



**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 26, 2013

ART Members: Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Administrator; and Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer.

Other Staff: Dan Phillabaum, Senior Planner; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jordan Fromm, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Rachel Ray called the meeting to order. She said there were no minutes to be approved at this meeting, and the minutes from the December 19th ART meeting would be available for the January 2nd ART meeting.

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 provided some recent updates. He reported that he and Brian Martin, Zoning Inspector, had visited the site on December 20 to evaluate the condition and placement of the existing trees. He said there were two significant, mature Maple trees that will remain on site but some of the other trees are not worth saving as they have been cropped at the top to allow for utility lines, which will not affect the layout.

Mr. Phillabaum said there is no master plan for the campus. He said he was conducting some analysis of the site plan overlaid onto the street network to gain a better understanding of the site layout and property lines. He pointed out the proposed street connections and where the applicant is showing a slight realignment of the future roadway extension from the roundabout. He said that the lack of a master plan could create problems due to the inability to assess the site beyond the proposed building, parking, and pond, which hinders our ability to see everything in context.

Fred Hahn asked if we could expect even a conceptual drawing before this moves forward. Colleen Gilger said she did not anticipate that Ohio University would have anything to show for several months. She pointed out that Daimler will own the proposed building. She said it is her expectation that the whole campus could develop as a series of individual buildings.

Mr. Phillabaum expressed concerns about the proposed alignments of the property lines and several ART members agreed. A brief discussion of the street alignments and site constraints driving the proposed alignments ensued.

Mr. Phillabaum said the exact alignment of the roads can be tweaked to some extent.

Mr. Hahn noted that the southernmost piece of land to the south of the OU campus has a creek that runs through the property so the future roundabout cannot be shifted farther to the south but could be moved farther west.

Ms. Gilger noted these are public streets and the north roundabout is in a fixed location. She said subarea three would not be deeded to OU and would instead be made available for future development partnerships between OU and the City.

Mr. Phillabaum said the applicant plans to file building permits in two weeks, which makes working within this accelerated time frame a challenge.

Mr. Hahn asked how the applicant plans to explain the parking ratio to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) and if they were planning to present more substantive changes since the last meeting with the Commission on December 5, 2013.

Ray Harpham asked the extent to which PZC will be involved in the review and determination on this proposal, and how well the applicant is processing the feedback and recommendations. Several ART members stated that the applicant heard the overwhelmingly positive remarks about the architecture but not as much with regards to the sea of asphalt proposed for parking. Several options to possibly resolve this issue were discussed such as reconfigurations and the addition of trees planted within parking lot islands to strike a better balance.

Mr. Harpham asked about the pond with relation to the road as it was not clearly identified.

Mr. Hahn asked about the design of the pond. Mr. Phillabaum said a stormwater report had been submitted, so he did not expect the design of the pond to change.

Mr. Harpham questioned whether the ART needed much more thorough site plans showing the proposal in context to be able to conduct a more thorough analysis on which to base our recommendations.

Rachel Ray asked Mr. Phillabaum to clarify the timing of this application.

Mr. Phillabaum stated that the ART's determination is scheduled for January 9 for the applicant to proceed to the PZC on the 23rd. He said that during the weekly meetings with the applicant, they have discussed the expectations for the West Innovation District. He said similar to the Bridge Street District, PZC will be asked to review the elements that do not meet the Code requirements.

Several ART members reiterated their concern about the site layout, and said questions about the overall site and master plan would need to be directed to OU rather than Daimler.

Mr. Hahn suggested that if applicable, the applicant should describe how the proposed parking is a temporary remedy to their immediate needs and the future vision is a work in progress.

Mr. Harpham asked if there was anything the members could do to help. Mr. Phillabaum said he was still completing the case analysis, which he would send out for review and input when it is complete.

Mr. Phillabaum said he plans to meet with the applicant next week and impress upon them the need for a vision for the area, factoring in the transportation network for the West Innovation District.

Ms. Gilger noted the City's desire to minimize any right-of-way encroachment on the adjacent property to the west.

Mr. Phillabaum asked Alan Perkins if he had received the plans for the turnaround yet. Mr. Perkins said he had not and had concerns with maintaining fire access to the existing buildings.

Mr. Phillabaum asked the ART if there were any additional questions or concerns or any further items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.