



**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**

**DECEMBER 12, 2013**

**ART Members:** Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Administrator; Lieutenant Steve Farmer, Police; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst.

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

**Applicant:** Kevin O'Connor, Red Rooster Quilts, Inc.

Gary Gunderman called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 5, 2013, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

**INTRODUCTION**

**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 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 said the applicant, Paul Ghidotti, of the Daimler Group, was not present but has been meeting consistently with Planning. He said they have started renovations to three existing buildings on the site, removing parking to create additional green space as part of their medical campus.

Mr. Phillabaum said this proposed new building will be located on the northwest portion of the site near the roundabout and will be used for medical office and classroom space. He said the 400-space parking lot shown was designed to accommodate parking for this building only and sized based on the stated needs of OU, not what Code would require. He said the next phase of the campus will include a building that generally mirrors the one presently proposed that would frame and enclose the plaza. He said the parking lot drive aisle through the plaza will contain different paving materials to emphasize the pedestrian-oriented use.

Mr. Phillabaum said a stormwater management pond is proposed along the property's frontage on the Industrial Parkway/Shier Rings Road extension to the west of the proposed parking lot.

Kristin Yorko confirmed a guardrail will be built to ensure safety.

Mr. Phillabaum said a master plan of the overall campus is still in progress. He said that this proposal was reviewed informally by the Planning & Zoning Commission at their meeting on December 5, 2013. He reported that the Commission reacted positively to the architecture but disliked the large parking configuration. He said that it is possible that a future building may take up part of the proposed parking area in a future phase.

Mr. Phillabaum assured the ART that the architecture reflects the intent of the West Innovation District standards for architecture. He said the buildings are very contemporary with clean lines and flat roofs at multiple elevations.

Alan Perkins believed that sufficient access was provided on the plan but is waiting on the applicant to complete an AutoTurn analysis to ensure that trucks could maneuver through the site adequately.

Steve Farmer had no safety concerns to express at this time.

Rachel Ray asked about the rooftop mechanicals and if they would be shielded by a parapet and if the glass would be transparent.

Mr. Phillabaum said glass on the south elevation may be intended to provide a solar benefit. He said the applicant was striving to incorporate points toward a LEED designation, although they are not seeking certification. He said there did appear to be a mechanical screen on the rooftop.

Mr. Phillabaum said the applicant is expected to attend next week's ART meeting and asked the ART members to start compiling their specific questions and comments in the meantime. He said the target date for recommendation to the Planning & Zoning Commission for the January 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting is Thursday, January 9, 2013.

Fred Hahn asked if the ART should expect to see a master plan in the next few weeks.

Colleen Gilger said she has yet to meet with the people providing the master plan and does not expect a plan for several months yet, which will be after OU needs to begin constructing the building.

Mr. Phillabaum said normally, an application of this type would be approved by the ART and would only be sent to the Planning and Zoning Commission if waivers were needed from the Code requirements. He explained that the Code includes a 'kick up' provision that allows the ART to forward a recommendation to the Commission for projects with significant community impact. He said that since this is the first new building in the West Innovation District as part of the new OU medical campus, Planning considers it to be a character defining project and recommends review and determination by the Commission.

Rachel Ray asked for clarification of the driveway connection between the existing and proposed parking areas.

Mr. Phillabaum said the proposed parking lot appears to connect to the existing service area behind the 7003 Post building.

Mr. Hahn asked who is responsible for construction of the public street.

Mr. Phillabaum said it was his understanding that infrastructure such as this was the city's obligation under the terms of the Economic Development Agreement.

Gary Gunderman asked Barb Cox for an estimated date of completion for the new road segment.

Ms. Cox stated she believed it was planned for construction to be completed by November 2014.

Mr. Gunderman asked if there were any further questions or comments regarding this application. [There were none]. He confirmed this case would be discussed at next week's Administrative Review Team meeting with a recommendation to the Planning & Zoning Commission scheduled for January 9, 2014.

## **CASE REVIEW**

### **2. 13-117BP – BSC Historic Core District – Dublin Riverview Mixed Use Development – North Riverview Street**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for a Basic Plan Review to construct two mixed-use buildings with retail, restaurant, office, and 27 residential units with a lower level, one-story parking platform located along North Riverview Street at the intersection with Blacksmith Lane. She said this Basic Plan Review is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.057-153.066.

Ms. Rauch said this case was introduced at last week's ART meeting and staff met yesterday to discuss the proposal. She reported that staff had several higher-level concerns and were requesting more information on economic development and expectations of the applicant to understand the pieces of this project.

Ms. Rauch said the proposed podium apartment building is not a permitted building type. She said the majority of the building type requirements had been met but there are concerns with the overall scale and design of project. She said she had requested one of the City's architectural consultants, Jonathan Barnes, to review the proposal. She stated that among some of the considerations, staff was concerned that:

- A sky bridge between the buildings is not appropriate in the Historic District;
- Trash removal including restaurant receptacles does not appear to be functional;

- Maneuverability for parking spaces off of North Riverview Street is not functional as proposed and the head-in parking spaces do not meet current parking requirements; and
- Provision of open space is minimal even with the City's intent of purchasing parcels to the east across North Riverview Street along the Scioto River.

Colleen Gilger asked about the topography of the land east of North Riverview Street.

Gary Gunderman replied the majority is floodplain.

Fred Hahn said he would like to see some provision of open space on site. He said it is the intent of the site that concerns him, not the quality of the parkland.

Dan Phillabaum said the intent is to contribute open space to the existing park but first they have to provide usable space with this project.

Mr. Hahn said what the applicant is proposing is not a deal breaker in his opinion.

Ms. Rauch said an option for stormwater has been proposed but the applicant should consider more sustainable practices rather than underground storage alone.

Barb Cox asked if a green roof was proposed.

Ms. Rauch said there are issues with the site plan as the property lines and right-of-way details have not been provided and are not clear.

Ms. Gilger asked if Blacksmith Lane was expected to be a one-way or a two-way street, since it appeared that the building would be very close to the street.

Mr. Phillabaum said it is two-way with two, 11-foot travel lanes.

Mr. Hahn inquired about whether there was a planned service area off of Blacksmith Lane for loading and unloading for the commercial uses.

Mr. Phillabaum said there were two parallel spaces designated for loading, but space is still likely to be an issue.

Ms. Cox said the dimensions from the intersection have not been provided.

Mr. Harpham noted the following general shortcomings in the application documents that have the potential of substantially impacting the design of the Basic Plan:

- The exiting provided for the residential portion of both the North and South Structure, which does not comply with the requirements of the Ohio Building Code (OBC).
- Additional exit stairs will be required.

- Accessible parking has not been accommodated for the residential units. Two spaces will be lost to the introduction of van accessible parking spaces in the buildings. Three spaces shown in the South Building cannot be utilized and one space will be lost when the two accessible parking spaces shown for the commercial tenants are properly configured with the required access space.
- The refuse chutes open directly onto the corridors and do not, therefore, comply with the OBC. The receiving rooms for refuse are inadequately designed and are not on the level of the living units. As drawn, the refuse chutes do not work for the first living floor.
- Building Standards will prepare a detailed analysis of the Basic Plan for distribution at the next meeting.

Mr. Hahn noted that trash service, loading areas, and similar spaces should not be an afterthought.

Mr. Harpham agreed. He said that the Building Code issues, the lack of a clear plan for building serviceability, and the lack of open spaces on the site, was very concerning.

Mr. Phillabaum asked about the bridge height and if it would be an issue for Fire.

Mr. Perkins said he would check, but it appeared that there would be enough clearance beneath the connector for a fire truck.

Mr. Gunderman asked for the proposed story dimensions.

Mr. Phillabaum said based on materials submitted earlier, there appears to be an approximate story height of 10 feet.

Mr. Harpham said he could not make a recommendation on this proposal without more detailed elevations to understand the height and dimensions of the proposed buildings.

Mr. Phillabaum said elevations showing the skywalk more clearly would be necessary, showing proposed materials and how it will look, to determine its appropriateness for this area.

Mr. Harpham said the skywalk will not be transparent and will block views toward the river. He requested that, in addition to elevations, he would like more information about how the fire trucks are expected to maneuver under the bridge.

Mr. Gunderman noted that the 28-day recommendation deadline is December 27, 2013.

Ms. Rauch recommended a time extension for this application to allow the applicant to address the need for additional information on the project.

Mr. Tyler said design development drawings are needed.

Mr. Gunderman summarized that fundamental design issues need to be clarified. He recommended further review next week with the applicant present. He asked the ART if there were any additional questions or concerns. [There were none.] He said Thursday, December

26, 2013, is the target Administrative Review Team recommendation to the Architectural Review Board, after he determined who would be in attendance for both the December 26, 2013 and January 2, 2014 meetings.

## **DETERMINATION**

### **3. 13-118MPR – BSC Commercial District – Red Rooster Quilt Shop – Building Expansion – 48 Corbins Mill Drive**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for a 1,258-square-foot building addition to an Existing Structure for an existing retail use, located to the east side of Corbins Mill Drive approximately 200 feet south of the intersection with West Bridge Street. She said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said the applicant, Kevin O'Connor, is present. She said this case was introduced last week and the proposal includes an addition on the north side, which is not required to meet all of the building type requirements of the Bridge Street Code because it is an expansion of an Existing Structure. She reported that one of the City's architectural consultants, Mark Ford, with Ford & Associates Architects, had reviewed the proposal and recommended the following:

1. False windows need to be trimmed out;
2. The proposed door specification should be provided to ensure compatibility with the proposed windows and building details;
3. The windows on the addition should match; and
4. Window types should be specified.

Kevin O'Connor said the windows are all single pane, not double hung windows.

Ms. Ray said the addition can look different if the overall architectural character is intact. She said the color palette needs to be specified on the plans submitted at building permitting.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the one window facing the parking lot with divided lights.

Mr. O'Connor said it is an aluminum clad casement window. He said he plans to match the existing windows or keep very close to what is there now, which is a bronze metal.

Ms. Ray said the windows on the west elevation have shutters and wood trim, which should be consistent among all of the proposed windows.

Ms. Ray noted there are additional conditions such as provision of bicycle parking spaces, a landscape area on the east side of the addition, and that the applicant obtain an easement encroachment for the sanitary sewer easement. She said the Code requires one bicycle parking space for every 10 required vehicle parking spaces.

Mr. O'Connor asked for clarification on the condition specific to the provision of additional turf area.

Ms. Ray said space allowing for foundation landscaping should be provided on the east side of the addition to appear finished. She asked about the maneuverability with the curve.

Mr. O'Connor said if the landscape area extends too far out, it would impact the turn radius for the parking lot drive aisle. He explained there is a drop off area for customers that he did not want to conflict with additional landscaping. In addition, he said he would want to make sure there was enough green space for something to grow, and he was not sure there was space.

Ms. Ray recommended that the applicant take a look at the plans and the space available and work with Planning to determine if there is enough space to provide foundation landscaping that will not conflict with the easement.

Ms. Ray stated that the applicant would need to record the easement encroachment before the building permit is issued.

Barb Cox said it involves a simple form with a notarized signature and fee of \$340.

Mr. O'Connor clarified the process with Ms. Cox.

Mr. Gunderman asked the ART if there were any additional questions or concerns. [There were none.] He confirmed that the applicant had a chance to review all conditions and that they were satisfied as written. He concluded that the Administrative Review Team approves this Minor Project Review application in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G) with the following four conditions:

1. That the following modifications and clarifications to the proposed architectural elevations be completed with the building permit submittal, subject to Planning approval:
  - a) Provide an exterior color and finish materials palette for review for compatibility with the existing building finishes and colors, including gutters, downspouts, and trim.
  - b) Clarify if any existing exterior finishes are to be modified.
  - c) Provide a specification for the paneled door to the parking lot demonstrating consistency with the proposed windows and other building details.
  - d) Define the proposed window units, including materials and colors, consistent with the architectural consultant's comments.
  - e) The wood trim to match the window jambs on the east and west elevations should be provided at the jamb sides of the false window openings on the north elevation where the shutters are sealed closed.
  - f) That all windows be trimmed and detailed in the same manner as the windows proposed on the west elevation.
  - g) That appropriate shutter hardware be installed with the shutters.
2. That additional landscape area be provided along the east side of the proposed addition, with foundation plantings provided along the north and east sides of the building consistent with Code Section 153.065(D)(7), subject to Planning approval;
3. That two bicycle parking spaces meeting applicable Code requirements be provided on the plans submitted for building permitting, subject to Planning approval; and

4. That the applicant obtain and record an Easement Encroachment Agreement prior to issuance of a building permit.

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

Mr. Gunderman asked if there were any further items of discussion. [There were none.]  
The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 pm.