



**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

DECEMBER 19, 2013

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

Other Staff: Dan Phillabaum, Senior Planner; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Kristin Yorko, Civil Engineer; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicant: Paul Ghidotti, Bob White, Chris Tumblin, and Tucker Bohm, Daimler Group; Greg Chillog and Michael Gathof, Edge Group; Jessica Chouteau, EMH&T, Craig Rutkowski, Moody Nolan Architects; Thomas Raabe and Donna Goss, Ohio University.

Gary Gunderman called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 12, 2013, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The 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 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 this case was introduced at last week's ART meeting and an overview of the project was presented to the Planning & Zoning Commission (PZC) as an informal review and non-binding discussion on December 5, 2013. He said the building location, parking, and vision for the next phase were shared with the PZC. He stated that the applicant, Paul Ghidotti, was present along with many others associated with this project in order to cover any questions or concerns the ART members may have outstanding.

Fred Hahn raised the question of stormwater and asked if the applicants could explain the plan for stormwater and landscaping in that area, given its prominent location.

Kristin Yorko asked about the dry basin and also expressed interest in the landscape plan, which Mr. Phillabaum responded by saying there was no landscape plan submitted for the area of the dry basin.

Claudia Husak mentioned that in previous discussions staff advised against the use of dry basins and PZC is typically not in favor of them. She said the stormwater basin along Industrial Parkway was accordingly revised to a pond, but this new dry basin along Post Road was never discussed previously.

Paul Ghidotti said the dry basin is currently located where a future building may be constructed and did not want to develop the area to the point that it would be difficult to change later. He said there was an old driveway there that has since been relocated farther west. He stated that he understands the requirements for a dry basin and is willing to accept conditions the City may recommend, if it will not impact the construction of a future building.

Jeff Tyler said a dry basin may not be appropriate for stormwater management and suggested the applicant consider a more sustainable alternative, recommending a bio swale.

Mr. Phillabaum suggested that Code provisions encourage sustainable parking lot design and permeable pavement could assist with stormwater management.

Mr. Ghidotti replied that concepts of permeable pavement are costly and durability is a concern. He said the dry basin is meant to be temporary, and could be eliminated in a couple of years.

Mr. Phillabaum questioned the lot arrangement and pointed out that there is a building setback issue created by the existing lot lines, and asked if the lots will be combined. He also asked if the pond along Post Road could be modified to a wet pond and create an entry feature at this existing entry drive.

Mr. Ghidotti answered that the lots would be combined.

Tucker Bohm, Daimler Group, addressed the potential for a wet pond in this area and stated that there is an existing water meter pit to the west side of pond and several existing utility easements running through this portion of the site that would make it difficult.

Mr. Phillabaum expressed his understanding of their objectives but asked that they provide information on landscaping regardless of their expressed temporary vision for this dry basin.

Ms. Husak requested that a clearer boundary be shown more predominantly on the development plan.

Colleen Gilger asked the applicant if they were any closer to a master plan. Mr. Ghidotti said he would check the status.

Alan Perkins was pleased with the fire access and stated the hydrant placement meets requirements. He expressed the need for autoturn analysis to confirm if vehicles could adequately maneuver through the site. He asked if a utility or water room was on the northeast corner of the first floor and proposed a wall mounted fire department connection with a fire hydrant placed within 100 feet. He stressed that landscaping cannot block the view of the fire department connection. He would also like to see access closer to the dumpster, etc.

Kristin Yorke had reviewed the list of comments from Barb Cox in her absence and noted the following concerns:

- The “land swap” for the property along the entrance drive from Post Road needs to be clarified to show the property line coinciding with the drive as it exists today and that it is recorded properly.
- The proposed parking field is over their existing sanitary sewer service for the existing buildings, which may need clean outs/manholes or additions to maintain access to this sewer for maintenance.
- A guardrail is needed on the edge of the western pond and possibly on the northern edge along Post Road.
- A public sewer along the western north/south property line needs to be verified and could provide sewer service to the new building. The existing sewer on-site is constructed out of clay pipe.
- Gates or removable bollards should be considered to limit the vehicle traffic through the plaza area but allow emergency services.
- The distance to the proposed drive on the new north/south road needs to be noted from the center line to the roundabout.
- The southern pipe system into the western pond from the parking field is too close to the outlet, which causes short circuiting of the pond. The design needs to be verified with the Stormwater Management Design Manual.

Mr. Ghidotti said the parcel line will be adjusted on the plan, which will also resolve the setback issue.

Ms. Yorke commented that it is hard to see what is existing and what is proposed and requested better plans.

Mr. Phillabaum suggested the best approach for determining lot coverage would be to treat the entire ±60 acre campus as a whole and ensuring that with each subsequent phase of development the lot coverage maximum is not exceeded. He said that he was currently reviewing the landscape plans with Brian Martin, Zoning Inspector.

Mr. Phillabaum started a discussion on the parking requirement and asked the applicant to be more specific about their proposed parking needs. He noted that the third floor plans for the building show nothing beyond the shell, and could not calculate classrooms, auditoriums, offices, etc. He also noted that the parking calculation provided appeared to be from the standard Zoning Code, not the Innovation Districts parking requirements.

Mr. Ghidotti responded by saying that he was certain about the use on the first floor and was not certain at this time what the use would be for the second and third floors.

Mr. Phillabaum said if educational use can be stated as the overall intent for the building that numbers could be based on that assumption. Mr. Ghidotti said they are probably light on the amount of parking they are proposing. Mr. Phillabaum stressed that the amount of parking proposed is roughly four times the amount required by standard code calculations for an educational use. He said more information would be needed to understand what the actual parking requirement would be under Innovation District standards. He wanted to know the number of students and employees at maximum capacity and if the proposed parking was intended to accommodate the future building to the south of the one currently proposed. He asked the applicant to more effectively explain their intentions for parking, as this would be a point of considerable focus with both the ART and the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Bob White, Daimler Group, said the parking ratio is similar to that for a medical office.

Mr. Phillabaum stated his concerns that the prominent visibility from the public right of way of the proposed parking location does not comply with the Innovation District requirements and that the future building will require yet additional parking beyond this initial proposal. He said given the layout of the current parking proposed, this additional parking needed in the future will be a considerable distance away from the building.

Ray Harpham brought up the point that eventually, surface parking will have to give way to parking structures. Mr. Ghidotti said parking structures are not in the plan given the abundance of land available. Ms. Husak reiterated the importance of being able to explain parking needs to the PZC who do not want to see a sea of asphalt and would prefer a parking structure.

Mr. Tyler said that even if they are not ready to graphically show a master plan, at a minimum, they need to develop a cohesive concept plan of how parking and stormwater is to be dealt with to share with PZC. Mr. Ghidotti recognized that they are going out of sequence to meet the November 2014 deadline.

Ms. Gilger agreed that the PZC has shown an interest in parking structures and that the lot needs to be well planned. Mr. Ghidotti stated that parking structures are usually considered when there is a limited amount of land and believes that is not the issue here.

Mr. Phillabaum noted that the previous plans did not combine the proposed plaza with vehicular circulation and suggested that this be revised. He understood bollards could be implemented to restrict vehicular access but anticipated that the need for this circulation may be warranted in the future.

Greg Chillog, Edge Group, said this was just a first attempt of what can be expected for Phase 1 and that the plaza may be expanded with the next building proposed.

Ms. Yorke asked if November/December was still the projected move in date. Mr. Ghidotti answered yes.

Mr. Phillabaum said that this plan will continue to be reviewed and the ART determination is scheduled for January 9 for approval to go before the Planning & Zoning Commission on January 23, 2013. He said that we can meet next week with anyone that would like to attend.

Mr. Ghidotti recognized that timing was an issue, due to the holidays. Mr. Phillabaum said the agenda would be distributed on January 10, followed by packets on January 17, so if there were any changes or additions, they would need to be received by January 14. Mr. Ghidotti asked for submission process clarification.

Mr. Phillabaum suggested that time be allowed for a thorough analysis to be completed with Brian Martin, the City's zoning inspector. He said a consolidated letter of that analysis with what was discussed today would be distributed for review. He again stated that parking analysis assumptions would be helpful as it is a major element to the site proposal.

Mr. Ghidotti asked how familiar the ART was with the proposed physician assistant program. He suggested that since not everyone has had the opportunity to read the minutes from the

informal review presented to the PZC on December 5 that he would provide a brief overview. He said that Ohio University plans to open a physician assistant's program in May 2015, which requires accreditation from a national body by November 2014. This would require starting construction March 1, 2014, obtaining the ART's approval, the PZC's approval January 23rd, and submitting a building permit January 10th. He understands this is all out of sequence and is on an accelerated schedule, but it is the only way to achieve a shell and walk thru space. He admits this is a work in progress and does not have all the answers at this time.

Gary Gunderman concluded this case would be on the next agenda for further review. Mr. Ghidotti said by not having a meeting next week, his group could use the time to work on the updates as suggested today.

Mr. Phillabaum stated the ART would review next week, even if the applicant was not present.

Mr. Ghidotti asked if there would be a vote among ART members. Mr. Phillabaum said determinations are made by consensus with conditions in order to make recommendations to go to PZC.

Mr. Gunderman asked if there were any other questions or concerns.

Mr. White asked how to best justify their need for parking. Mr. Phillabaum suggested they provide a better description of their unique use and part of that could be a comparison to medical office use.

Mr. Tyler warned the applicant to be careful because using the medical office use might address the number of spaces but not the design of the parking. Mr. Hahn suggested that whatever the logic is, that it be put in a more narrative form since the Code requirement was both for numbers of spaces required and the layout were not a perfect fit for the use proposed and Mr. Tyler agreed.

Mr. Ghidotti asked if the Code is just used as a guide and not used to mandate. Ms. Husak answered by saying a starting point is needed. She said for example if our Code requires 92 spaces, the applicant would then have to "sell" the need for 400 spaces. Mr. Phillabaum thought most of PZC understood the request but a number is needed as well as an improved configuration.

Mr. Tyler and Mr. Phillabaum were both interested in what the future plans were for parking to accommodate an additional building.

Mr. Ghidotti said prettier elevations and connectivity will be provided for January.

Mr. Gunderman asked when a master plan would be available for OU. Thomas Raabe with OU answered, someday. He said a consultant had been hired and a first reading of that study will be done in March/April.

Jessica Chouteau with EMH&T said they will address the physical elements.

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.

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

Dan Phillabaum presented this case for Jenny Rauch and 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. He said this Basic Plan Review is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.057-153.066.

Mr. Phillabaum reported that this case was reviewed at last week's ART meeting and although Gerry Bird, the applicant, was not in attendance, he said that prior to last week's ART meeting, a general staff meeting was held to review the application and identify the major issues. He said that Gerry Bird informed them that he would not be able to attend today's ART meeting and that a time extension would likely be requested.

Mr. Phillabaum asked the ART if any additional issues or concerns with the application had come to light.

Ray Harpham said that he was creating a memo to recap the details of his analysis and this would be made available to the ART and the applicant.

Mr. Phillabaum added that the minutes from last week's meeting would also be sent to the applicant. He said at this stage the type of input is focused on the larger, transformational issues with the proposal as opposed to more detailed items, but added that we will provide any and all comments to the applicant for their consideration as revisions are made in the future. He informed the ART that Jon Barnes, an architect, had been brought in as a consultant to review the architecture as it relates to the context and mass, scale, height, etc.

Mr. Harpham suggested that the applicant provide photos of transparent walkways and connections to address the concerns the ART has with the purported transparency of this element proposed by the applicant.

Jeff Tyler suggested that Jon Barnes be provided a copy of the comment letter, as it may impact his review.

Gary Gunderman asked if there were any other comments from the ART. [There were none.] He recommended further review next week with the applicant present. 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.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Gunderman asked if there were any further items of discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.