

# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 17, 2022

### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:50 p.m. (meeting started late due to technical difficulties) and welcomed everyone to the March 17, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Ms. Call stated that tonight's meeting is not streaming at the City's website due to the technical issue. Public comments on the cases are welcome from meeting attendees.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Kim Way, Lance Schneier, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman  
Commission members absent: Leo Grimes (excused)  
Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nicole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell, Taylor Mullinax, Michael Hendershot, Tina Wawzkiewicz, Tammy Noble

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the February 17, 2022 meeting minutes.

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

[Motion approved 5-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. She stated that there is one case eligible for the Consent Agenda - Case 3, Dublin Jerome High School at 8300 Hyland-Croy Road, 22-005AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan. Because a Commissioner has requested the case be moved to the regular agenda for discussion, it will be included in the regular agenda.

Ms. Call swore in individuals present who planned to testify on the cases.

### CASES

#### 3. Dublin Jerome High School at 8300 Hyland-Croy Road, 22-005AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

A request for construction of a ±58,600-square-foot building addition, renovations to a ±11,500-square-foot of existing space, and associated site improvements. The 88.17-acre parcel is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Dublin Jerome High School and is located northeast of the roundabout of Hyland-Croy Road and Brand Road.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Noble inquired if the Commission would like a full presentation, or if they preferred to proceed directly to questions.

Mr. Way indicated that he had requested the case be moved to the regular agenda, because he has one question.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Way stated that in reading the narrative from Perkins and Will regarding the proposed building addition, he noticed that the white elements on the existing building were not being carried through on the new addition. In viewing the renderings, he observed that the continuity was lost. Without any continuity, the building addition appears heavier. There are no additional colors to break up the massing. Because an addition is a continuance of what exists, it would seem logical to carry the rhythm of color and materials into the new addition.

Ms. Noble stated that there was significant discussion with the applicant about continuing certain elements into the addition. Their intention is to make the addition unique in character.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Steven Turkes, Perkins and Will, 410 Michigan Avenue, Suite 1600, Chicago Illinois, stated that their intent was to respect the form of the existing building but allow the addition to have its own character. The addition has the same brick and a similar form as the existing building, but the first bay of the new building reflects a darker element. It is a tighter composition, with downspouts recessed into the brick, and a more modern aesthetic.

Mr. Way stated that he understands the desire not to mimic the current building; however, the proposed addition appears to be a lesser building. The existing elements lighten and provide more detail to the current building. The addition is so plain that it almost appears as though there was insufficient money to add the same elements. Perhaps it is not necessary to continue all the elements, but include some element that makes the new building appear equal. The horizontal sills are probably the strongest element. He likes the change in brick as a transitional element between the older building and the new addition. It sets the new addition apart, but the expectation is that it should be better or different.

Mr. Turkes responded that cost is not an issue; it was a matter of preference. The white bands are a split-face CMU element.

Mr. Supelak stated that he also appreciates the massing break with the darker inset, but he agrees the proposed addition so closely matches that it now appears to have fallen short of matching.

Ms. Call agreed; the two sections are so similar that the expectation is that they should match. She also prefers brick over CMU, but the latter element already exists. She believes the applicant has indicated they would consider making a change. Ms. Call requested Commission consensus on adding a condition that the applicant work with staff to provide complementary materials in the new addition. Commission members expressed no objection.

Mr. Turkes inquired if the issue is more about color or about the material.

Ms. Call responded the Commission is not requiring that the white element be continued. Essentially, if the red brick is continued, the white element should be added; if the red brick does not remain, adding the white element would not be necessary. It is not necessarily one or the other; however, staff is aware of this discussion and is able to provide the appropriate direction.

Ms. Martin stated that more specific direction is needed.

Mr. Way stated that he would like to see the use of the lighter colored material in the existing building reflected in the addition to provide horizontal continuity.

Ms. Call stated that it would be preferable if it were not the existing CMU material.

Mr. Way responded that his concern is more about color than material, but he would prefer a higher quality material, as well.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed condition.

Mr. Turkes responded that he had no objection. However, they had already added some horizontal banding or relief in the brick façade, but he understands the primary issue is color. They could consider integrating a higher quality, pre-cast material in the façade, such as the sills.

Mr. Boggs stated that a condition has been added that captures the Commission's direction.

### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments on the case.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with four (4) conditions:

- 1) The applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the City of Dublin Code of Ordinances;
- 2) The applicant provide two additional parking spaces to meet the minimum parking requirements of the development text; and
- 3) The applicant continue to work with the City of Dublin to finalize lighting fixtures for the proposed additions.
- 4) The applicant work with staff to continue a lighter color material, complementary to the detail on the existing building, to the proposed addition.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

### **TABLED CASES**

Ms. Call stated that the following two cases would be heard together.

#### **1. Bridge Park, Block F – The Bailey at 4351 Mooney Street, 21-193CU, Conditional Use**

A request for construction of a podium parking structure in association with the development of a 1.77-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is northwest of the intersection of Dale Drive with Banker Drive.

#### **2. Bridge Park, Block F – The Bailey at 4351 Mooney Street, 21-182PDP/FDP, Preliminary and Final Development Plans**

A request for construction of a six-story, podium apartment building consisting of 87 units and associated site improvements. The 1.77-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood and is located northwest of the intersection of Dale Drive with Banker Drive.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review of combined applications for both a Preliminary and a Final Development Plan with a Conditional Use. This is the proposed construction of a second building

within Bridge Park, Block F. Bridge Park is located immediately to the east of Riverside Crossing Park and north of the roundabout with SR161. This specific site is 1.77 acres. The site is undeveloped and currently contains a portion of Banker Drive. The site is surrounded by Springhill Suites to the north, the COTA Park and Ride to the east, Acura of Columbus to the south, and the Mooney parking garage in Block B to the west. Typically, the Bridge Street District development process occurs in three steps, but the second and third steps have been combined with this application, as there are no new public or private streets or additional lots of development being proposed. This application was originally reviewed by the Commission on January 6, 2022 and tabled. The applicant has addressed the Commission's previous concerns and made revisions.

#### Proposal

The proposal is for a 6-story, podium apartment building. The building will contain 87, age-restricted units; 87 structured parking spaces, and 2,300 square feet of office. The application also includes public open spaces and a private amenity deck. In January, the Commission discussed opportunities to minimize building encroachments along principal frontage streets as well as opportunities to increase the primary materials, enhance pedestrian circulation, and elevate both architectural and landscape design.

#### Updates

The applicant has made the following updates to their proposal:

- Reduced encroachment outside of the Required Building Zones (RBZ) along Dale Drive by narrowing the building footprint.
- Maintained the minimum 5-foot landscape buffer required between the building facade and the public rights-of-way.
- Aligned Building B4/B5 (Parking Structure) and Building F2 (Podium) entrances along Mooney Street.
- Increased amount of brick cladding in lieu of a wood-look and white metal panel. Metal panel is retained in select locations as an accent material.
- Retained Winder Drive mid-block pedestrian connection between the entrance of the Building F1 and the proposed Pocket Park in front of the main entrance of Building F2.

The first application is for a Conditional Use for a podium parking structure. A waiver was approved with the Concept Plan to permit a taller podium apartment building than permitted by Code. The Commission is asked to determine if by use of architecture, landscape design and site design, the applicant has mitigated all the potential impacts of a podium parking structure at grade. The applicant has revised the plans to enhance the opportunities for circulation. The primary vehicular access and service access continues to occur from Mooney Street. Visitor access occurs via an auto court on Winder Drive. Additional pedestrian circulation has also been provided. Approximately .4 acres of open space is provided north and south of the building, with the most substantial area located to the southeast. Additionally, a private amenity deck augments and activates the public open space.

Approval of a revision to a previously approved parking plan is also requested. A parking plan was approved for the Springhill Suites development in 2019. No additional spaces are requested within Block B that were not approved; however, some of those spaces are not needed by the hotel. For this project, there will be a total of 87 structured parking spaces, 12 on-street spaces and 142 parking spaces located in Block B that were previously approved.

Ms. Martin reviewed the building materials on the elevations. The most significant revisions occur on the north elevation along Winder Drive. Some revisions were made to be consistent with Code requirements. [renderings shown].

Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable review criteria and recommends approval of the Conditional Use, the revised Parking Plan, 15 Waivers, 1 Administrative Departure, and a Preliminary and Final Development Plan with 10 conditions.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Schneier requested clarity regarding the posts and the undersides of the balconies. Is it staff's recommendation that the posts be eliminated?

Ms. Martin responded that staff is not requesting that they be eliminated but that the applicant investigate that possibility prior to permitting, as it would be visually preferable. The undersides of the balconies would be clad and finished in some manner.

Mr. Schneier stated that wood planks were indicated as a possible material for the underside. Would it be possible to look up and into the upper tenant's balcony?

Mr. Supelak stated that the planks would not be used as a deck material, but as a finishing product – a sealing product.

Mr. Schneier inquired about the reference to "either wood plank...or gypsum batten strips."

Ms. Call responded that the applicant could address that question with his presentation.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Joe Pax, Architect, M+A Architects, 775 Yard Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43212 stated that they have made many revisions since the January 6 meeting. At that meeting, the Commission expressed support for some of the proposed waivers, but since then, the need for additional waivers has been identified. He presented an overview of the key factors that have necessitated their waiver requests. One of the primary adjustments made with this re-submission is the reduction in building area and size. That reduction enabled them to pull the building two feet further away from Dale Drive, reducing the amount of encroachment. There now is a 6-foot setback from the sidewalk to the building, which permits more landscaping. He reviewed the increased use of primary materials on the elevations (presented images). Following the previous review, a parking realignment was requested; therefore, the interior parking layout has been reconfigured to allow the realignment. The Commission also requested elements to provide more distinction to the building facades [reviewed elements, including brick detailing, which have been incorporated to achieve increased distinction]. The landscape buffer has been enhanced, and the northeast corner of the building at Dale and Winder Drives has been activated. In addition to the light poles, windows have been added to the building at that corner. A flex space in the building has been added that flanks the lobby and engages the public from the plaza. The Commission requested that attention be given to the intersection of Dale and Banker Drives. Lighting, including a gabion wall with lighting elements, landscaping and bench seating have been included as entry elements into this side of Bridge Park. There are pedestal components, perhaps for future public art. The brick wraps around into the balconies. The intermediate posts previously on the balconies have been removed, resulting in cleaner lines and less obstruction of the view. Poles remain only at the corners, as structural columns. Creative brick work will enhance the courtyard. In regard to Mr. Schneier's earlier inquiry, some of the balconies have faux wood metal siding, the same material used on the façade; other balconies will have a cement board siding with batten strips within. Some may be white; others may have a wood appearance, but the undersides of the balconies will be finished.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Fishman inquired if full brick, not slim brick, would be used.

Mr. Pax responded that a combination would be used. Up to 20 feet above grade, full brick is used on all sides of the building. Above the transition strip and stone cap, thin brick is used. There are consistent brick returns, so the windows will be recessed three inches from the face of the brick.

Ms. Call stated that that there is one elevation with a very tall brick strip. There does not appear to be a transition element on that façade, so will there be a transition from full to thin brick?

Mr. Pax responded that full brick would be used full height.

Ms. Call inquired if in the adjacent recessed area, where there is a façade division, there would be a transition from full to thin brick.

Mr. Pax responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way stated that his primary concern is the setback area along Dale Drive. He very much appreciates the many revisions that have been made, but remains concerned about there being sufficient space to soften the edge along Dale Drive. The 5-foot RBZ on Mooney Street currently includes foundation landscaping, which he believes achieves little. All other buildings along Mooney Street have no foundation plantings. Although the setback is a requirement for this building, pushing the building 5 feet toward Mooney Street would permit more landscaping to be included along Dale Drive. Mooney Street serves primarily as an access to parking. The minimal amount of landscaping along Mooney Street in Blocks C and D is not thriving.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, OH stated there is foundation planting in Blocks C and D. Although D block was specifically designed to permit the foundation planting, that element was added on C Block in late 2021, which was too late. When plants are added at the right time, they will be far superior to what exists there. What is proposed here is more similar to what was done in D Block, which is more successful. Although the area is pinched here, there is far more green area to the north and south along Dale Drive. He believes there is a good balance.

Mr. Pax stated that there is actually 7 feet of depth in the landscape bed on Mooney Street, which gives more opportunity for viable landscaping. They recognize the tug and pull between the Mooney and Dale Drive sides of the building, but they would prefer to keep the 2 feet on the Mooney Street to enable viable landscaping.

Mr. Way responded that he is not supportive of placing the additional two feet on the Mooney Street side. The ground level of the building on that side has been articulated and detailed well, so there will be a nice urban edge there without any plant material. He would ask fellow Commissioners to consider whether having the additional area along Dale Drive or Mooney Street would be more valuable. The latter is not a pedestrian street. The proposed landscaping along Dale Drive could be much more rigorous. Presently, it is very low and does nothing to screen the parking edge. Currently, there are areas of blank wall; including taller plant materials could add variety to that edge. There was a bike rack in the small park at the corner of Dale and Banker Drives, which appears to have been eliminated. He believes having a bike rack there would be good. Is there a cap on the wall screening the trash area?

Mr. Pax responded that there is a cap on the wall, which screens the electric transformer on the northwest corner. It will be a cast concrete cap, which will match the trim on the transition element at the second floor.

Mr. Way stated that the stair tower at the end of the two wings is full brick. It would be good to include coursing through that area to break up the mass.

Mr. Supelak stated that faux wood can work, but sometimes the fact that it is faux can appear jarring. Many large sections will be used here. Is there confidence that from a distance the visual expression of this product will be like wood?

Mr. Pax stated that there is woodgrain in the product; however, the element will be monolithic and uniform. There are some variations in color within the product, but the variations will not be significant.

Mr. Supelak stated that the park on the south side has very few entry points. He has advocated for gaining another access point on the west end in addition to that on the east. Was that considered?

Mr. Pax responded that it was. The lower, step-down terrace is 60 feet wide. The brick element on the pavilion flanks the north side of that terrace. They studied the option of including steps; however, there is a 7-8 foot grade differential there. The amount of steps required seemed grandiose to provide limited access to a 60-ft. wide terrace, when ADA handicapped accessibility is provided on the east end, as well as the main approach to the terrace from the Dale and Banker Drive intersection. In their evaluation, the number of steps required with the 8-foot grade change over-powered the area and consumed too much of the landscaping. They tried different configurations, but they all appeared forced, not attractive. The slope is slighter on the east side.

Mr. Supelak stated that some of the other drawings do not express an 8-foot grade change. From the corner to the east, there is a four feet grade change for an 8-foot long stair. It is still 50 feet from the other end of the plaza.

Mr. Pax responded that with that configuration, is the suggestion that the stairway would be descending to the east?

Mr. Supelak responded affirmatively. He is not suggesting that it be extended parallel to the hill.

Mr. Pax responded that it would seem that if the intent was to engage Mooney Street, that the stair would descend to the west. They are already engaging the Dale Drive descent for pedestrians. The distance and separation from the stair landing to the at-grade entry into the plaza would not seem logical.

Mr. Supelak stated that although the grade makes it difficult, it would still provide an additional access point into the plaza, and access and proximity matter to people. Because the distance would be greater than 50 feet to the other access points, having a nearer access would be preferable to people when walking upgrade. The gymnastics to provide it are less of a problem than the additional 50-foot distance to reach the other access.

Ms. Pax stated that adding it would impact the landscaping and greenspace that could be provided, which also was a concern expressed by the Commission. Landscaping cascading down the retaining and sloped terrace walls would add an attractive green element.

Mr. Schneier inquired about the ceiling height of the parking structure. What is the ceiling height in existing parking structures?

Mr. Pax responded that he is unsure what it is in existing structures, but the proposed height for the Bailey parking garage is 12 ft. 6 inches. There will be a 10-foot clearance on the underside.

Mr. Hunter stated that he believes the height is either 12 ft. 8 inches or 13 feet on the ground floor of existing structures; on upper levels, it is 10 feet.

Mr. Schneier stated that a 12-foot height is required, but there is a waiver request to make the ceiling height 9.67 feet.

Mr. Pax responded that there is a drop ceiling within the garage for a condition space under inhabitable areas. There are 9-foot drop-in ceilings in the garage.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the garage ceiling height is 12 feet throughout Bridge Park, why do they need to be only 9.67 feet with the Bailey?

Mr. Pax responded that the drop ceiling areas, which make the height 9.67 feet, are beneath the dwelling units. Within the condition space, there are heaters and insulation to protect the unit floors above.

Mr. Hunter stated that it is consistent with the parking garage ceiling heights throughout Bridge Park, with the exception of the ground floors, which were made taller so they could be converted to retail in the future.

Mr. Schneier stated that the Code requires 12 feet. Have we granted waivers throughout Bridge Park, making it 9.67 feet elsewhere? If not, why is a waiver requested here? Does this impact 30 feet or so of the ground level, or is it all of the ground level and every level, as well?

Mr. Pax responded that the waiver for the 9.67 height is to allow for the ventilation and conditioning for the occupied space above. In the center of the garage, the height will be 10 ft.6 inches.

Mr. Hunter stated that the drop ceiling is necessary. If they were to raise the floor up to provide that clearance, it would add a minimum of 3 feet to the first floor height. The amenity deck and the interaction of the building with the surrounding grades would need to be higher, as well. It is important that the garage work without negatively impacting the other elevations.

Mr. Schneier inquired staff's perspective.

Ms. Martin stated that this is actually the first podium building within the Bridge Street District to be reviewed by the Commission. This is a unique building type. Typically, when the Commission has reviewed parking structures, they are the parking structure building type. The applicant is attempting to balance the podium and architecture with the functionality. From staff's perspective, the fact that this is a private garage that will be accessed only by tenants and is not open to the public and any vehicle, makes it justifiable.

Mr. Fishman inquired what is the warranty on the faux wood.

Mr. Pax responded that there is a 10-year finish warranty. It is a manufactured product, heavy gauge metal, not susceptible to warping and distortion. The product is dimensionally stable, which prolongs the life of the product and finish.

Mr. Fishman stated that his concern is durability beyond 10 years. In other cities that built projects 10-15 years ago using these types of materials, the appearance of the materials has deteriorated. Presently, Bridge Park has an attractive sparkle, but if the structures begin to reflect aging, it will be an issue. He inquired if the thin brick is the same material as the full brick, or if it would be a full brick, split in half?

Mr. Pax responded that it is the same clay masonry material, manufactured in the same manner, but cut differently during the process

Mr. Fishman inquired how the product is adhered to the building.

Mr. Pax responded that it is adhered by mortar to the hard surface. The thin brick would have all same joints as a full brick application to allow movement. The intent is that the difference between the full and thin brick cannot be distinguished.

Mr. Supelak responded that typically, the difference can be seen at the corners and at windows. The applicant has assured us that this product is the same as full brick at those points. How can the applicant be held to that, however, when it is manifested in the construction drawings.

Ms. Martin responded that in the field, there are inspections throughout the process.

Mr. Supelak stated that he has no objection to the thin brick, because the applicant has provided these assurances; however, is a condition needed that would provide a guarantee?

[Discussion of thin brick continued.]

Ms. Martin stated that the Final Development Plan documents are forwarded to Building Standards. The Zoning Permit review would confirm that the final construction drawings reflect these details. Once construction begins, there are construction check-in points.



Mr. Fishman stated that may address Mr. Supelak's concern about the construction, but his concern is how the thin brick and faux wood will age. This has been an issue in other communities that have used these products.

Mr. Hunter stated that a large amount of thin brick has been used in Bridge Park and on several residential buildings. The buildings with which they are experiencing the most cracking are the full-depth brick structures. The steel in a building does not allow movement. Thin brick allows movement, so it is a better product for wood-frame construction.

Mr. Pax stated that in the early years, thin bricks were produced by cutting a full brick with a saw, which placed incredible stress on the bricks. Because thin bricks are being used more widely today due to the fact that they work better with a wood-frame construction, they are now manufactured in a kiln.

### **Public Comment**

No public comments were received.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Fishman stated that he has already shared his concerns regarding the materials. He has traveled extensively and observed good and bad construction results. Using high-quality products produce buildings with greater longevity.

Mr. Supelak stated that the presentation was well organized. The gabion wall is a very nice feature, and he appreciates the efforts being taken to activate it. Gabion walls comprised of smoother stones in lieu of rough-cut stones have a more finished look, less industrial. He would encourage them to use materials that produce a more finished look. He is concerned about the faux wood. He understands the intent is a monolithic look, but there is the potential of the faux wood to look jarring when seen at scale. He is not requesting a mock-up, but he would advocate for a sufficient amount of this material to be provided for review in order to provide assurance to the Commission. On the south façade, some of the faux wood was replaced with brick; in the renderings, that facade appears bland. There is a great opportunity here to add elements to address that, such as the extension of a brick course or detailing across it. The façade is not yet finished. He would advocate, perhaps, for taking the brick detailing immediately under the projected header course and tiling it up the façade. In looking at lighting, perhaps there could be a vertical inlay with strips of lights. There is a great opportunity to activate this elevation. He continues to advocate for access on the south side of the plaza. If a space feels confined and has a private-public quality, people will not venture there as comfortably as if the access is provided. There is merit in providing the access point on the south side. The wood product is also used on the underside of the canopy. Perhaps it should be a different product there, such as Prodima, which has more of a touch and feel of wood. In regard to the façade separation, he applauds the general concept, but he believes it is lackluster. It could be made a stronger element. He could be supportive of adding the additional greenspace on the Dale Drive side of the building rather the Mooney Street side. It would provide opportunity to add vertical landscaping on that side.

Mr. Way stated that the applicant is requesting a waiver of the RBZ on Dale Drive. However, he believes it will be difficult to provide thriving landscape on the Mooney Street side; a greater impact could be achieved With more greenspace along Dale Drive. He would prefer to grant a waiver of the RBZ on the Mooney Street side to provide more space for robust landscaping along Dale Drive. He encourages them to restore the bike rack in the plan. Additionally, he is not supportive of the substitution of some plant materials with Gingkoes and Kentucky Coffee Trees. Gingkoes are slow growing and not ideal in urban settings; Kentucky Coffee trees look unsightly in the winter.

Mr. Schneier commended the applicant on the revisions made, and most of his questions have been answered to his satisfaction. He likes the concept of the gabion wall, but care should be taken to ensure it is done right so it can produce the desired results. Due to the significant width and height of the facades, he agrees that additional elements/treatments are needed.

Ms. Call stated that much of the concern expressed is because there is no “play” with this site. Shifting the building on either side would require a waiver. As a previous Commissioner has said, we are asking the site to do too much. She agrees with Mr. Supelak’s comments about the benefits of adding another access to the terrace. She agrees with the suggestions regarding landscaping. She agrees with the need to activate the stair towers wall, which is very monolithic. She likes the gabion wall. The light in the middle looks attractive, but the proposed stone has an industrial look.

Mr. Way stated that he believes the gabion wall looks attractive. The applicant is putting a limestone cap on it, which is not reflected in the graphic but is mentioned in the narrative. That should provide more sophistication. In regard to the suggestion for an additional access, from an ADA perspective, if a better access is provided to others than to them, it creates an equity issue. As currently proposed, the access is fair to everyone.

Ms. Call responded that she appreciates the equitable approach. However, from a potential future disaster perspective, if there is only one access point, everyone would be competing for the same exit. Two access points would be preferable. Additionally, different levels of mobility can cross via different structures, i.e. curbcuts versus stairs.

Mr. Way stated that he is not opposed to stairs. Currently, there are stairs to the north, so there are already two access points – one that is ADA and one that is not.

Ms. Call requested Commissioners’ views on the addition of the stairs.

Mr. Supelak responded that he would be supportive of adding a condition requiring it.

Ms. Call noted that there were not four members expressing support for adding that condition.

Ms. Call inquired Commissioners’ views on the gabion wall. The clarification that a limestone cap will be added mitigates some of her concern about a finished look.

Mr. Supelak stated that the cap would help with a finished look. Perhaps the applicant could work with staff to finalize details and specifications for the gabion wall.

The Commission discussed the proposed conditions.

Mr. Boggs reminded the Commission that a majority of the quorum present, not 4 votes, is needed to for passage of an item.

Commissioners discussed waiver of the RBZ on either the north or south sides of the building for landscaping purposes.

Ms. Martin stated that it is important to keep in mind that this is a podium apartment building, which is the reason there are additional landscape requirements not required for other buildings. The intent of the landscaping on Mooney Street, which is more than what is seen elsewhere, is to mitigate with the Conditional Use the function of the podium. That is the reason for the Code requirement.

Mr. Schneier stated that he has no objection to the building location as proposed.

Ms. Call stated that she concurred. She would prefer that to shifting the building. This is a different building type than seen elsewhere in Bridge Park. Having a little landscaping on each side would be preferable to having none on one side.

Mr. Way stated that he would prefer not to attempt a landscape bed on the Mooney Street side, as in his opinion, it would not thrive. He would prefer to provide the space on the more open side of the building, where it would thrive.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would agree that people will be seeing the front of this building, so that is where the landscaping should be. He does not believe it would be noticed on the Mooney Street side.

Mr. Supelak stated that he would also be supportive of transferring that space to the Dale Drive side.

Discussion of the conditions continued.

Ms. Call invited the applicant to comment regarding the proposed conditions.

Mr. Hunter stated that because this is podium building, this building is further away from the streets than any other building in Bridge Park. If the building is moved closer to Mooney, and the Dale Drive side has more robust landscaping, this site will feel less urban than everything else in Bridge Park. The Dale Drive experience will feel vastly different. This site is less dense than everything else developed in Bridge Park to date, but that is because a podium building has different RBZs than other buildings. From a financial standpoint, this has been a difficult building. Attempting to shrink the building would likely sink the building. As proposed, the site feels right with everything else done in Bridge Park.

Mr. Pax stated that the driver of the building width and the east/west access is the need to provide 87 9-foot wide parking spaces within the podium garage.

Ms. Call inquired if the 87 parking spaces were required by Code, Commission request, or applicant preference.

Mr. Pax responded that the Code requires one parking space per unit.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Conditional Use.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the following 15 Waivers:

1. §153.062(O)(12)(a)(3) — Parking Location and Loading  
Requirement: Loading areas are required to be located on side or rear elevations.  
Request: To permit a loading facility location on Mooney Street, a front elevation.
2. §153.065(B)(5)(b) — Site Development Standards – Stacking Spaces  
Requirement: Two vehicle lengths of 20 feet be provided between the street and the garage entry gate.  
Request: To permit a stacking area 13 feet in length.
3. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(3) — Principal Entrance Location  
Requirement: Principal entrances must be located on a primary street façade.  
Request: To permit a principal entrance on a non-primary, street façade.
4. §153.062(O)(12)(a)(1) — Building Siting  
Requirement: A Required Build Zone of 5-20 feet.  
Request: To waive the RBZ requirement along Mooney Street.
5. §153.062(O)(12)(a)(1) — Building Siting  
Requirement: Permitted lot coverage not to exceed 70% impervious with an additional 20% semi-pervious.  
Request: To permit 81% pervious lot coverage and no additional semi-pervious coverage.
6. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(3) — Building Entrances  
Requirement: 1 entrance per 75 feet of façade width.  
Request: To permit a reduction in the required number of entrances for each elevation.
7. §153.062(E)(1) — Façade Materials

Requirement: A minimum of 80% of each façade visible from a street or adjacent property, exclusive of windows and doors, shall be constructed of permitted primary materials.

Request: To permit a reduction in the percentage of primary materials on each façade.

8. §153.062(O)(12)(d)(5) — Façade Materials—Exposed Podium

Requirement: Masonry shall be used as the primary building material for ground story or exposed basement facades.

Request: To permit a reduced amount of primary materials on the exposed basement podium of the building. Whereas a minimum of  $\geq 50\%$  masonry is incorporated in all exposed podium facades above grade. The requirement for 80% primary materials overall in these locations is not met on the east, west or north elevations.

9. §153.062(E)(2) — Façade Material Transitions

Requirement: When more than one façade material is proposed vertically, the 'heavier' material shall be incorporated below the "lighter" material.

Request: To permit a deviation from this requirement based on the architectural style proposed that is highlighted by an overall vertical orientation of the exterior materials.

10. §153.065(B)(c)(3) — Parking Structure Design - Internal Circulation

Requirement: Clear ceiling height of 12 feet where a parking structure has street frontage.

Request: To permit a clear ceiling height of 9.67 feet.

11. §153.064(G)(1) — General Open Space Requirements - Proportion

Requirement: Open space types shall be sized at a ratio of not more than 3:1, length to width.

Request: To permit a ratio of 5.68:1 for the southernmost and largest open space, and a ratio of 3.16:1 for the northwest pocket plaza.

12. §153.064(G)(A) — General Open Space Requirements – Ground Plane Materials

Requirement: Pocket parks consist of 30% impervious surface maximum, plus an additional 10% semi-pervious surface.

Request: To permit up to 34% of the southern pocket park to consist of impervious surfaces.

13. §153.064(G)(A) — General Open Space Requirements - Ground Plane Materials

Requirement: Pocket plazas consist of a minimum of 40-percent impervious surface.

Request: To permit 24-percent of the north-central pocket plaza to consist of impervious surfaces.

14. §153.064(G)(A) — General Open Space Type Requirements - Size

Requirement: Pocket parks are to be a minimum of 0.10 acres in size.

Request: To permit a pocket park of  $\pm 0.061$  acres in size at the northeast corner of the site.

15. §153.064(G)(A) — General Open Space Type Requirements - Size

Requirement: Pocket parks are to be between 300 and 1200 square feet in size.

Request: To permit two pocket plazas of  $\pm 1,800$  square feet and 2,060 square feet in size on the north side of the building.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Parking Plan.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plans with the following 15 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide material specifications for all proposed windows, subject to staff approval and prior to submitting for building permits;
- 2) That the window sills and lintels be provided where appropriate, subject to staff approval and prior to submitting for building permits;
- 3) That the posts connecting balconies above and below are to be eliminated from the design of the balconies, if they are not structurally required; and the underside of the balconies are to be finished, subject to staff approval and prior to submitting for building permits;
- 4) That all roof-mounted mechanical equipment be screened per Code, subject to staff approval;
- 5) That the applicant confirm all required bicycle parking spaces are provided with building permit submittal;
- 6) That the applicant update the plans to provide columnar trees along the east building façade and to install street trees 30-foot on center along Dale Drive, subject to review and approval by the City Forester;
- 7) That all street tree wells be at least 5 feet wide per Dublin City Code and that the applicant work with the City to identify an expandable tree grate design consistent with the existing grates, subject to staff approval;
- 8) That the applicant notify City of Dublin staff when installing street trees, and that staff be present when installation occurs to verify proper installation;
- 9) That all final open space furnishing details be provided to Planning for review prior, to submittal for building permits, and subject to staff approval;
- 10) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering staff to better align the access into the Bailey garage with the Block B garage access, subject to staff approval.
- 11) The applicant continue to work with Engineering to install curb ramps designed and installed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- 12) The applicant update the plans to provide a bicycle rack within the southeast open space, and that the applicant update tree species in alignment with the Commission's discussion.
- 13) The applicant work with staff to finalize design details of the gabion wall consistent with the Commission's discussion, subject to staff approval.
- 14) The applicant work with staff to provide additional architectural detail, whether by use of brick coursing, lighting, or otherwise, to the two stair towers to enhance the Banker Drive (south) façade.
- 15) The applicant update the PDP/FDP to shift the building west to be sited along Mooney Street providing additional landscape area along Dale Drive, to the greatest extent possible; and that the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure all Engineering requirements are met.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

## COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Martin reported that:

- There will be a Board and Commission recognition in the Council Chamber building at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, April 11, 2022.
- The annual APA National Conference will be held in San Diego, April 30-May 3, 2022. Commission members should notify staff if they wish to attend the event.
- There will be a Board and Commission recognition in the Council Chamber building at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, April 11, 2022.
- Commissioners should save the date of Wednesday, April 20 for an anticipated joint Board and Commissioner training with Consultant Greg Dale concerning meeting operations.
- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, April 7, 2022, at which new Commission members will be sworn in.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

---

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Assistant Clerk of Council