



**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](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

**ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**JANUARY 9, 2014**

**ART Members:** Dana McDaniel, Deputy City Manager; Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Administrator; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Paul Hammersmith, Director of Engineering.

**Other Staff:** Tammy Noble-Flading, Senior Planner; Dan Phillabaum, Senior Planner; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Jennifer Rauch, Planner II; Kristin Yorke, Civil Engineer; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

**Applicants:** John Behal, Behal Sampson Dietz; Paul Ghidotti, Bob White, and Chris Tumblin, Daimler Group; Thomas Raabe, Donna Goss, and Mike Fitzpatrick, Ohio University; Greg Chillog, Edge Group; and Jessica Chouteau, EMH&T.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the January 2, 2014, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

**INTRODUCTION**

**1. 14-001ARB-MPR – BSC Historic Residential District – Tackett Residence – South High Street**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a proposal for the construction of a new single-family dwelling located southeast of the intersection of South High Street and Waterford Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.063(B) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch said the undeveloped lot has not been assigned an address. She asked that the front setback be noted on the site plans. She described the site layout, which includes a pool and both attached and detached garages. She asked the applicant about the existing stone wall and if they propose to add in the missing sections.

John Behal replied that the existing stone wall sections appear to have been installed in the 1950s and are inconsistent with the historic stone walls located elsewhere in the Historic District. He said the applicant is planning to remove sections of wall and rebuild it consistent with the historic stacked stone style.

Ms. Rauch noted that the stone wall would encroach into the right-of-way, but ART agreed that should not present a problem, given the existing stone walls.

Steve Langworthy asked if the stone wall had been discussed as part of the subdivision for this lot, and if it was addressed on the plat.

Claudia Husak noted that there was also a parkland dedication fee that would be required when this lot was developed, which was discussed during the subdivision for this lot.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any additional questions or concerns left to be addressed.

Barb Cox said she needed a few more details, and she would review the plans to see what else she might need.

Mr. Behal said they will maintain existing grading and will leave the trees on the north side of the lot. He confirmed for the group that the house is one and a half stories.

Mr. Behal asked if the pool should be included in the lot coverage calculation. Ms. Rauch stated she would verify how the Code addressed pools in lot coverage calculations.

Ms. Cox complimented the applicant on the driveway arrangement with the grass strip down the center.

Mr. Langworthy said the target date for an ART recommendation to the ARB is January 23, 2014; and the target date for an Architectural Review Board determination is January 29, 2014.

## **DETERMINATION**

### **2. 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).

Steve Langworthy said the plans that are being reviewed, may or may not be the most current.

Paul Ghidotti began by stating that what he heard from the ART last week was a clarification on the road alignment of Industrial Parkway being extended south of their access point. He said he met with Dan Phillabaum and Kristin Yoroko to go through the approaches. He said they discussed parking issues along the south of the building that runs along the road as well as stormwater issues. Mr. Ghidotti said they are working on a plan, which he understood only allows a short time frame for Planning to review. He said he will provide a landscape plan showing the parking layout and respecting the roadway to south. He stated that EMH&T provided an engineering plan last night/early this morning.

Mr. Ghidotti reiterated that in order to stay on the original schedule to go before the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) on January 23, they need a determination from ART, today. He asked if conditions of approval could be written to address issues not meeting the City's satisfaction at this time. He said he is not comfortable with any scenario if he is not able to start construction on or about March 1. He noted that since they first met with the City about

this proposal, they have made many changes. He said he understood the City's concern that they still do not have a master plan, and unfortunately do not plan to provide one. He clarified that the site of the dry detention basin at the south end of the site is intended for a future bldg.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if it was his intent to resolve the parking issues, today.

Mr. Ghidotti said when they met with PZC in December, he heard them say that they did not like the parking layout at that time. He said they have since come back with the same parking configuration but with a pond in the front to help screen it from the street. They made the mistake of not having the road in correct alignment.

Mr. Langworthy asked for the date of the plan the ART was intended to review. It was confirmed to be January 9, 2014. He said that Mr. Phillabaum had completed an initial review and had comments to present.

Mr. Phillabaum said that Greg Chillog, Edge Group, had sent a parking lot design with comments back, yesterday, which incorporated many of the revisions discussed but it was his belief that the parking arrangement can be better. He voiced his apprehension of the parking appendage to the south, which appears to be an obvious "tack-on" in the worst possible location, adjacent to the Industrial Parkway extension, instead of tucked closer in to the campus. He asked if that section could be eliminated and more landscaping added to provide a visual break along Industrial Parkway. He said with the revisions he was suggesting, the only change to the parking space count would be the section he recommended for elimination. Mr. Phillabaum said he has had no time to complete an analysis of these new plans to see what meets Code, make a recommendation, and determine whether any deviations would be appropriate.

Mr. Langworthy asked Mr. Phillabaum if there were any other outstanding issues like the problem with the property line. Mr. Phillabaum answered they appear to greatly exceed the required parking, but the applicant has not yet submitted a complete parking analysis either.

Mr. Ghidotti reported they did a study of Ohio University's satellite campuses, excluding some clearly dissimilar projects. He said their need for parking is more than what was even proposed originally. He stated they need to have spaces for 4.5 cars per 1,000 square feet of office space. He said the east side of the parking lot fronting on the green formed between the three existing campus buildings is a great location for a building of the same general size. He said their goal is to create an overall campus feel by having parking located around the perimeter of the site, with buildings and a campus green internal to the site.

Mr. Phillabaum said the original Economic Advancement Zone (EAZ) Plan did not anticipate a true university campus in this area. He said the plan clearly states that parking should be at the back or the side of buildings, limiting their view from the right-of-way.

Dana McDaniel clarified that colleges had in fact been considered as an anchor tenant, even back in 2007 when Ohio State was looking at a facility in this area. He said the City sought Ohio University for this site. He said their vision incorporates parking garages but understands it will take time to get there.

Mr. Phillabaum said the Zoning Code speaks to different standards, stating that if parking is visible, it needs to be well designed.

Mr. Ghidotti said the shape of subarea 1 does not create enough room for parking. He said his vision was for this building in Phase 1 and a sister building in the next Phase that would establish a gateway element at the roundabout. He thought everyone was in agreement on that. He said it was his belief that there is no other place to put parking. He said he could not think of a parking garage that had been built for an office building in a suburban environment without a subsidy, since they are normally built due to limited ground availability.

Colleen Gilger agreed with Mr. Ghidotti.

Mr. Phillabaum explained that the vision for Industrial Parkway is that it will become like Emerald Parkway, as a primary connector roadway that will parallel US 33 much like Emerald Parkway rings the outer belt.

Mr. Ghidotti asked about the parking for Cardinal Health and Verizon positioned on the northern part of Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Phillabaum clarified that unlike this site, Cardinal Health and Verizon have frontage on I-270, and the buildings are positioned to have frontage on the highway.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that a decision would need to be made, whether Post Road or Industrial Parkway are more important in terms of creating gateways and locating parking.

Claudia Husak asked about the parking "appendage" proposed, and if it was necessary on day one. Mr. Ghidotti replied that it was necessary.

Mr. Phillabaum stated that the required parking for this site is still difficult to determine because parking numbers have not been provided by the applicant. He asked Mr. Ghidotti if they can provide a number of estimated students for classes anticipated for the second and third floors of the building.

Mr. Langworthy clarified that, as the Code is written, parking cannot exceed the Code requirement. Mr. Ghidotti asked about the stringency of the Code and if exceeding the requirement by one space requires PZC approval. Ray Harpham confirmed but asked him not to get hung up on "one car" making it an issue. He pointed out that there appears to be a significant amount of parking proposed beyond the number required by Code.

Mr. Langworthy said in order for PZC to take action to approve a Development Plan for this site, they need to see what Code requirements are not being met. He emphasized the need for a list of items in order for ART to make a recommendation, starting with the parking requirements.

Mr. Phillabaum reiterated that a base has not been received to make a comparison. Ms. Cox requested that the applicant provide the report they prepared from analyzing other satellite campuses and said it needed to be reviewed by Mr. Phillabaum. Ms. Cox recommended that they take into account that collegiate commuter campuses are different, and a comparison to a vocational school is probably a more appropriate comparison in this case.

Mr. Phillabaum asked for a relationship between specific lots and specific buildings. Mr. Ghidotti said it was currently 108,000 square feet and asked how many spaces are needed based on that 4.5 spaces/1000 calculation.

Ms. Husak clarified that Planning was not necessarily opposed to the amount of parking proposed but asked that the location and amount be justified.

Mr. McDaniel said he attended the PZC on December 5, 2013, and he thought they understood that a campus has very different needs than an office campus. He suggested that OU make the argument of their need based on how this Development Plan compares to other campuses.

Mr. Langworthy asked that a ratio be provided, which shows the relationship between this building and the parking proposed.

Mr. Ghidotti asked how to calculate the parking when the second and third floors uses are still unknown and would be estimates or guesses. Mr. Langworthy said a best guess as to the potential tenants would be best. He said that as for the second requirement not meeting Code in terms of the parking location, helping the Commission understand the overall campus plan will help the argument for having parking at the side or rear of the building.

Mr. Ghidotti asked what is considered the "side" in relation to this campus. Mr. Langworthy said this site was not associated with a campus when the Zoning Code was written. He emphasized the need to explain the philosophy and vision for this campus and how the individual buildings should be accommodated.

Mr. Phillabaum readdressed the property line issue related to calculation of building setbacks. Mr. Ghidotti asked if a condition could be written requiring that the properties be combined to eliminate the setback in the middle of the campus.

Mr. Langworthy clarified the design direction for the parking lot that it would be split up into five bays plus the "appendage" south of the main parking area. He noted that Mr. Phillabaum had suggested narrowing the "triangle" island in the parking lot to reinforce buffering from the roadway as it had not been incorporated into the plan yet. Mr. Phillabaum referred to the sketch, which showed smaller pods of parking along the right-of-way noting that landscaping would benefit the user by buffering against strong prevailing winds.

Greg Chillog, Edge Group, said he had received Mr. Phillabaum's parking lot plan sketch but did not present a revised plan simply because he did not have time.

Fred Hahn said that if the recommended changes did not significantly change the footprint of the plan and the number of spaces, it appeared to resolve the issue by breaking up the mass of asphalt.

Mr. Ghidotti said there were cost ramifications with additional islands, particularly irrigation and drainage and they do not always look the best, but they would consider it.

Mr. Phillabaum clarified the provision of bicycle parking. Mr. Phillabaum requested that the applicant provide a bicycle connection to the buildings and the multiuse path proposed on Industrial Parkway.

Mr. Langworthy referred back to the site plan, asking if a vertical element could be added at the end of the drive to create more of a significant entrance.

Mr. Ghidotti thought it made sense to have an additional meeting with Mr. Phillabaum, making sure everything was resolved. Mr. Phillabaum agreed but asked for time to conduct a thorough review of what had been presented.

Mr. Langworthy brought up the subject of mounding along the edge of the parking lot. Mr. Hahn inquired about the width between the parking lot and the right-of-way. Mr. Phillabaum specified that it appeared to be 30 feet to the right-of-way to a multi-use path, 35 – 40 feet to play from back of curb to edge of bike path.

Mr. Phillabaum asked Alan Perkins if the AutoTurn analysis had been completed and that the site sufficiently accommodated fire access. Alan Perkins said it would and that he was pretty confident that the future main access to the site would be from Industrial Parkway. He requested that the future access be reflected. He added that in the future, the fire apparatus turn-around area behind the 7003 Post Road building and the aerial apparatus access (dumpster location) next to the proposed building will need fire lane signage and potentially pavement markings to prohibit unauthorized parking.

Mr. Langworthy asked each ART member if they had any further questions or concerns.

Mr. Harpham noted that one strip along Industrial Parkway was very narrow and would not allow room for screening of height, and that he was more comfortable with mounding than just planting.

A discussion ensued over possible landscaping for the two dry basins. It was suggested that if they are known to be temporary basins, it needs to be reflected on the Development Plan. Mr. Ghidotti said the southern basin is a place holder until a master plan is completed.

Mr. Langworthy said they would need to be staged until a formal management plan was created.

Ms. Cox said that some of the information already received is ok in that regard.

Mr. Phillabaum noted the discrepancies on the tree survey. He inquired about the 62" Sugar Maple. He was assured that the trees in question would be preserved to the extent possible. He was told the sanitary sewer running through the tree's canopy may impact its survivability, so they have calculated the replacement inches just in case.

Ms. Cox approved of the stormwater plan. She thought the new water service and fire hydrants were covered at this point.

Mr. Langworthy reiterated that a minimum/maximum base number for parking was needed for the Code requirement. Mr. Ghidotti said he would provide the off-site analysis.

Rachel Ray read the conditions currently being recommended:

1. That the applicant provides Planning with vehicular and bicycle parking data, including the number required and number proposed, prior to review by the Planning and Zoning Commission;
2. That the applicant modify the site plan consistent with the ART's comments, including the parking lot design, bicycle parking, provision of a terminal vista, and fire access;
3. That the lots be combined prior to occupancy;
4. That the parking lot be modified to include mounding, additional landscape islands, and breaking up the parking areas into smaller pods, prior to review by the Planning and Zoning Commission; and
5. That the applicant include a scaled composite site plan prior to review by the PZC.

Mr. Hahn confirmed that the Zoning Code has requirements for the height of the mounds intended to screen the parking lot.

Mr. Chillog asked if the mound also had to include a continuous line of hedge or evergreens. He asked about the open space tree planting requirement and promised to provide a plan to Mr. Phillabaum by the end of day Monday and will attend the meeting on Tuesday to answer any questions.

Mr. Langworthy recommended meeting again before making a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He suggested that the ART hold a Special Meeting on Tuesday, January 14 at 2:00 pm.

Mr. Ghidotti said he understood the City's reluctance to make a recommendation at this time due to the lack of information and time. He expressed his appreciation for the City's efforts to make the schedule work.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed the date, time, and place for the Special Meeting before adjourning at 3:20 pm.