



**Land Use and Long
Range Planning**

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 2, 2014

ART Members: Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Administrator; and Kristin Yorko, Civil Engineer.

Other Staff: Dan Phillabaum, Senior Planner; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Tammy Noble-Flading, Senior Planner; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Paul Ghidotti, Chris Tumblin, and Tucker Bohm, Daimler Group; Greg Chillog, Edge Group; and Thomas Raab, Ohio University.

Gary Gunderman called the meeting to order at 2:10 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 19, 2013, or December 26, 2013, meeting minutes. [There were none.] Both sets of minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

CASE REVIEW

1. 13-119WID-DP – ID-1 – Ohio University College of Health Sciences and Professions – Post Road & Industrial Parkway

Dan Phillabaum said this is a proposal for an approximately 87,000-square-foot, three-story educational building, parking lot, and associated site improvements as part of the Ohio University Dublin Campus. He said the site is located on the south side of Post Road, west of Eiterman Road. He explained this Development Plan Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.042(D).

Mr. Phillabaum reported that updated information had been received this week from the OU consultant team:

- Monday — Architecture Update
- Tuesday — Grading and Stormwater Update
- Thursday — Pedestrian Connections Plan, AutoTurn Analysis

Mr. Phillabaum said he understands that a master plan for the overall Ohio University campus is still being developed but a master plan in some kind of context is needed to gain a better understanding of the proposals for the site. He said that what has been received to date shows the north and south areas split in half but nothing that shows the overall campus including future streets on a single plan. He said he had to create a composite plan himself based on the drawings submitted that illustrates the campus as a whole. He pointed out that this plan more clearly shows the misalignment with the Thoroughfare Plan. He presented the details of the Thoroughfare Plan for the West Innovation District that includes the extension of Industrial

Parkway south of the roundabout, which the applicant proposes will become 'Academic Drive.'

Mr. Phillabaum reported that he just received a plan from Greg Chillog today, which sets the access point and alignment of the road, but it interferes with the location of the pond. Mr. Phillabaum reported that he conferred with Jeannie Willis, Engineering Manager, about the proposed alignment, and it is not acceptable to the City. He said the road alignment needs to present a more gentle curvature. He said that because the proposed site plans do not align with the Thoroughfare Plan, this is a substantial issue.

Mr. Phillabaum pointed out that he had incorporated a conceptual second building into his composite overall site plan, which he estimated to be half the size of the first phase building proposed, which also included future parking. He said that this is likely to raise many questions from the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) again about the lack of a master plan. He stressed that if another building is proposed, they will need to explain where the parking would be to support its use if a parking structure was not an option. He noted that there is another meeting tomorrow with staff and the applicant to discuss the overall project schedule and timing at a higher level, and asked if there were any preliminary thoughts based on the information presented today.

Paul Ghidotti reported that he did not have the opportunity to review the plan sent by Dana McDaniel on Monday, which showed the line for the future portion of Industrial Parkway. He asked if Jessica Chouteau saw it and if it included the southern alignment. He thinks she may not have, as the pond is in the wrong area and if the alignment has to be in that location, it pushes the parking further out. He said Ms. Chouteau was not present to address these issues. Mr. Ghidotti explained that one parking lot was not intended to service that entire building. He said parking will be spread out over the campus. He said the parking for the buildings at 7001 and 7003 Post Road could be used and encouraged the ART to consider the overall campus. He stated that the ratio for parking could be different for the next building. He referenced the stormwater management for the site and noted that EDA subarea 1 could serve as a good location for a regional stormwater facility. He asked how PZC might respond to eliminating the pond in front of the large parking area along the future road extension, since he thought the plantings around it might help screen the parking from the roadway.

Mr. Phillabaum said that a pond in front of parking is not a prerequisite. He suggested creating a large landscape island in the center of the parking area to break up the amount of pavement and landscaping to help soften the appearance from the road.

Mr. Ghidotti suggested that if the pond were relocated to a regional stormwater facility, they would gain a lot of area to better design the parking area in the direction that Mr. Phillabaum described. He pointed out areas that could accommodate parking for future phases but stated it is important to see how the first phase is built out. He said he has not received any feedback from OU yet on what their anticipated parking needs might be; he said it could be a lot less than what has been proposed.

Mr. Phillabaum reiterated that the City's objective was to avoid being painted into a corner by the road alignments proposed as part of this first phase. He said that if the pond gets built as drawn, ultimately we will be stuck with an alignment that we do not support, and that is why the first phase needs to be right.

Mr. Ghidotti asked how they should best move forward. Mr. Phillabaum said they will talk with Dana McDaniel, tomorrow about the schedule, but ultimately, the ART cannot make a recommendation with a major condition that a pond or parking lot be redesigned.

Mr. Ghidotti asked how the redesigns can be accomplished within this time frame. Mr. Phillabaum suggested they start drawing and submit the revised plans as soon as possible.

Gary Gunderman emphasized the need for a real stormwater plan that can be analyzed.

Mr. Ghidotti was concerned with this information being presented today, considering it was the 19th meeting with the City.

Ray Harpham pointed out that the ART is just now reviewing a plan that shows a layout for the entire campus in context with the future roadways, which brings all of these issues to light and that is only because Mr. Phillabaum had to create the drawings after not receiving the plans he had requested.

Jeff Tyler asked if structured parking was off table. Mr. Ghidotti said yes, because of the cost per parking space, which is approximately \$18,000 – \$25,000 per space in a parking structure. He said he did not believe that the cost argument would be relevant to the discussion with PZC.

Mr. Tyler stated that he understood, but the applicant is asking the Commission to approve a plan with a significant amount of parking and the potential for even more parking for future buildings without sufficient information and without a master plan. He said the ART is going to have a difficult time making a solid recommendation without all the details.

Mr. Phillabaum said that even if a parking structure is not an option in this first phase, if it is an option that could be considered in the future, conceptual locations should be reflected in the master plan, along with locations for future buildings. He said the perception seems to be that the land available for development is limitless and that is certainly not the case. He recommended that the applicant make the existing parking even more efficient. He also suggested that they present a conceptual 30 year plan, even if it could change in five years.

Mr. Tyler agreed that they need to provide a conceptual master plan at a minimum, including a parking garage as one option.

Mr. Ghidotti said he appreciated the feedback.

Mr. Phillabaum stated that there are a number of ancillary site design issues in addition to the City's more significant concerns with the parking and road alignments. He referred to the dry detention basin shown in the northern portion of the site, which requires the removal of significant trees. He said the City would not support the tree removal in that location. He explained that in order to warrant a request for a tree waiver, every effort needs to have been made to save these trees first, and he did not believe that was the case.

Mr. Ghidotti said he believed that the plans may be incorrect, because he did not think they intended to remove those trees. He thought there might have been a tributary split that requires the basin in the north portion of the site in addition to the retention pond in the southern portion.

Mr. Phillabaum suggested that if all of the stormwater management could be relocated to the south as part of a future regional retention basin, it could be sized to accommodate the first phase, leaving room to expand and be resized for future development.

Mr. Tyler advised the applicant to consider alternative stormwater solutions such as a bioswale, green roofs, permeable pavement, etc., which prompted a brief discussion of location options.

Mr. Phillabaum asked Greg Chillog about some trees noted on the proposed site plan. He said that he and Brian Martin, Zoning Inspector, had visited the site and noticed major trees clustered together that were topped due to the utility lines, which probably should be removed. He said the significantly sized Sugar Maple, mislabeled as a Spruce tree on the plans, was in good condition and would not interfere and asked that it be preserved. He said it would provide a nice screen to the service area on the other side of the lab building.

Mr. Chillog said they would take another look at the plans.

Mr. Phillabaum asked the ART members if any of them had the opportunity to review the updated stormwater report received on Tuesday. He said architectural updates were provided but at this point, they were low on the priority list.

Mr. Harpham said none of the architectural revisions were substantial enough to be concerned about at this stage.

Alan Perkins said he needed to review the Pedestrian Connections Plan and AutoTurn analysis he had recently received. He stated they needed to maintain access to 7003 Post Road and may ask Jessica Chouteau with EMH&T to provide an additional AutoTurn analysis.

Mr. Phillabaum asked the applicants if they had any additional questions for the ART members. Mr. Ghidotti said no; they will incorporate the stormwater changes and parking lot modifications on the proposal and get the revised plans submitted as soon as possible.

Mr. Phillabaum reiterated that in order to go before the PZC on January 23, the applicant will meet twice more with the ART before a recommendation is made on January 9. He explained that cases would normally be placed on the Commission's agenda on the 10th but only when there are no substantive changes expected. He said that next week the ART can review more plans before the packet is due on the 17th.

Mr. Phillabaum said today marks the 15-day rule submittal deadline for the January 23rd meeting.

Ms. Gilger said Mr. McDaniel has not ruled out proposing a special Commission meeting to accommodate this project's accelerated schedule. Mr. Gunderman said, as it stands now, missing the January 23rd meeting puts this off for two weeks until February 6, 2014.

Mr. Ghidotti said he already planned to submit plans to begin the City's building permit review, but he is concerned they are setting themselves up for failure with this accelerated timeline and submitting out of sequence.

Mr. Gunderman agreed the timeline did not seem to be working out.

Mr. Tyler said Building could start reviewing the building plans to see if the applicant was compliant with the building codes, but the zoning would be disapproved for the first round.

Mr. Tyler advised the applicant to keep in mind that once they have decided where the building is going to be, there would be no problems with the building permit. He emphasized that the other site issues should be of greater concern.

Mr. Gunderman asked when we might expect additional revised drawings. Mr. Ghidotti answered possibly early next week.

Mr. Phillabaum said it was okay to send preliminary revisions to review to make sure they were heading in the right direction, and he would be the point of contact for staff.

Mr. Gunderman asked the applicant team if they had any further questions or comments. [There were none.]

Mr. Phillabaum confirmed with Mr. Ghidotti that they will meet tomorrow face-to-face at 5800 Shier Rings Road in lieu of a phone conference.

Mr. Gunderman asked if there were any additional questions or concerns regarding this case and if there were any further items to discuss. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.