

# Minor Project Review

## 12-068ARB-MPR – BSC Historic Core District

### The Scioto Room – 38 West Bridge Street

This is a request for site and architectural modifications as well as a parking plan for an existing building in Historic Dublin. This is a request for Minor Project Review for a project in the Architectural Review District, requiring an Administrative Review Team (ART) recommendation within 14 days of submittal, and Architectural Review Board review within 28 days following the ART recommendation. A time extension was agreed to by the City and the Applicant.

**Date of Application Acceptance**

Tuesday, September 25, 2012

**Date of ART Recommendation**

Thursday, December 6, 2012

**Date of Architectural Review Board Determination**

Wednesday, December 19, 2012

**Case Manager**

Jennifer M. Rauch | (614) 410-4690 | [jrauch@dublin.oh.us](mailto:jrauch@dublin.oh.us)

## **PART I: Application Overview**

<i>Zoning District</i>	BSC Historic Core District
<i>Review Type</i>	Minor Project Review and Parking Plan Approval
<i>Development Proposal</i>	Sign, Site and Architectural Modifications to an Existing Structure  Parking Plan: To permit 12 fewer parking spaces than required by Code due to the change in use for a total of 29 parking spaces serving the site.
<i>Use</i>	Eating and Drinking (Permitted in BSC Historic Core District)
<i>Building Type</i>	Existing Structure
<i>Administrative Departures</i>	Canopy lighting
<i>Waivers</i>	None
<i>Property Address</i>	38 West Bridge Street
<i>Property Owner</i>	Jason Liu
<i>Applicant/Representative</i>	Tim Bass, Bass Studio Architects
<i>Case Manager</i>	Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP   (614) 410-4690   jrauch@dublin.oh.us

### **Application Review Procedure: Minor Project Review**

The purpose of the Minor Project Review is to provide an efficient review process for smaller projects that do not have significant community effects. The Minor Project Review is necessary to ensure that applications for development meet the requirements of Chapter 153 of the Dublin Zoning Code.

Following acceptance of a complete application for Minor Project Review, the Administrative Review Team shall make a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board to approve, deny, or approve with conditions the application based on the criteria of §153.066(F)(5) applicable to Site Plan Reviews. A determination by the Administrative Review Team is required not more than 14 days from the date the request was submitted. A time extension was agreed to by the City and the Applicant. The Architectural Review Board shall make a decision on the application not more than 28 days from the date of the Administrative Review Team's recommendation.

### **Zoning Code Analysis**

#### *Proposal Overview*

The site has a 2,500 square foot commercial building located in the center of the property along the western property line. Parking and loading are located to the rear with additional parking at the front of the building. Access is from W. Bridge Street through to a shared driveway at the north end of the site, which connects to Darby Street.

The applicant is proposing minor exterior modifications to the existing façade, and a new enclosure to the rear of the building for storage. Modifications are proposed to the parking lot to address parking requirements for a change in use and circulation issues. Additional site modifications include landscape areas within the parking lot and a new street wall and landscape feature along W. Bridge Street. Two

new signs are proposed; one wall sign located on the south elevation at the main entrance and one ground sign integrated into the proposed stone wall along W. Bridge Street. A new dumpster enclosure is proposed to the rear of the building within the loading area.

### *Zoning Requirements*

The Bridge Street provisions of the Zoning Code identify building type requirements for new and renovated structures with the intent to provide a range of high quality building options to reinforce the character of each district. The Administrative Review Team determined that the requirements for the Historic Cottage Commercial building type and the following requirements are most applicable to this proposal.

#### *153.062 – Building Types*

**Existing Structures** This is an Existing Structure. Existing Structures may be extended, enlarged, altered, remodeled, or modernized after approval by the ART upon finding that the conditions of §153.062(B)(2)(b) are met. This proposal involves no enlargement or extension of the Existing Structure, and although not required to do so, the applicant has made substantial efforts to meet or come nearer to conformance to the General Building Type Requirements with the proposed exterior façade modifications.

**Materials and Colors** The building is primarily clad in brick and stone, with a flat roof and a canopy located over the front entrance. All existing building materials will be retained with the proposed façade modifications, with the exception of new architectural metal panels and perforated metal or glass panels to enclose the existing outdoor storage and loading area located to the rear of the building. a permitted As a secondary façade material the proposed architectural metal panels brings the materials closer to Code conformance. The applicant is proposing the addition of a new colored glass window on the west elevation with a fire shutter (which is a Building/Fire Code requirement). The existing metal trim on the canopy is proposed to be painted graphite black to match the proposed metal panels at the rear of the building.

Metal paneling is proposed to the rear of the building and appears secondary to the brick and stone material located on the main structure. A new brick base is proposed under the metal panels at the loading area in the rear of the building. The existing flat roof is retained, with the addition of a new 4-foot, 8-inch high metal panel screen proposed on top of the roof to screen the roof top mechanicals from the public right-of-way, as required by Code.

#### **Entrances & Pedestrianway**

The applicant is maintaining the existing entrance on the south elevation facing the parking lot, and creating a new exit on the east elevation for emergency egress. The new exit has a concrete landing and stairs into the parking area. The ART has recommended that the new concrete landing be extended south to connect with the existing concrete walk that runs along the east side of the

building to provide a continuous walk from the rear parking area to the main entrance.

Windows, Shutters,  
Awnings & Canopies

All existing windows remain, with the addition of an optional colored glass window on the west elevation. The proposed colored glass incorporates a fire shutter to address building separation concerns raised by Building Standards. The existing metal canopy located over the main entrance will be retained and repainted to match the metal paneling on the rear of the building.

Signs

The proposed wall sign facing W. Bridge Street on the south elevation is placed above the entrance and integrated into the architecture of the building. The proposed ground sign is integrated into the proposed stone wall along the W. Bridge Street frontage. Additional sign requirements and proposed sign details are outlined below under 153.065(H) of this report.

*§153.065(B) – Site Development Standards – Parking, Loading and Circulation*

The site accommodates parking along the eastern property line, which does not permit two-way travel through the site. This requires the driveway along W. Bridge Street be exit only, which will require patrons to enter the site through the 50 W. Bridge Street driveway or from Darby Street. Planning and Engineering each expressed concerns about the safety and practicality of this circulation pattern at the ART discussion of this application. At the ART review, Planning recommended the removal of the parking spaces labeled 34 and 35 to better enable two-way access along the north drive between 50 W. Bridge Street and Darby Street. The applicant has shown the removal of these parking spaces to accommodate the required width for two-way travel.

The applicant is requesting approval of a parking plan in accordance with Code Section 153.065(B)(1)(f) to allow 17 spaces for this site in lieu of 29 required parking spaces. Detailed information has been provided regarding the valet operations within this area of the Historic District and shared parking options available on adjacent sites. Evaluation of the parking plan information is provided later in this report.

A minimum of one bicycle parking space is required; the applicant is proposing five, meeting the requirements of Code Section 153.065(B)(3)(c).

*§153.065(D) – Site Development Standards – Landscaping*

Code requires a street wall with landscaping for surface parking lots with 10 or more parking spaces within 20 feet of a public street. The applicant has proposed a stone wall 8 feet from the property line along W. Bridge Street. The height of the street wall is not provided, but is limited to four feet. Code requires five shrubs per 25 feet of linear feet of the parking lot boundary facing the public street, or eight shrubs. Nine are shown.

Interior landscape requirements include a minimum 10 foot wide, 150 square-foot landscape island for every 12 parking spaces, with one medium deciduous tree per island. The island proposed in the northwest corner of the site meets this requirement.

The applicant proposes a landscape treatment within the RBZ (Required Building Zone), which includes lawn with sidewalk connections between the building entrance and the public sidewalk. This area extends to the west and includes the southeast corner of the adjacent property of 50 W. Bridge Street. This includes benches along the public sidewalk, a paved area with bike racks, and trees and other landscape material.

*§153.065(E) – Site Development Standards – Fencing, Walls, and Screening*

An outdoor waste enclosure is proposed on the rear of the building, adjacent to the loading area, and will be enclosed by metal panels to match the proposed storage enclosure and meets Code. A round metal panel is proposed to screen the rooftop mechanicals.

*§153.065(F) – Site Development Standards – Lighting*

The applicant is proposing two 14 inch diameter pendant light fixtures under the canopy. Canopy lighting is required to be recessed to limit glare onto adjacent properties, requiring an administrative departure which was approved by the ART. The fixture proposed is decorative and will not distribute enough light to cause negative effects on adjacent properties. The applicant is also proposed two pole mounted light fixtures within the parking lot, which meet Code.

*§153.065(H) – Site Development Standards – Signs*

This single-tenant building is permitted signs as shown in the table below. Both signs use reverse channel letters with back halo lighting with a copper panel, with routed letter cut-offs illuminated by back lighting.

Proposed Wall Signs			
	Permitted	Proposed	Requirement
Size	Max. 8 sq. ft.	Reverse channel letter with copper patina panel; 7.8 sq. ft. total	Met
Location	Within 6 ft. of the common public entrance; on walls facing a public street	Installed adjacent to main entrance along south elevation in line with the existing metal canopy.	Met
	Additional building-mounted sign is permitted for tenants with a dedicated public entrance facing an off-street parking lot		
Height	15 ft. or not extending above the roofline	13 ft. above grade	Met
Colors	3 colors	2 total - Black and copper patina	Met
Proposed Ground Sign			
	Permitted	Proposed	Requirement
Size	Max. 8 sq. ft.	7.8 sq. ft.	Met
Location	Permitted for Historic Cottage Commercial Building Types Only	Set back 8 ft. from the ROW	Met
	8 ft. setback from ROW/property line		
Height	6 ft.	4.5 ft.	Met
Colors	3 colors	2 total - Black and copper patina	Met

## **PART II: Applicable Review Standards**

### **Minor Project Review Criteria**

The Administrative Review Team has reviewed this application based on the applicable review criteria for Minor Projects, which included the following:

**(c) Meets Applicable Zoning Regulations**

*Not met.* While the building type and site development requirements are met with regard to proposed materials, screening, colors, signs and landscaping. The required parking for the site and site circulation are not met.

**(d) Safe and Efficient Pedestrian, Bicycle, & Vehicular Circulation**

*Not met.* Site modifications for pedestrian and bicycle circulation have been provided with this proposal, but the site circulation creates several conflict points with the modifications to the one-way access from W. Bridge Street and site circulation between 50 W. Bridge Street to Darby Street. Serious concerns have been raised about the functionality and safety of the proposed circulation particularly with the relative intensity of the proposed use with a large portion of the patrons arriving at or near the same time.

**(h) Appropriate Stormwater Management**

*Not met.* No stormwater information has been provided at this time.

**(j) Consistency with Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report, Community Plan, and other Policy Documents**

*Met.* The proposed building modifications are consistent with the objectives of the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report and the Community Plan.

### **Parking Plan Criteria**

The Administrative Review Team reviewed this application and recommended disapproval of the Parking Plan based on expressed concerns regarding site circulation and proposed parking locations. The ART identified the following general issues based on the criteria of Section 153.065 (B)(2)(b)6 as further detailed below.

- Concerns about the reduction of parking for site and the details of the parking plan given the parking demand issues identified within the northwest quadrant of the District.
- Practicality of using off-site parking spaces, particularly the Dublin Community Church lot across W. Bridge Street.
- Concerns about the functionality of the valet parking and the effects on the existing public parking system.
- Modifications to the circulation created by the need to have the W. Bridge Street access point be an exit only for this site.

1) **Land Use and Development Character of the Area**

*Consideration not met:* The Historic District is a mixed use area providing on-street parking, public parking lots, and limited or no on-site parking areas for most uses. The issue related to the examination of the Parking Plan criteria relates to the location and relative intensity of this particular use. The majority of the greatest parking generators in the District are in this northwest quadrant of Bridge and High Streets. While daytime use of the proposed facility may cause less of a problem, evening events will significantly add to the parking deficiencies for this quadrant. Future uses for uses in this quadrant should not be permitted to significantly overburden the limited available parking in the area.

2) **Availability of Public Parking**

*Consideration not met:* While the applicant appropriately provides information regarding availability of parking, this issue is not solely about numbers but about operational considerations, including the difficulty of on-site circulation (especially for first time patrons) and the high parking demand concentrated in this quadrant of the historic district. As noted, this quadrant has the highest generators for parking demand and, as a result, public parking is limited during certain evening hours and days.

While the City has attempted to gain the cooperation of restaurant owners and other businesses to have employees park in more remote parking areas, many still park in the Darby Street lot. The City completed additional parking studies over the summer that verified the employee use of the Darby Lot. This condition has reduced the availability of the most convenient parking for patrons.

The applicant has indicated the owner will require employees to park in the Dublin Community Church lot and the Indian Run lot. This proposed solution would alleviate the stress of parking within the Darby lot, but is difficult to enforce. The Darby Street lot has been converted to all 3 hour time-limited parking which may, with adequate enforcement, aid in this situation, provided that other parking areas not become overburdened.

The City has also made arrangements with the parking valet service and the Dublin Schools to permit the lower Indian Run lot (or Teacher's Lot) to be used solely for valet parking during evening hours and when school activities are not planned. This location serves the valet operations being conducted from the Bri-Hi Square valet station, which includes both the Bri-Hi and Tucci's establishments. The applicant has indicated that this location will also accommodate the proposed use. It is uncertain as to whether these conditions will be effective for opening up additional space in the Darby Street lot, particularly if employees refuse to park elsewhere.

3) **Timing of Parking Relative to Other Uses**

*Consideration not met:* While daytime use may not create a significant parking issue, evening events will conflict with already stressed parking demands. This site is currently used to help accommodate the parking need for the existing restaurant. Having a large number of vehicles arriving at the same time may create significant parking and circulation problems with the existing restaurant and nearby uses.

The applicant has provided supplemental information showing a 'worst case scenario' solution not presented to the ART which attempts to address how valet parking will be staged for 38 and 50 W. Bridge Street with the potential for only minimal stacking onto W. Bridge Street. It is difficult to see

how this worst case scenario solution could ever be implemented, especially given the need for parking for the existing restaurant. Even so, the proposed solution would create hazardous circulation issues for 50 W. Bridge Street with valet staging in the drive aisle of the only site entrance point to both 50 and 38 W. Bridge Street. This proposed solution would also affect the required parking spaces for 50 W. Bridge Street along the eastern property line.

4) **Parking Requirements for Similar Uses**

*Not Applicable*

5) **Location of Existing/Proposed Parking Spaces**

*Consideration Not Met.* The on-site parking spaces counted toward the parking requirement are in locations separated from one another. As a banquet facility, it is likely that this use will have a large percentage of first time patrons for each event. Having an unconsolidated parking area may make circulation difficult, especially with most patrons arriving within a relatively short time and being unfamiliar with the site and area.

6) **Parking Compliance to the Maximum Extent Practicable**

*Consideration Met.* The existing parking lot will not easily accommodate additional parking spaces.

7) **Other Parking Adjustments**

*Not Applicable*

8) **Supporting Documentation**

The supporting documentation highlights the most significant unknown factor - the number of vehicles that may use the valet service compared to those that self-park, or are parking or using the valet for the existing restaurant. There may be some valet capacity, but without knowing how many patrons would use the service, evaluating the ability of that capacity to serve even a portion of the parking needs is difficult. The applicant has indicated that they would require patrons to use the valet parking; however, there are serious concerns about the enforcement of this policy. Overall, the operational considerations are as important as numerical calculations, and any solution to accommodate the parking need seems questionable.

## **Architectural Review Board Standards**

Section 153.174 of the Zoning Code identifies criteria for the review and approval of a Board Order for proposals within the Architectural Review District Boundaries. Following is an analysis by the Administrative Review Team based on those criteria.

### **General Review Standards**

1) **Character and Materials Compatible with Context**

*Criterion met.* The proposed modifications are compatible with the character and design of the existing building.

- 2) Recognition and Respect of Historical or Acquired Significance  
*Criterion met.* The most significant architectural modifications are proposed to the rear of the building to enclose the existing loading and service area. The modifications proposed to the existing building do not alter the historic significance.
- 3) Compatible with Relevant Design Characteristics  
*Not Applicable*
- 4) Appropriate Massing and Building Form  
*Criterion met.* The proposed screening is subordinate to the main building and located to rear using metal panels as a secondary material to the brick located along the remain building facades.
- 5) Appropriate Color Scheme  
*Criterion met.* The proposed colors for the trim and metal panels are appropriate and match the existing scheme of the building.
- 6) Complementary Sign Design  
*Criterion met.* The proposed signs meet the provisions of the Bridge Street District.
- 7) Appropriate Landscape Design  
*Criterion met.* The proposed landscape material meets Code and is appropriate for the proposal.
- 8) Preservation of Archaeological Resources  
*Not Applicable*

#### **Alteration to Buildings, Structure, and Site Standards**

- 1) Reasonable Effort to Minimize Alteration of Buildings and Site.  
*Criterion met.* The applicant is proposing minimal alternations to the building, which with most significant modification to the loading and service area located to rear of the building. The proposed screening enhances the aesthetic of the building. The proposed site modifications include increased landscape and streetscape improvements, which enhance the overall appearance of the site.
- 2) Conformance to Original Distinguishing Character.
- 3) Retention of Historic Building Features and Materials.
- 4) Alteration Recognizes Historic Integrity and Appropriateness.
- 5) Recognition and Respect of Historical or Acquired Significance.
- 6) Sensitive Treatment of Distinctive Features.
- 7) Appropriate Repair or Replacement of Significant Architectural Features.
- 8) Sensitive Maintained Historic Building Materials.  
*Not Applicable*

#### **Additions to Existing Buildings, Structure, and Site**

- 1) Use of Traditional Materials on Additions.
- 2) Contemporary Design of Additions Compatible with Existing Structures.
- 3) Additions are Distinguishable and Subordinate to Original Structure.
- 4) Addition Recognizes Historic Integrity.  
*Not applicable.*

### **PART III: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATION**

Recommendation of disapproval to the Architectural Review Board for this Minor Project Review application and the proposed parking plan. While the building and site modifications unrelated to parking are appropriate, site circulation issues and the lack of available parking form the basis for the ART recommendation.