner needs to be improved. He believes there is opportunity to utilize the mullions to activate the horizontal element. A mezzanine quality on the SR161 façade could be nice, unless there is a grade issue that could impact handicapped accessibility. If some space is gained, opportunities arise for a long open space with seating and planters in front of the glass façade. He agrees that the opportunity to view color inside the building also could add interest. Because this large mass will be prominent, lighting could soften it. He likes the material palette and the imagery is good. He anticipates the details that will be added in the next phase will alleviate the concerns expressed by Commissioner Fishman. He would be supportive of waiving the 5-yard setback and deploying that square footage elsewhere in a more meaningful way.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is discomfort with attempting to write conditions for approval without appropriate study beforehand.

Mr. Boggs reiterated that if there were to be a development agreement with respect to this property, the Concept Plan would fall under City Council's authority to approve. Engineering will have to identify the right-of-way space needed. He would recommend tabling the case tonight to allow the needed study to occur.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the applicant would agree with that direction.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded to table the Concept Plan.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded to table the request for combination of the review and approval of the Preliminary Development Plan and the Final Development Plan.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

Mr. Supelak stated that the next two cases concern the same property and would be heard together.



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 6, 2020 | 6:30 pm

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

**4. 4012 W. Dublin-Granville Road
20-119CP**

Concept Plan

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Proposal: | Construction of a two-story, ±11,000-square-foot, multi-tenant building for a restaurant and medical office on a 1.1-acre vacant site. |
| Location: | Northeast of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with David Road and zoned Bridge Street District Office. |
| Request: | Review and approval of a Concept Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. |
| Applicant: | Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners |
| Planning Contact: | Chase J. Ridge, AICP Candidate, Planner I |
| Contact Information: | 614.410.4656, cridge@dublin.oh.us |
| Case Information: | www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-119 |

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded, to approve the Concept Plan with six conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with Planning and Engineering Staff on appropriate stormwater management facilities as to ensure compliance with Code;
- 2) That the applicant continue coordinating with Staff to provide a street wall with landscaping along David Road, as required for off-street parking within 20 feet of the right-of-way;
- 3) That the applicant continue to work with Staff on addressing the parking shortage on the site;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to ensure the intent of the Bridge Street District Code is met with regards to minimum building height requirements;
- 5) That the applicant continue to work with Planning Staff to finalize the details of the open space to meet the requirements of the Bridge Street District Code; and
- 6) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to finalize the building type analysis prior to the submission for the Preliminary Development Plan.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Concept Plan was approved.



**4. 4012 W. Dublin-Granville Road
20-119CP**

Concept Plan

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|------------------|-----|
| Jane Fox | Yes |
| Warren Fishman | Yes |
| Kristina Kennedy | Yes |
| Mark Supelak | Yes |
| Rebecca Call | Yes |
| Leo Grimes | Yes |
| Lance Schneier | Yes |

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Claudia D. Husak

B3FD32A1AD0C439

Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner
Current Planning Manager for
Chase J. Ridge, AICP Candidate, Planner I



4. 4012 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 20-119CP, Concept Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for approval of the construction of a two-story, ±11,000-square-foot, multi-tenant building for a restaurant and medical office on a 1.1-acre vacant site. The site is northeast of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road and David Road and zoned BSD – Bridge Street District Office.

Case Presentation

Site

Ms. Husak stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Concept Plan for a new, approximately 11,000 square-foot, multi-tenant building located at the northeast corner of the intersection of David Road and W. Dublin-Granville Road. This site is located opposite the Primrose School site discussed in the previous case. The site also has frontage on Banker Drive on the north side and David Road on the west. The site consists of two parcels. The eastern parcel has a heavily wooded tree stand. The western parcel is vacant of vegetation. There is an AEP easement along the eastern property line and a gas easement along the southern property line. The Bridge Street Code provides a hierarchy of requirements for establishing a gridded street network, and the proposed site has two of the street types in the Street Network Map: a Corridor Connector Street (W. Dublin-Granville Road) and two Neighborhood Streets (David Road and Banker Drive).

Proposal

The proposal is for a commercial building, a Loft Building Type, which is a permitted Building Type in the BSD-Office zoning district. As a multi-tenant building, it will house medical office space and a restaurant. The medical office use is a permitted use in the Bridge Street District, Office District. The proposed restaurant use is permitted, but is limited in size to 5,000 square feet of the gross floor area, or 20 percent of the gross floor area of the ground floor of the principal structure, whichever is smaller, unless otherwise permitted as a conditional use. In this case, the restaurant use requires review and approval of a Conditional Use application due to its proposed size in comparison with the rest of the building. There are no additional use-specific standards for a medical office use in the Bridge Street District, Office District. The proposal meets setback requirements, however, it provides only 53 of the 58 required parking spaces. There is opportunity to add additional parking spaces in the natural drainage area, as noted on the Site Plan, if needed. The applicant is proposing open space at the southwest corner of the building, closest to the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with David Road. Those details will be finalized in the Preliminary Development Plan. Per Code, buildings are required to meet the minimum number of stories for the associated Building Type. The minimum number of stories required for Loft buildings is two. The applicant is proposing a primarily single-story building, with a portion of the building consisting of a two-story tower element, as well as a second story rooftop patio. While the majority of the building is proposed at one story, the single-story portion consists of floor heights significantly taller than is typical, giving the shorter portion the appearance of a 1.5-2 story building. If the two stories cannot be occupied, a waiver will be required. The Penzone Building, also within the BSD, is also a building that was required to be two stories, but received a waiver for a tall one-story, which permitted them to create a mezzanine area. The applicant has provided character images for the intended architecture of the building. The images consist of a variety of materials including wood, stone, masonry and metal paneling. The buildings are contemporary in design, utilizing significant glazing across the facades. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with six conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, OH, stated that they already have a tenant for the 7,000-square-foot medical office space and are working with them. For purposes of calculating the parking spaces, the additional 4,000 square feet is tentatively identified as Restaurant. The prospective medical office tenant has indicated a desire for the covered rooftop patio as event space, and particularly on the David Road corner to engage with the open space. A rooftop patio requires an elevator and stairs, which is the purpose of the two-story mass on the corner. From there, the

roof planes are stepped back toward the east. With the proposed layout, they will be close to meeting the parking requirements. They would not have been able to do so with a two-story building, as required in the District. They have attempted to meet the intent of the Code with the elevated story and parapet heights. Due to the existing site constraints, including the electrical easement to the east, a stormwater easement to the west, and a gas easement to the south, the building site is restricted.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak inquired if the parking space calculation is inclusive of the Restaurant Use.
Ms. Husak responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox stated that in the Bridge Street District, there is the flexibility to approve changes to achieve the best architectural design. Even though a two-story building is required in the District, the advantages here in massing, design, use, unique architecture and vitality are reasons for permitting a Waiver. In the Bridge Street District (BSD), we are looking primarily for an objective.

Ms. Husak responded that is the reason the Waiver provision was included in the BSD Code, subject to review and approval by the Commission, contingent upon meeting the criteria. The AC Marriott is an example of a successful, innovative project, and it received the greatest number of waivers that have been granted. Ms. Fox stated that this Concept Plan provides the creativity desired, and she is hopeful that the Preliminary Development Plan further develops the images provided.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the rooftop patio would be limited to the Medical Office tenant, not the Restaurant use.

Mr. Hunter responded that it is a higher-end Medical Office tenant that will have a retail use. They have a specific idea in mind for the building architecture and design. The patio is intended to be an event space for that tenant.

Commission Discussion

Commission members expressed approval of the proposed design and concept.

Ms. Fox requested clarification of the location of the proposed restaurant space.

Mr. Hunter responded that it is the space to the east of the two-story mass and middle section, which are part of the Medical Office Use. Currently, that space is depicted only as a box structure; as the project develops, that space will have more design focus, including whether it will include outdoor dining. AEP is currently working in that easement, so the easement size is increasing slightly on this site. At this point, he is unsure if the existing vegetation under the lines will be removed. The location of any potential outdoor dining component would be determined, based upon what is occurring with the easement.

Ms. Fox inquired if the one-story mass could shift to the north and give them more street frontage. Doing so would give them better use of the open space. She would be in favor of granting a setback waiver for that purpose. They would be able to have greater energy there on the street front with some outdoor dining, for instance. She would encourage repeating the transparency feature of this building in the one-story section, as well. With the development occurring, there will be greater energy along Banker Drive. Is it possible to include a water feature, or something imaginative in the stormwater easement on that corner?

Mr. Hunter responded that the project has not yet been designed, but the intent is to do something substantial enough that it can be experienced from the rooftop. It could be more lush or taller plantings, including trees, or a water feature. This early in the process, he prefers not to commit to those items in order to permit the flexibility needed in the design phase.

Ms. Fox stated that we are trying to look holistically at the public realm experience with these projects. She, again, would encourage him to consider ways to duplicate the energy that is present on the west corner, on the east corner frontage. They also should attempt to enhance the public realm experience on the David Road and Banker Drive corner.

Mr. Hunter requested clarification of her suggestion. Is she suggesting that the 4,000-square-foot, one-story restaurant be shifted north, away from SR161 sufficiently to create some outdoor space between it and the road?

Ms. Fox responded affirmatively.

Mr. Hunter responded that if the stormwater facility is run underground, that would be possible. The parking lot will be 120 feet with two bays. If the structure is shifted to the north, they will have more flexibility.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission is looking for the "WOW" factor. We would like the next applicant to be able to use this building as an inspiration for their project. The Commission likes the concept and is anticipating the next phase.

Mr. Fishman stated that he has no issue with the one story and the roof step-downs. He agrees with the suggestion to push the building back. At this point, the details cannot be discussed, but he would be in favor of waivers to achieve the type of creativity that has been proposed.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Discussion occurred regarding the street wall and landscaping requirements along David Road.

Ms. Husak noted that, due to its location, the building is required to have more frontage on the David Road side. One way to do so is with a street wall.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Concept Plan with the following six conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with Planning and Engineering staff on appropriate stormwater management facilities to ensure compliance with Code;
- 2) That the applicant coordinate with staff and investigate ways to address the street wall requirement along David Road;
- 3) That the applicant continue to work with staff on addressing the parking shortage on the site;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure the intent of the Bridge Street District Code is met with regard to minimum building height requirements;
- 5) That the applicant continue to work with staff to finalize the details of the open space to meet the requirements of the Bridge Street District Code; and
- 6) That the applicant continue to work with staff to finalize the building type analysis prior to the submission of the Preliminary Development Plan.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

~~6. Chase Bank, 6515 Sawmill Road, 20-106PDP/FDP/CU/WR, Preliminary & Final Development Plans/Conditional Use/Waivers~~

~~7. Chase Bank, 6515 Sawmill Road, 20-107MSP, Master Sign Plan~~

~~Ms. Call stated that there are two cases on tonight's agenda involving the construction of a ±4,100-square-foot, one-story bank with a drive-thru ATM on a 0.85-acre site. The first application is a request for review and approval of Preliminary and Final Development Plans with a Parking Plan, a Conditional Use, and two Waivers. The second application is for a Master Sign Plan that includes three wall signs and a window sign. The site is northwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road with Banker Drive and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood. Both cases will be heard together.~~