City of Dublin
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

City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission

History

Thursday, June 20, 2013

13-052PP
Preliminary Plat
BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center Rights-of-Way Plat

building located on the north side of Tuller Road at the intersection with Village Parkway, however the application is being withdrawn. She said Planning has reviewed the proposal as well as the applicable Zoning Code provisions and has determined that a sales facility of this nature without any exterior changes is a permitted use and no further review is needed.

3. 13-051MPR – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – AMC Theater – Signs – 6700 Village Parkway

Jonathan Lee said this is a request for two new permanent wall signs to replace existing wall signs for an existing movie theater in the Dublin Village Center, located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Tuller Road and Village Parkway. He said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Mr. Lee presented the proposed site plan and explained that the proposed replacement signs will be internally illuminated channel letters.

Rachel Ray said the property owner has been meeting with staff on behalf of AMC to discuss more significant façade improvements, but their intent is to obtain approvals for the signs only at this time. She said there were several sign variances that were approved for this site a number of years ago that need to be reviewed prior to the ART's determination on this proposal next week.

Mr. Langworthy asked how this site was permitted to have two signs. Ms. Ray said she believed they were a result of the variances granted for this site, and since the variances run with the land, would still be in effect for this site. She noted that under the new sign regulations, two signs would be permitted because a new street will be platted south of the theater, which would provide two frontages for signs.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the Administrative Review Team members had any further comments or questions at this time. [There were none.]

Ms. Ray said the target Administrative Review Team determination for this proposal is Thursday, June 13, 2013.

4. 13-052PP – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center Preliminary Plat – Tuller Road & Village Parkway

Claudia Husak said this is a request to plat approximately 7.166 acres of right-of-way for new public streets and associated infrastructure in the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District, located west of Sawmill Road, south of Tuller Road, and east of Village Parkway. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations, Section 152.020.

Ms. Husak reviewed the proposed preliminary plat showing streets, lots, easements, and rights-of-way.

Barb Cox noted that the drawings show future improvements that are not necessary for the preliminary plat and asked that they be removed.

Ms. Husak said there is a general staff meeting on Friday afternoon. She said she would like to mark up a set of plans with all of staff's comments to return to the applicant in order to turn this application around for the Planning and Zoning Commission packets at the end of next week.

Ms. Husak reported that original signatures were still needed on the application, since a portion of the plat involves an adjacent property.

Steve Langworthy pointed out that the plans still show the right-in driveway to the AMC theater off of John Shields Parkway. He noted that that driveway should also be removed from the plat and that his understanding was that the City Engineer was not supportive of the driveway.

Ms. Husak said that if the applicant does not remove the driveway, they could make its removal a condition of approval of the Preliminary Plat at the Planning and Zoning Commission's review.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments on the application at this time. [There were none.]

Ms. Husak said the target Administrative Review Team recommendation is Thursday, June 13, to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their June 20, 2013 meeting.

5. 13-049DP-BSC – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center – Edwards Apartment Building – Tuller Road & Village Parkway

Rachel Ray said this is a request for review of an approximately 324-unit podium apartment building to be constructed on an approximately 6.4 acre site with approximately 7.82 acres of new public streets and 7.78 acres of off-site improvements in the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. She said this is a request for Development Plan Review by the Administrative Review Team under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E).

Ms. Ray reviewed the application submittal, including the proposed rights-of-way, interior blocks, lots, street types, existing conditions, and the neighborhood standards.

Steve Langworthy said the proposed street sections should be depicted on the plans.

Ms. Ray said the applicant will need to provide an interim plan for the period of time following the demolition showing the "temporary" conditions of the parking lots, new streets, and associated landscaping until new development is proposed on the adjacent development blocks.

Barb Cox said she had requested that the applicant make the mid-block pedestrian crossings eight feet in width, which is wider than they would typically be, so that they would be more noticeable to vehicles. She stated that there is a meeting with the project engineer on Friday to review the outstanding items of concern such as the ownership and maintenance of the retaining walls within the right-of-way.

Fred Hahn asked if the Development Plan application was intended to include the resolution for the provision of required open space.

Ms. Ray noted that the open space proposed with the Development Plan is the same amount of open space shown at the Basic Plan Review, and that the resolution for the provision of required open space would be addressed through the Development Agreement and a future application for development in the center. She stated that the details for the open spaces that are being provided would be addressed with the application for Site Plan Review.

Brian Griffith, Creative Design + Planning, representing the applicant, stated that they were working through the process.

Ms. Ray said that the target ART determination is Thursday, June 27, 2013.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further questions or comments from the ART members at this time. [There were none].

Ms. Husak said that if the applicant does not remove the driveway, they could make its removal a condition of approval of the Preliminary Plat at the Planning and Zoning Commission's review.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments on the application at this time. [There were none.]

Ms. Husak said the target Administrative Review Team recommendation is Thursday, June 13, to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their June 20, 2013 meeting.

5. 13-049DP-BSC – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center – Edwards Apartment Building – Tuller Road & Village Parkway

Rachel Ray said this is a request for review of an approximately 324-unit podium apartment building to be constructed on an approximately 6.4 acre site with approximately 7.82 acres of new public streets and 7.78 acres of off-site improvements in the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. She said this is a request for Development Plan Review by the Administrative Review Team under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E).

Ms. Ray reviewed the application submittal, including the proposed rights-of-way, interior blocks, lots, street types, existing conditions, and the neighborhood standards.

Steve Langworthy said the proposed street sections should be depicted on the plans.

Ms. Ray said the applicant will need to provide an interim plan for the period of time following the demolition showing the "temporary" conditions of the parking lots, new streets, and associated landscaping until new development is proposed on the adjacent development blocks.

Barb Cox said she had requested that the applicant make the mid-block pedestrian crossings eight feet in width, which is wider than they would typically be, so that they would be more noticeable to vehicles. She stated that there is a meeting with the project engineer on Friday to review the outstanding items of concern such as the ownership and maintenance of the retaining walls within the right-of-way.

Fred Hahn asked if the Development Plan application was intended to include the resolution for the provision of required open space.

Ms. Ray noted that the open space proposed with the Development Plan is the same amount of open space shown at the Basic Plan Review, and that the resolution for the provision of required open space would be addressed through the Development Agreement and a future application for development in the center. She stated that the details for the open spaces that are being provided would be addressed with the application for Site Plan Review.

Brian Griffith, Creative Design + Planning, representing the applicant, stated that they were working through the process.

Ms. Ray said that the target ART determination is Thursday, June 27, 2013.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further questions or comments from the ART members at this time. [There were none].

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments from the ART.

Ms. Ray said there will be a determination at the next ART meeting June 6th.

Determinations

None

Pre-Application Case Review

3. **Pre-Application Review (Bridge Street District) – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District - Dublin Village Center – Edwards Apartment Building – Tuller Road and Village Parkway**

Rachel Ray this is a request for pre-application review prior to submission of a Development Plan Application in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(C).

Ms. Ray said the applicant is not present, however they had met earlier in the day to review what is needed for the submission of the Development Plan Review application expected on Friday, May 31, 2013.

Administrative

Mr. Langworthy asked Ms. Ray to provide a brief update regarding potential upcoming applications. Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any changes to the May 23, 2013 meeting minutes. Mr. Langworthy accepted the minutes into the record. Mr. Langworthy confirmed there were no further items of discussion and adjourned the meeting.

City of Dublin

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

MAY 23, 2013

Attendees

Steve Langworthy, Director of Land Use and Long Range Planning; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Dan Phillabaum, Senior Planner; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Director of Building Standards; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Jeremiah Gracia, Economic Development Administrator; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities Development Company; Stephen Caplinger, Creative Design + Planning; Tim Volchko, EMH&T; Brad Parrish, Architectural Alliance; and Flora Rogers, Administrative Assistant.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order.

Case Introductions

None

Determinations

None

Pre-Application Case Review

1. Pre-Application Review (Bridge Street District) – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District - Dublin Village Center – Edwards Apartment Building – Tuller Road and Village Parkway

Rachel Ray said this is a non-binding review of a future application for Development Plan Review for a 324-unit podium apartment building to be constructed on an approximately 6.3-acre site with approximately 7.8 acres of new public streets in the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. She said this is a request for pre-application review prior to submission of a Development Plan application in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(C).

Ms. Ray distributed plans submitted by the applicant and comments prepared by Planning and Engineering.

Ms. Ray reviewed the General Application Requirements including the application form, fee, project description and the description of the conformance to Code Sections 153.060-061 and 153.063.

Ms. Ray reviewed the General Site Plan Elements including the Existing Conditions Plan as shown on Sheet C-1, identifying additional information needed to identify the project area boundaries, defining the site to include all new streets and rights-of-way, new development blocks, and adjacent portions of the site impacted by the new streets/development and to split the existing conditions plan into detail plans to a scale of not more than 1”=100’. She said the

Demolition Plan as shown on Sheet C-2, should include the removal of unnecessary line work to help with the plan's legibility, clearly identifying existing property lines and all areas to be impacted by the demolition. She said that if the parcels to the east of Dublin Center Drive will be impacted beyond the right-of-way, owner authorization will be required. She said the plans should identify the total building square footages to be demolished, and total square footage to remain and to be constructed. Ms. Ray stated that the trees to be removed, including size, species, and their condition should be identified in accordance with Code Section 153.065(D)(9).

Ms. Ray stated that, with respect to the Interim Conditions Plan, Sheet C-3, the plans should identify how existing parking lot access, pedestrian circulation, etc. will be maintained to areas impacted by the demolition and road construction. She referred to the Parking Lot Modifications Plan, Sheet C-4, and requested the removal of unnecessary line work, and that the applicant create labels or some other consistent identifier for each new Block and each new street segment. She requested that the applicant provide detailed plans for each new Block to be created or impacted, showing the new block directly south of the Edwards site as graded and seeded. She stated that the plans should include a calculation of the number of existing parking spaces, and parking spaces to be removed and reconfigured, and the final parking count.

Ms. Ray reviewed the Streets and Utilities Plan, Sheet C-5, noting that the plan is illegible at this scale and with the amount of line work shown, asked that the applicant refer to comments regarding the site information on sheet C-1. She said that intersection modifications at Tuller Road and the new North/South street to the west of the Edwards site, the intersection of Tuller Road and new John Shields Parkway, and Dublin Center Drive and new proposed East/West street south of the Applebee's should be shown, and the plans should also reflect the latest street configurations discussed at the Engineering meeting on Tuesday, May 21, including street sections with permeable pavers on John Shields Parkway, 8-foot sidewalks, 5-foot planting zones with tree grates, and 5-foot cycletracks where appropriate.

Ms. Ray reviewed the Lot and Block Configurations and requested that the plans identify each block dimension for all new blocks created and known open spaces with dimensions and acreages.

Ms Ray reviewed the Neighborhood District Requirements, identifying the areas where terminal vistas will be required, but noted that details should be provided at appropriate Site Plan Reviews. She stated that details related to the proposed pocket parks should also be provided at the Site Plan Reviews, but the locations should be shown on the plans at this time.

Ms. Ray said the applicant needs to provide the proposed preliminary plat and interim reconfigured lot lines as well.

Tim Volchko said these were submitted with the Roadway Package to Engineering on Wednesday, May 22nd.

Ms. Ray asked Ms. Cox to comment on Engineering's preliminary comments on the initial set of plans.

Barb Cox stated that she had prepared Engineering comments and considerations with respect to the Preliminary Plat, the Interim Conditions Plan, Water, Sanitary Sewer, and Stormwater

Management Plans for both the Edwards site as well as the public street network. She also noted comments on the proposed street network plans, including parking lot access, mid-block crossings, driveway intersections, street lighting, bicycle parking, and the parallel spaces shown on Tuller Road. Ms. Cox noted that she had shared this information with Rob Ferguson, also with EMH&T, the representative for the applicant at the Tuesday May, 21st Engineering meeting.

Ms. Ray asked if there were any other questions or concerns from the ART at this time. Ms. Ray said Planning and Engineering had scheduled a meeting for this upcoming Friday, May 24th to discuss some of the comments noted by Engineering, and will provide the appropriate information and conclusions to the applicants.

Ms. Ray concluded the discussion regarding the pre-application review to discuss architecture while Stephen Caplinger arranged for Pete Edwards to join the meeting via conference call. She noted that the applicant had requested the opportunity to discuss questions related to the architectural requirements in preparation for the Site Plan Review application for the Edwards project.

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, representing the applicant, led the discussion on architecture. He requested clarification on Code requirements related to horizontal and vertical façade divisions, roof pitches, roof ridge breaks, window types, shutter details, terminal vista requirements, first floor opacity calculations for parking garages, podium parking garage ceiling height, balcony encroachments into setbacks, balcony depth calculation, and dumpster/compactor location and design.

Pete Edwards commented with respect to his concern for the expense associated with the public improvements and how far the TIF funds were projected to stretch to cover these expenses.

Jeff Tyler asked for details related to dryer vents and the exterior treatments required.

Steve Simonetti said they would like the opportunity to provide examples of window treatments and details related to the high quality material as well as using vinyl as a building material for the façade of the interior courtyards.

Mr. Edwards commented on the use of vinyl siding as a high quality, durable, and low maintenance building material.

Steve Langworthy agreed to note the areas of clarification necessary within the ordinance regarding the architectural requirements.

Administrative

Mr. Langworthy asked Ms. Ray to provide a brief update regarding potential upcoming applications. Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any changes to the May 16, 2013 meeting minutes. Mr. Langworthy accepted the minutes into the record. Mr. Langworthy confirmed there were no further items of discussion and adjourned the meeting.

City of Dublin
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

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

MAY 16, 2013

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center
Edwards Apartment Building **Tuller Road and Village Parkway**
13-031BPR **Basic Plan Review**

Proposal:	To construct a 324-unit podium apartment building on a 8.32-acre site, on the north side of a new public street in the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District northeast of the existing AMC Theater.
Request:	Review and approval of Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D).
Applicant:	Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities.
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4656, rray@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #1: To approve the requests for the following two Development Plan Waivers: 1) Table 153.060-A-Maximum Block Dimensions - To permit two new blocks to exceed the maximum block dimensions; and 2) 153.063(C)(5)(a) – Shopping Corridor - To not be required to provide a mixed use "shopping corridor" as part of this development.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The two Development Plan Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Joseph Budde	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes

City of Dublin
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

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

MAY 16, 2013

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center
Edwards Apartment Building **Tuller Road and Village Parkway**
13-031BPR **Basic Plan Review**

Proposal:	To construct a 324-unit podium apartment building on a 8.32-acre site, on the north side of a new public street in the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District northeast of the existing AMC Theater.
Request:	Review and approval of Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D).
Applicant:	Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities.
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4656, rray@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #2: To approve this application for Basic Plan Review (Development Plan) under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D), with 12 conditions:

1) That the applicant coordinate driveway access along John Shields Parkway (Street Segment 1) to direct pedestrian activity, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
2) That driveway access points along the neighborhood streets (Street Segments 2 and 3) be coordinated and aligned, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
3) That heightened architectural detailing and an open space node be provided at the intersection of Street Segments 1 (John Shields Parkway) and 2 at the southwest corner of Block B;
4) That the applicant work with the property owner to reconfigure the proposed open space to provide the required open space "node" at the intersection of Street Segments 1 and 2, with open spaces (pocket plazas or pocket parks) at a minimum of three, if not all four corners of the intersection and provide the minimum required 1.49 acres of open space on-site and/or within 660 ft. of the development site;
5) That the applicant submit a demolition plan in addition to a plan for the interim site conditions, including grading, seeding, parking lot reconfiguration, etc. as part of the Development Plan Review;
6) That the applicant coordinate the timing of the improvements to Tuller Road with the City Engineer;
7) That the applicant provide a phasing plan as part of the Development Plan Review;
8) That the applicant provide all necessary public and private infrastructure plans as part of the Development Plan Review;
9) That the applicant provide a designated bicycle way and enhanced pedestrian pathways on John Shields Parkway;

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center
Edwards Apartment Building **Tuller Road and Village Parkway**
13-031BPR **Basic Plan Review**

Motion #2 (Continued)

10) That the applicant provide additional sidewalk width on the eastern north-south street;
11) That the applicant work with staff to address concerns regarding theater exits and safe roadway crossings for pedestrians; and
12) That the applicant provide greater architectural detailing at the terminal vista of a potential road connection east of the proposed apartment building.

*Ben W. Hale, Jr., Smith & Hale, representing the applicant, agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Basic Plan Review (Development Plan) was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Joseph Budde	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes

City of Dublin
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

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

MAY 16, 2013

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center
Edwards Apartment Building **Tuller Road and Village Parkway**
13-031BPR **Basic Plan Review**

Proposal:	To construct a 324-unit podium apartment building on a 8.32-acre site, on the north side of a new public street in the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District northeast of the existing AMC Theater.
Request:	Review and approval of Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D).
Applicant:	Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities.
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4656, rray@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #3: To disapprove the requested Site Plan Waiver to Zoning Code Section 153.062(E)(1) – Façade Materials, Permitted Primary Materials, to permit the use of vinyl siding as a permitted façade material.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The requested Site Plan Waiver was disapproved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Joseph Budde	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes

City of Dublin
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

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

MAY 16, 2013

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center
Edwards Apartment Building **Tuller Road and Village Parkway**
13-031BPR **Basic Plan Review**

Proposal:	To construct a 324-unit podium apartment building on a 8.32-acre site, on the north side of a new public street in the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District northeast of the existing AMC Theater.
Request:	Review and approval of Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D).
Applicant:	Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities.
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4656, rray@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #4: To approve the Basic Plan Review for the Site Plan with nine conditions:

1) That the ridge lines parallel to the streets be interrupted to meet Code Section 153.062(D)(2)(c);
2) That the applicant provide a pedestrian circulation plan demonstrating safe access to the building for residents and visitors;
3) That the building's architecture be modified to provide the appropriate vertical façade divisions (no spans greater than 40 feet), horizontal façade divisions (detailing required within 3 feet of the top of the ground story), and required change in roof plane (changes required every 80 feet) to meet the Podium Apartment Building Type requirement;
4) That Pocket Park D be redesigned to eliminate the proposed bioretention facility and reconfigure the stormwater management facilities (if needed) to maintain usable, accessible open space area;
5) That the applicant provide publicly available bicycle parking facilities within the streetscape and within the pocket parks and plazas for visitors and residents;
6) That the applicant provide additional details regarding the parking structure operation and circulation at the Site Plan Review;
7) That the surface parking lot plans be modified to provide a street wall consistent with Section 153.065(E) with the landscape treatment required by Sections 153.065(D)(5)(a) and (c);
8) That the applicant work with Planning and Engineering to reevaluate the proposed dumpster location in relation to the proposed right-of-way, prior to Site Plan Review; and

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center
Edwards Apartment Building **Tuller Road and Village Parkway**
13-031BPR **Basic Plan Review**

Motion #4 (Continued)

9) That the applicant work with the City to execute a suitable agreement that provides the full amount of required open space as required by Code as part of a future phase development of the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District.

* Ben W. Hale, Jr., Smith & Hale representing the applicant, agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Basic Plan Review (Site Plan) was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Joseph Budde	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 14.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

MAY 16, 2013

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center
Edwards Apartment Building **Tuller Road and Village Parkway**
13-031BPR **Basic Plan Review**

Proposal:	To construct a 324-unit podium apartment building on a 8.32-acre site, on the north side of a new public street in the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District northeast of the existing AMC Theater.
Request:	Review and approval of Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D).
Applicant:	Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities.
Planning Contact:	Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4656, rray@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #5: To disapprove the request for payment of a Fee-in-Lieu of open space land dedication.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The request was disapproved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Joseph Budde	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Rachel S. Ray

Rachel S. Ray, AICP
Planner II

Motion and Vote
Mr. Taylor moved to accept the May 2, 2013 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Hardt seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes (Approved 7 – 0.)

Administrative Business
Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She determined that the cases would be heard in the order of the published agenda.

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center
Edwards Apartment Building **Tuller Road and Village Parkway**
13-031BPR **Basic Plan Review**

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application Basic Plan Review to construct a 324-unit podium apartment building on an 8.32-acre site, on the north side of a new public street in the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District northeast of the existing AMC Theater. She said this Basic Plan Review application is in anticipation of Development Plan and Site Plan Review applications and is proposed in accordance with the Zoning Code. She noted that this application also includes requests for Site and Development Plan Waivers and a request for Open Space Fee-In-Lieu. She said the Commission will be required to make five motions.

Rachel Ray said that they are pleased to present this Basic Plan Review for the Edwards Podium Apartment Building within Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. She explained that this is the first step in the development application process and includes requests for Development Plan and Site Plan Waivers that have been identified at this early stage of the proposal that require review and determination by the Commission, and involves a request to pay a fee-in-lieu of providing the full public open space dedication requirement.

Ms. Ray presented a site plan of the location of the Dublin Village Center shopping center located west of Sawmill Road, south of I-270 and Tuller Road, with the AMC Theater in the western portion of the shopping center and the Applebee's restaurant in the eastern portion facing Dublin Center Drive.

Ms. Ray provided an outline of the presentation as this is the first significant Bridge Street District project of this nature and scale, and she said she wanted to review the application and process to clarify the current stages and status of the project, the steps that will follow, and what is going to be requested of the Commission as part of the request for Basic Plan Review. She said that at the end of the presentation she will have the applicant spend some time discussing their project as well as responding to some of the issues that have been raised in the ART Report to the Commission.

Ms. Ray explained that as staff had been meeting with potential developers, architects and designers and presenting the Code in various forums, potential applicants were encouraged to meet with staff early and often, the purpose of which was to make sure that when they are ready to bring forward an application that they have a substantial understanding of the Code requirements and how that impacts their project. She said that this applicant has embraced that "early and often" process and are pleased to let the Commission know that the applicant has been meeting with staff on a regular basis even before the application was filed. She said if, however, an applicant doesn't meet with staff prior to submitting an application, there is a Pre-Application Review process built in to the Code that makes sure that once an application is ready to be filed that they have all the appropriate materials that are necessary to make sure they have a complete submittal for review.

Ms. Ray said the first step is the Basic Plan Review application, and this requires an Administrative Review Team review and recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission with a determination within 28 days from the submittal of the complete application. She said the purpose of the Basic Plan

Review is to outline the scope, character, and nature of the proposed development, and the process allows the required reviewing body (which in this case is the Planning and Zoning Commission, but might end up being the Architectural Review Board for projects in the Historic District) to evaluate the proposal for its general consistency with the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Plan as well as the Bridge Street zoning regulations. She noted that the Basic Plan Review also provided the opportunity for public input at the earliest stages of the development process.

Ms. Ray said the Basic Plan Review is required prior to submission of applications for Development Plan and Site Plan Review and since the applicant will be filing both those applications in the near future, this Basic Plan Review application includes the Basic Plan Review for both. She said the Commission is required to make a determination on the Basic Plan Review proposal to either approve, approve with conditions or deny the request.

Ms. Ray said since the applicant has already identified some of the Development Plan and Site Plan Waivers and their desire to pay a fee-in-lieu of dedicating all of the required open space, all of which require Planning and Zoning Commission review and determination, those requests have been combined with the Basic Plan Review process. She said following the Commission determination on the Basic Plan Review the next steps are the Development Plan and Site Plan Review applications and they can be filed concurrently or separately and are only required to receive Administrative Review Team review with a determination required within 28 days from the submission of a complete application.

Ms. Ray said the Development Plan Review looks at development project elements including the street network, the lots and blocks, and elements typical of what would be included in a subdivision plat which also requires review and recommendation to City Council by the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said Site Plan Review is required for all other developments that do not qualify as Minor Project Reviews. She stated that the Site Plan Review includes the specific building design and materials, open space details and all other site development standards including landscaping, parking, building materials, signs and lighting. She reported that the Administrative Review Team's review is the final step before building permitting.

Ms. Ray said the provision of publically accessible open spaces are intended to be planned and incorporated in concert with proposed development projects to the extent possible, rather than purchased by the City after the fact, using those park land funds generated by those fee-in-lieu of open space dedication payments. She said there might be circumstances in limited situations where payment of a fee might be appropriate, and as such it was included as a process in the Code, but that process does require Planning and Zoning Commission approval.

Ms. Ray presented the proposed development project overview describing the shopping center as a typical auto-oriented center with surface parking located in front of the theater, and noted that the site is served by a series of private drives coming off the public streets that circumscribe the site including Tuller Road to the north, Village Parkway to the west and Dublin Center Drive to the east. She said that a portion of the existing shopping center structures will be demolished as part of this project moving forward. She pointed out an electric transmission line easement along the western portion of the site running in front of the theater that bisects the theater from the rest of the site. Ms. Ray explained that there are new streets proposed to serve the development on the east and west sides of the new building, with the new public street serving as an east/west connector through the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. She said that this street as proposed is to be a District Connector street that will ultimately continue on west and down toward Riverside Drive that will establish the public street network and connect to a new portion of the street recently approved as part of the Vrable Skilled Nursing project.

Ms. Ray said the proposed building is on an approximately 8-acre site and will contain approximately 324 apartment dwelling units making the project approximately 40 dwelling units per acre. She stated that

there are about 519 parking spaces shown at this time to be provided in a private off-street parking lot on the western portion of the site west of the apartment building as well as on-street and principally within the parking structure within the ground story of the proposed building. She reported that in addition to the building and the parking, approximately ½ acre or so of publiclyaccessible open space has been provided with this development as well as 1.6 acres of privately owned and operated open space within the courtyard interiors of the building.

Ms. Ray said this building is referred to as a "podium" apartment building and has two to three stories of apartments on top of the parking garage at the first floor of the building. She explained that the building will be three stories on the southern and northern portions of the site and four stories in the center. She pointed out that there is a clubhouse and management leasing office proposed along the new principal frontage street that will help provide greater pedestrian activity along the street in that area and across from the theater. She noted that there are a few ground level apartment units proposed in the pockets of the ground floor adjacent to the proposed Pocket Parks. She said the materials proposed at this time include brick, glass and siding as primary building materials and they plan to incorporate a higher level of architectural detailing and landscaping along the ground floor where portions of the parking structure would be visible from the street.

Ms. Ray said the portions of the application for consideration under the Development Plan Review include the street network and the blocks created as part of the new streets as shown. She said that anything interior to the new blocks that are being created are not under review as part of this application, since those areas will come forward as future Basic Plan Review applications once the applicant or the owner is ready to develop those particular blocks. She reiterated that the Site Plan Review portion of this application includes the proposed use, the building type, site development standards and the provisions of open spaces.

Ms. Ray said the Administrative Review Team has reviewed the Basic Plan Review application with respect to the review criteria applicable to the Development Plan Review and determined that the proposed block layout is consistent with the objectives of the Code, which is to achieve the walkable block dimensions that place a high value on pedestrian movement and safety and a street network that appropriately distributes vehicular traffic, with the exception of the Waiver requested for the maximum block length. She said the proposed street network is consistent with the conceptual street network shown in the Bridge Street Code, with conditions relating to the coordination of intersections, spacing and alignment and also driveway spacing, which are details that will be determined through the Development Plan Review in coordination with the City Engineer and others on the Administrative Review Team.

Ms. Ray said this proposal is the first significant step toward the redevelopment of the Dublin Village Center shopping center and is being coordinated with other improvements in this center. She said this new residential site development and corresponding street networks are going to set the conditions for future development opportunities in this Neighborhood District. She stated that the Neighborhood District standards here have some other requirements for minimum amount of mixed use shopping corridor, the purpose of which is to help define a critical mass of commercial activity to anchor development in this area. She explained that since the shopping corridor is not proposed with this development, a Waiver is required to be approved by the Commission to not meet this particular requirement.

Ms. Ray referred to the proposed Waiver request to exceed the maximum block dimensions for Block B, where the Edwards site is located. She explained that the request is to have 660-foot long north/south block dimensions, which exceeds what Code allows, which is 500 feet or less for block faces or a maximum block perimeter of 1,750 feet. She said due to the configuration of the podium apartment building and the fact that it is not practical to run a street through the center of that building, the applicant is requesting a Waiver for the block dimensions for Block B. Ms. Ray stated that the dimensions for Block C, which is the theater block, are created by existing conditions, and while the maximum block perimeter is met, the 658-foot or so of Village Parkway does exceed the 500-foot limitation, but because

of preferred intersection spacing and the existing theater building footprint it's not possible to reduce the block segment along Village Parkway to meet the requirement.

Ms. Ray said this site is located within the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District, which is one of the three neighborhood districts included in the Bridge Street Code. She explained that the Neighborhood District Standards were developed to address some of the master plan elements desired in these areas, recognizing that actual development is likely to occur in phases. She explained that certain elements that would be incorporated into larger scale areas as development phased in were intended to be addressed by the Neighborhood District Standards, and for example, the oval shaped area is where the mixed use anchor, or "shopping corridor," was expected to be provided. She pointed out that since this is a primarily residential development in the northern portion of this district, it is not appropriate that the shopping corridor be provided in the northern portion of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District at this time, but the shopping corridor should be provided with future development that does occur throughout the rest of the shopping center.

Ms. Ray said the Site Plan Review criteria has been reviewed by the Administrative Review Team and based on the information that the applicant has developed at this time, and all appropriate Code sections represented have either been met, met with conditions, met with approval of the Site Plan Waiver that is being requested, or are details that are anticipated to be worked out with the development as the project moves forward.

Ms. Ray said there is one Site Plan Waiver that is being requested with this application and that is a request to use vinyl siding as a permitted primary building material in limited applications on each of the building facades. She said the primary materials as defined by Code are any materials that comprise more than 20 percent of an individual building elevation, although the Code actually requires two different primary building materials to make up that 80 percent to help break up the building facades and provide greater architectural interest. She noted that the Code does say that other high quality synthetic materials can be approved by the required reviewing body with examples of successful high quality local installations. Ms. Ray stated that he Waiver, if approved, would permit the use of vinyl siding as a permitted primary material. She reported that since the Administrative Review Team had made their recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission, staff had been meeting with the applicant and they have agreed to reduce or eliminate the use of vinyl siding but they are including this as a request for the Commission to make a determination on this since the materials were included in the materials that Administrative Review Team reviewed and based their recommendation to the Commission.

Ms. Ray referred to the request for payment of an Open Space Fee-In-Lieu. She said that while this residential project includes a sizable amount of private open space, including 1.6 acres of land provided within the courtyards of this development, the intent of the open space requirement is to achieve public open spaces that enhances quality of life and fosters a sense of community of the neighborhood at large. She explained that the desire is to provide these public open spaces scattered throughout the Bridge Street District to help provide greenway connections and also community spaces for visitors and residents.

Ms. Ray stated that staff would like to continue to work with the applicant to identify and provide the required open space within a walkable distance of this site as permitted by the Code and consistent with the open space character and network considerations as described in the Neighborhood District Standards. She said based on the number of dwelling units (324), the Code requires 200 square feet of publicly accessible open space for each of those units which ends up being about 1.5 acres of open space required. She stated that the applicant has provided some of that in the pocket parks on the west and east sides of the building and the pocket plazas on the south side of the building. She said that the applicant has also been meeting with the City to discuss strategies for providing the required open space either on-site or within the walkable distances permitted by the Code, and they are exploring opportunities to make sure that the open space is provided in a suitable manner. She said the

Administrative Review Team is recommending disapproval of the request for open space fee-in-lieu of actual land dedication, and an additional condition has been recommended that as this proposal moves forward to Development Plan and Site Plan Review, that the applicant work with the City to execute a suitable agreement that provides the full amount of required open space as required by Code as part of the next phase of development of this neighborhood district. She said the applicant has expressed a willingness to work with the City to achieve this objective, and they have begun to explore opportunities to meet this condition.

Ms. Ray noted that the Administrative Review Team's comments have been summarized and included in the ART report for the Commission's review and consideration, in addition to an Engineering memo that was provided as an attachment to the report. She said there are five determinations with five motions.

Development Plan

1. Basic Plan Review (Development Plan): The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 8 conditions:
   1) That the applicant coordinate driveway access along John Shields Parkway (Street Segment 1) to direct pedestrian activity, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
   2) That driveway access points along the neighborhood streets (Street Segments 2 and 3) be coordinated and aligned, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
   3) That heightened architectural detailing and an open space node be provided at the intersection of Street Segments 1 (John Shields Parkway) and 2 at the southwest corner of Block B;
   4) That the applicant work with the property owner to reconfigure the proposed open space to provide the required open space "node" at the intersection of Street Segments 1 and 2, with open spaces (pocket plazas or pocket parks) at a minimum of three, if not all four corners of the intersection and provide the minimum required 1.49 acres of open space on-site and/or within 660 ft. of the development site;
   5) That the applicant submit a demolition plan in addition to a plan for the interim site conditions, including grading, seeding, parking lot reconfiguration, etc. as part of the Development Plan Review;
   6) That the applicant coordinate the timing of the improvements to Tuller Road with the City Engineer;
   7) That the applicant provide a phasing plan as part of the Development Plan Review; and
   8) That the applicant provides all necessary public and private infrastructure plans as part of the Development Plan Review.

2. Development Plan Waivers: The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **approval** of the following:
   1) Maximum Block Dimensions, for Block B (Edwards Apartment Building site) - Table 153.060-A, to exceed the maximum permitted block length of 500 feet at approximately 658 feet, and exceed the maximum permitted block perimeter of 1,750 feet at approximately 1,987 feet, and allow Block C (AMC Theater site) to exceed the maximum permitted block length of 500 feet at approximately 658 feet.
   2) Placemaking Elements, Shopping Corridor - 153.063(C)(5)(a), to not be required to provide the minimum 600 linear feet of mixed use "shopping corridor" development as part of this Development Plan/Site Plan Review, and instead ensure that the shopping corridor is provided on the blocks south of Street Segment 1 (John Shields Parkway).

Site Plan Review

3. Basic Plan Review (Site Plan Review): The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 9 conditions:
   1) That the ridge lines parallel to the streets be interrupted to meet Code Section 153.062(D)(2)(c);

2) That the applicant provide a pedestrian circulation plan demonstrating safe access to the building for residents and visitors;
3) That the building's architecture be modified to provide the appropriate vertical façade divisions (no spans greater than 40 feet), horizontal façade divisions (detailing required within 3 feet of the top of the ground story), and required change in roof plane (changes required every 80 feet) to meet the Podium Apartment Building Type requirement;
4) That Pocket Park D be redesigned to eliminate the proposed bioretention facility and reconfigure the stormwater management facilities (if needed) to maintain usable, accessible open space area;
5) That the applicant provide publicly available bicycle parking facilities within the streetscape and within the pocket parks and plazas for visitors and residents;
6) That the applicant provide additional details regarding the parking structure operation and circulation at the Site Plan Review;
7) That the surface parking lot plans be modified to provide a street wall consistent with Section 153.065(E) with the landscape treatment required by Sections 153.065(D)(5)(a) and (c);
8) That the applicant work with Planning and Engineering to reevaluate the proposed dumpster location in relation to the proposed right-of-way, prior to Site Plan Review; and
9) That the applicant work with the City to execute a suitable agreement that provides the full amount of required open space as required by Code as part of the next phase of development of the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District.

4. The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **disapproval** of the Site Plan Waiver for Section 153.062(E)(1), Façade Materials – Permitted Primary Materials, as the criteria for the Waiver are not met.

Open Space Fee-in-Lieu

1. The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **disapproval** the request for payment of a Fee-in-Lieu of open space land dedication.

Ms. Ray said it is important to note and to recognize that the redevelopment of the center has been a priority for many in the community, and City Council has been made aware of the development plans that are in the works for this project. She reported that the shopping center has been assembled over the years to provide for a larger scale more coordinated master plan for this site, however there is no master plan in place at this point in time. Ms. Ray stated that the City has been working with the property owner and is confident that future phases will be catalyzed by the new residential development that is proposed. She said that staff recognizes that this being the first truly urban project developing under the new Bridge Street District regulations, there might some pause due to the lack of an overall master plan to guide the center's overall development, but staff feels that this is a catalytic project, and with the adjacent street network and all of the adjacent blocks that are being created being very consistent with the character, they would like to see this project set a good precedent for future development in the Bridge Street District.

Richard Taylor asked for clarification regarding the process. He summarized that the Commission will be reviewing the Basic Plan Review, but they are voting on Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review Waivers, although the Waivers are only to the Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews. He asked how this was possible, since the applicant hadn't filed Development or Site Plans yet.

Ms. Ray said the applicant has identified these three Waivers for which a determination is requested from the Commission at this stage. She explained that because the applicant is required to receive Basic Plan approval from the Commission anyway, they have included the Waivers that they already know they need with this application. She said that if however the applicant identifies additional Waivers further in the process, those will have to come back before the Commission for review; these are just the Waivers that have been identified at this point.

Ben Hale, Jr., representing the applicant, Pete Edwards of the Edwards Communities Development Company, who is in attendance, said this property was purchased a few years ago by the Stavroff family, who he believes are making a leap of faith by tearing down half of the shopping center, but they are betting that they will attract new tenants and will build new buildings here as part of the shopping center. He said this is also a real leap of faith by the Edwards Company, who has done a lot of urban projects around the country as well as a lot of great developments here in Dublin such as Ballantrae, and now they want to be a part of Bridge Street. He said they have been working very closely with the City on the plans for the construction of the new streets, which will cost in excess of $5.5 million dollars and is a huge undertaking. He said the apartments are on a fast track is because there are ideal times to open apartment projects, which is usually in the spring since the leasing season starts in March. He said that they will need to start renting apartments next March, and to make that timeline, construction needs to start by around July 1st.

Mr. Hale introduced the team, Stephen Caplinger, Creative Design + Planning; Brian Jones, architect; and Steve Simonetti, project manager.

Mr. Hale said the applicant is willing to drop the request for the vinyl on the exterior on this building. He said that Mr. Edwards has used beaded vinyl over the years and has not had any issues with it and found that it is a very good product requiring very low maintenance. He stated that the other products like Hardiplank need to be painted regularly, and since this is a three and four story building, it will not be cheap to paint. He said that from a maintenance and appearance point of view, the beaded vinyl is the best product out there, but they will agree to not use vinyl.

Mr. Hale said the property has in its interior courtyards 1.5 acres of open spaces with a pool and other places for the people who live here to use. He noted that between the 1.5 acres of open space in the interior of the building and what they're providing on the exterior, they have more than what is needed with 2.2 acres total. He added that there will likely end up being a park across the new public street to the south, and a plaza area at the theater, so there are a lot of other open spaces that will be usable. He stated that the owners will also have other open space requirements and he believes there will be plenty of other places to supply the open space in the area. He said that Pete Edwards is willing to pay the fee for the direct purchase of open space in the area and will put the funds into escrow. He said everybody believes that when this project is said and done, there will be adequate open space.

Mr. Hale said the owners have worked very diligently on the theater since they bought this site. He explained that the theater had been looking for a place to go and were even looking at Tuttle mall, but the owners have gotten the theater to agree to stay, which is important for the entire shopping center because it is a magnet that brings people in. He noted that the theater will also help with attracting good restaurants and will also help retailers. He stated that the interior is being updated with stadium seating and adding a bar, and although the theater is happy with the exterior of the building, the owners are planning to spend over a million dollars on the exterior of the building with a new design that will go to the City soon to upgrade the overall appearance of the theater consistent with the overall redevelopment plans for the shopping center.

Stephen Caplinger, said this is an ambitious project, and the owners have stepped up and been very fortunate to be part of the first phase with their project along with the AMC theater renovations. He said they took the lead with the Administrative Review Team and City staff and diligently met early and often, read the Code, did all of their homework, and put together a great design team with Brian Jones' office, Brad Parish with Architectural Alliance, and Kerry Reeds with MKSK, all of whom have been working with the owners on their master plan for the center, along with civil engineering services from EMH&T.

Mr. Caplinger said Edwards carved out an 8-acre parcel within the project and they have created a site that will net about 6 acres because of the new roads being carved out of the 8-acre site. He said the new

building will be about 5 to 20 feet from the property lines, with parallel parking on all the streets, street trees, new street lights, nice paving and an urban setting. He said it is their intent to create a new building type with a more urban feel, with a center hall corridor and elevators and much more of a dense urban project with three and four stories with ground floor parking. He said the street theme along the new John Shields Parkway will include the clubhouse entrance and will be very richly landscaped and will have sidewalks with fountain features as well as architectural elements that come out from the building. Mr. Caplinger said that the pocket parks are being used as entry ways into the building and will provide breaks in the longer east and west building façades. He said the building is shaped with three courtyards in the center of the buildings, which are very important feature of all the Edwards projects and are also planned to be richly landscaped, serving as an oasis for the residents to enjoy. He said they feel they have more than enough open space for this project with the public open space provided as well as the private open space.

Brian Jones, Jones Studio Architects, representing the applicant, said that over the last decade he has been working with Pete Edwards on a number of projects and they have been outside of central Ohio, which has been relevant to their understanding the objectives of the Edwards Companies. He said this is a big project and they looked at breaking down the scale of the buildings into very dynamic townhouse-style scale elements, and they see each of these styles with three or four key components that together give the project a wonderful texture and character.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to speak with regard to this application. [There were none.] She closed public comment portion of the agenda and invited the Commission's comments on the proposal.

John Hardt said he is excited about this project and since many people have been working on the Bridge Street District plan for a few years now and keep hearing about the potential redevelopment of Dublin Village Center, it's exciting that it's finally here, and it is exciting for him personally and he is glad to see it happening. He agreed that it is a strong step forward and he thanked the applicant for the work done to date.

Mr. Hardt asked about the warehouse site to the east of the Edwards project and how will it be handled.

Ms. Ray said the Development Plan application will deal with the new street rights-of-way, street landscaping, and other infrastructure, and she agreed that there is expected to be some impact to the adjacent parking lots as well as the side of the warehouse building where the adjacent buildings will be demolished. She said that at this time, they expect minor driveway relocations and minor parking lot landscaping modifications, and they anticipate those off-site modifications being reviewed as part of the Development Plan Review. She said if there is something that is specific enough to require additional review by the Commission in terms of either a Waiver or significant site modification requiring Basic Plan Review, it would be brought forward.

Amy Kramb noted that the existing theater parking to the east in front of the building will be removed with the new streets and blocks, and she asked when and how in the process they are going to factor in the change to the theater parking.

Ms. Ray said the theater was planning to allocate all their required parking to the north of their building. She said that with this development, a lot of the existing structures will be demolished, and the need for all of that parking is going to be greatly reduced. She said that staff will be looking at the required theater parking to make sure it is adequately provided and accessible as part of the next steps.

Mr. Hardt said there was a note in the engineering comments that the applicant is requesting to omit the bikeway on John Shields Parkway and asked for an explanation.

Ms. Ray said that comment is in reference to the cycle track planned through the Bridge Street District. She said that staff had determined that instead of having bike facilities up at sidewalk level in a highly pedestrian-oriented environment, ultimately the staff decision has been to re-route the plans for the cycle track down Village Parkway that would continue west along John Shields Parkway as additional development occurs to the west. She said that since a very different environment will be established at Village Parkway, the expectation is that bicycles would be primarily in the street at that point. She said that the cycle track is to be intended to be a commuter route connection with higher speeds and fewer interruptions, with more point A to point B travel, as opposed to pedestrian activity anticipated in this area with more potential for conflicts.

Ms. Amorose Groomes commented that with a 324-unit apartment building and the potential for 600-700 people living in this building with 500 parking spots could result in a high demand for bicycle activity.

Ms. Ray said bicycles will be accommodated at street level, with lower vehicle speeds because of the pedestrian-oriented environment, and the cycle track will be picked up to the west of this site and down along Village Parkway. She pointed out that a change of character occurs at Village Parkway as part of the overall neighborhood district standards.

Mr. Hardt said he did not agree with that, and noted that as the Commission went through the Bridge Street Corridor Code regulations, they extensively discussed the accommodation of bicycles virtually everywhere.

Ms. Ray agreed and said bicycle facilities will be provided on all streets.

Justin Goodwin said the intent for all of the streets within the Bridge Street District is that, regardless of whether or not there is a specific dedicated facility, all of the streets are intended to be bicycle-friendly. He explained that the overall design of the right-of-way itself should accommodate cyclists as part the street system, whether there is a sharrow marked on the street or a bike lane or a cycle track. He noted that they do not expect high speeds of traffic through what is going to become more of an urban core through this area. He stated that the intent is that cyclists should be able to share the travel lane with vehicles.

Mr. Hardt said they only have once chance to build the street and a cycle track will never be built later. He said he was not supportive of the proposed street without the cycle track.

Mr. Hardt said there is 1.6 acres of private open space provided on the site, and he thought it curious that a third of that is on the roof. He asked if green roof space could be considered open space if it were publicly accessible.

Ms. Ray said the Code requires a certain amount of right-of-way frontage to allow open space areas to be counted as required, publicly available open space. She supposed that there could be a circumstance that stairs could lead to a second level to a publicly accessible open space along a frontage.

Mr. Hardt said he was not inclined to consider the interior courtyards to be counted as public open space and would like to see the open space requirement met, but he wondered whether it would be possible.

Mr. Hardt said he is concerned with how to get the theater patrons across John Shields Parkway to the new designated parking areas to the north. He asked if the applicant had considered patterned pavement or something to alert vehicles that there is a pedestrian zone.

Dan Phillabaum said they have been working with EMH&T and with the grading changes that need to happen on the north façade of the theater, they are looking at means possible to steer pedestrians

toward the main intersection. He explained that there will be a four-foot drop from the sidewalk to the street and there will be barriers to direct pedestrian movement to the intersection crossing.

Victoria Newell said her struggles with the application are the process. She noted that the process is very different, and since the Commission doesn't yet have all the details about this project, they are being asked to make a leap of faith and trust that the project will turn out as they expect it to. She stated that the development will come, but she thought that everything needs to function in concert with each to make this a truly spectacular and successful development, and not having all of the pieces makes this even more challenging for the Commission.

Joseph Budde said after all the work developing the streets, block requirements and the size of those blocks within the Code, the very first applicant is requesting excessive block sizes. He asked if there is a way to separate the building and have a part of this project on the other side of a street and build what was required to be built in terms of required block sizes.

Ms. Ray said that was a concern for staff as well, and they want this project to be as pedestrian friendly as possible and make sure there is a street network that appropriately distributes traffic the way it needs to be distributed. She said that while Planning was working on the Code, they had even worked with the applicant to develop the Podium Apartment Building as a building type as part of the additions made to make sure this type of building could be accommodated. She said that Planning recognized that there might be some areas that were more residential in character that might have this larger scale of development and still be appropriate. She said that it is the Administrative Review Team's opinion that this portion of the Bridge Street Corridor Sawmill Center Neighborhood District is set off to the edge of the overall area of critical mass of commercial mixed use urban core area. She noted that, while the block sizes are a concern, they feel it is appropriate to this site and this location. She said as additional development phases in over the long term, they would make sure they have the necessary street connections. She noted that there are entrances provided as part of the building so that pedestrians coming from this building could have shorter walks to the intersections from the middle of the development block.

Ms. Kramb said she was okay with the larger block assuming they were not going to break up the other adjacent blocks with new east/west streets that dead end into this block. She said if that was the plan for the streets, then she is against the proposal.

Mr. Goodwin said the streets would not be "dead ended," and they do expect that there will be streets that will terminate at "T" intersections. He pointed out that the Code allows for additional architectural details at those intersections with terminal vista requirements at the end of those streets.

Ms. Kramb said that if the intention is to put another east/west street north of John Shields, then she thought the building needed to be redesigned.

Ms. Ray said the new streets would be built as future development phased in, and they would be looking at intersection spacing with the new streets, as well as what happens to Tuller Road in the future. She stated that there are lots of factors that would be considered in terms of how those streets would be developed.

Warren Fishman said the streets as proposed make it difficult to walk around the building and crossing the main street from the movie theater to an intersection or a crosswalk is a concern. He said the open space requirement has to be met with publicly accessible space. He said they are encouraging bicycles and pedestrians and they need to put bicycle circulation in the plan and provide adequate bicycle parking.

Mr. Caplinger said there will be bicycle parking within the parking garage along with bicycle racks. He said their experience is that people carry their bicycles to their units, however it is not encouraged.

Ms. Ray said they would like some bicycle racks to be provided within the public open spaces as well. She stated that the Code requires one bicycle parking space for every two dwelling units.

Mr. Fishman said he is thrilled with this project and with Mr. Edwards because he has looked at many of his projects and have not seen a bad one yet, and he hoped that he feels that Dublin deserves the quality that was provided in Mr. Edwards' projects downtown.

Mr. Fishman asked if the existing shopping center use will be continued in the future. Mr. Hale said they are tearing down 125,000 square feet of the shopping center and they plan to rebuild 75,000-80,000 square feet of restaurant and retail.

Mr. Fishman asked for the total number of parking spaces provided within the parking garage. Mr. Caplinger said there are 324 units and approximately 325 parking spaces within the parking garage and the remaining is in the lot to the west. He said that Edwards feels comfortable with the amount of parking being provided.

Ms. Newell said the ratio is 1.64 spaces if they include all of the on-street perimeter parking and 1.4 spaces if counting the spaces being provided off-street.

Ms. Kramb said she is against the additional east/west street to the north and if they are giving a Waiver for a larger block size she does not want to see a street "T'd" into this building.

Ms. Kramb said there are mid-block pedestrian crossings into the parking lots, which makes sense, but the crossing to what might be to the east, she did not understand why it would be necessary at this time.

Kerry Reeds, MKSK, said the entrances will have pedestrian access from either the parking lot to the north end which is more the pedestrian portion of the open space, as well as from the east.

Ms. Kramb said the big parking lot will be connected to the little parking lot through one shared drive on the north side of the park.

Mr. Taylor said it is wonderful that the project being proposed is the high quality that it is and in many ways is an embodiment of the ideas that they have all been talking about and hoping to see in this district. He said the master plan does not have a lot of "plan" to it yet, but he understands and is okay with the idea that this part of the project does not having shopping associated with it, since that wouldn't make sense. He said, however, the next part of the area that gets developed better have a lot of retail associated with it to draw people.

Mr. Taylor said they need to make sure that as they are planning open spaces that the entire areas are planned as spaces with just as much thought as the buildings and that they do not become left over spaces. He wanted to make sure that if they are going to be doing a fee-in-lieu that it doesn't become a pile of money in a piggy bank, and that it is planned for spaces that will actually be provided within the district.

Mr. Taylor said the pocket parks are very interesting and when they are done they will be nice entrances to the building. He noted that pocket parks succeed because they are a relief to the urban density.

Mr. Taylor noted that the new John Shields Parkway extends to Sawmill Road, and on the plan it indicates a new entry feature at the new intersection. He said that, since this is not intended to be just a district or just a development, he would not want to see another clock tower or names of retail shops as part of an entry feature. He stated that this will be a major gateway for the city as a whole, discouraged the use of an entry feature. He said he is concerned with the extension of John Shields Parkway possibly

from I-270, across the river onto Sawmill Road and the potential for a two lane road to handle the volume of traffic that is likely to occur. He said he would like the right-of-way to be wide enough for future expansion.

Ms. Ray stated that the urban street grid helps to distribute traffic, avoiding the problem we currently have at the intersection of Bridge Street and High Street. She said that the challenge there is that there are no other options for vehicles to cross the river and they are forced to use Bridge Street to get across. She said that in the future, drivers will continue to use both Bridge Street as well as John Shields Parkway, but there is also Banker Drive and Village Parkway to help provide access onto Sawmill Road at signalized intersections to help distribute traffic demand. She said they are confident that the right-of-way and the lane configuration will meet traffic needs going forward.

Mr. Taylor said that the theater parking lot being separated by a roadway and getting people to use an intersection that is 100 feet away will be difficult, and he would like to see the access corrected now while there is nothing there and they have the opportunity to solve it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that she too is excited about this project and seeing the Bridge Street Corridor start to develop. She thought the theater exits should be relocated to the front and make the sides emergency-only exits, making the front exit into the courtyard with easier access to get to the parking areas.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is concerned about only putting in six-foot side walks through these areas that are expected to be as busy as we hope. She said she did not know why we wouldn't want to put in a wider sidewalk where two people could walk together. She stated that it would be a huge mistake to make the sidewalks that narrow and would be more inclined to eliminate some of the other streetscape elements to get a bigger sidewalk.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she is concerned that they are not providing any accommodation for bikes, and even though the law says bicyclists can ride in the auto lane, in her opinion that is not "providing for" bikes and she thought the provision for bicyclists needed to be better than that in this area.

Ms. Amorose Groomes called for a short break at 8:27 pm.

Ms. Amorose Groomes resumed the meeting at 8:31 pm.

Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities, said they have been meeting with the theater even though it is outside of their 8-acre site. He reported that the theater is going from 3500 seats to 1500. He added that the theater has a contractual obligation for a certain number of parking spaces and they have contemplated and located the parking within an area relative to the theater and those factors have driven their site layout and parking.

Mr. Simonetti said that, with respect to the Edwards project, he said they exceed the Code-required parking because they know that if they can't provide adequate parking spaces for their tenants then the tenants will rent somewhere else. He agreed that it would be ideal if they could take the full 60 acres and master plan it all up front, including block layout and open space, but it is their belief that if they can come in and put in 324 apartment units (with roughly 70 percent one bedroom and the rest two bedroom units), there will be less than 500 people; however, if they can get 400-500 people in this area, then that is the catalyst that causes the rest of the development to occur throughout the center.

Mr. Simonetti said they are working with the Stavroffs and they are listening to their needs for their complex with an apartment perspective while they work with them to accommodate what they think they are going need for the rest of the development.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they will move their discussion to architecture.

Mr. Budde said this is a fantastic project based on what they have seen so far, however, he said he is not in favor of vinyl siding. He said his experience with one bedroom apartments is that they turn over rapidly, and it is not always that the tenant leaves, but that they often fail to pay rent. He said that he knows that single people with single incomes are faced with a more challenging financial situation, and with 70 percent of this project being one bedroom units, this concerns him from his experience.

Jennifer Readler said there are certain things the developer has to decide upon, such as number of bedrooms and payment of rent, and the Commission should not go into a review of that part of the application.

Ms. Newell said she likes this project and the renderings are lovely. She commented that the drawings in the back half of the packet include lovely renderings, and she heard a great presentation about the texture of materials. She noted that the applicant talked about how they were planning to change the materials across the facades, and yet she looked at the north building façade that appears very flat in the elevations that is in the packet. She asked how are they moving forward, knowing that staff has assured the Commission that they will get the quality and detail they desire.

Ms. Ray noted that the Administrative Review Team raised the same concern about the north elevation. She said that the podium apartment building type does have special detailing requirements for where the parking structure at the street level will be visible. She agreed that there is some concern that the design is not there yet, but they have made the applicant aware of their expectations and they will work with them on it. She said the Code has requirements for multiple different types of primary materials to help break up the façades and get more architectural interest in the elevations, and the applicant has heard and understands the concern.

Ms. Newell said the printed form is the record going forward and not necessarily what is stated at this meeting. She said she is bothered by the printed form, and wondered whether it would be referenced in the future and whether it would clearly convey the desire for quality and detail with respect to the architecture.

Ms. Ray said that concern was specifically documented within the report. She pointed out that as staff as research is done for each project, the reports and minutes from past Commission meetings are often referenced more than the graphics. She said the point is well made that this is all part of the overall record, and the Code requirements still have to be met.

Mr. Jones said this is part of the process, and as the plans move from the general to the specific, they are actually six weeks beyond what was included in the original submittal packet. He stated that they have solved a lot of the concerns, but the three dimensional renderings do the best job of showing some of the steps and surfaces and the massing and articulation that is a part of these buildings. He said that he has a long history of working with this team and this is representative of the projects this team has put together, and that is the strongest qualification and fundamental part of their product offering. He said that if there are things that are missing from the very extensive Code that has been established and they are subject to performing within, that they will bring those back to the Commission for review.

Mr. Simonetti said this is a process where the actual architectural detail is not submitted for review until the Site Plan gets submitted which is 28 days after the Development Plan gets submitted, which typically is after the Basic Plan is approved. He suggested they are ahead of where they might normally be, where the process is for the Commission.

Mr. Fishman said they have talked about no vinyl siding and they deserve in Dublin to get an all-masonry building like in Edwards' downtown development.

Ms. Kramb said that, from what she could tell, the renderings are improving and she likes what has been shown and not necessarily what was in the packet. She said she did not like the use of wrought iron gates along the first level along the east and west elevations and did not see as many in the newer drawings. She said she did not like the first floor treatments with the gates and the fake signage over the gates. She commented that the south elevation did not have a strong central focal point, but thought it might be fixed. She agreed that there should be no use of vinyl siding, and but overall, the architecture will get there.

Mr. Hardt said he shares the concern with the elegance in the renderings being missing from the submitted documents, but the displays presented at this evening's meeting demonstrate that the project is heading in the right direction and in fact look better than what was submitted. He asked about roof pitches of the front to back of the longer roofs, since they did not look to be a 6:12 pitch.

Ms. Ray said that is an element that will be refined as it goes forward, since Mr. Hardt is correct that the Code does have a range of permitted roof pitches.

Mr. Hardt agreed with Ms. Kramb's comments on signage. He said there is something a bit a "Disney-esque" with some portions of the elevation being made to look like a storefront. He said that, given the whole district is conceived to be an active and vibrant work place and play place, he is not in favor of that kind of architectural move; if it is an apartment, then it should look like an apartment.

Mr. Taylor said everyone has hit on his comments, but he wanted to know why they are all afraid of big buildings. He said he is uncomfortable with trying to make this big building look like a series of little buildings. He said he likes the north elevation of this building because it is the only elevation that looks like *a* building and not a collection of smaller buildings, but he agreed that it can be improved but it doesn't need bits of siding and other materials, and it looks good the way it is with a good concept.

Mr. Taylor said the south elevation is good and symmetrical, very clear and easy to delineate the parts that make it up, and if there is a part of the building that works as a collection of buildings, it is there. He said that on the east and west elevations, that idea falls apart because it's trying to be something like eight different buildings jammed together and he thought it would be better to make it two buildings with a piece in between, or three individual buildings, or one big building. He said he would love to see a simpler building with an overall concept and get away from "Disney-esque." He said the two corners of the buildings are detailed to look like shops, but they are in fact apartments, and should look like apartments and get rid of the signage that makes it look fake.

Mr. Taylor said he thought they should get rid of the siding altogether and make the building all brick and simplify the whole building. He said they need to work on roof pitches and window frames and the windows need to have a profile and be set back from the brick, as required by the Code. He commented on the cornice and trim details shown on the rendering presented this evening. He said there are other ways to create the detail without introducing new materials that are going to cause maintenance issues. He said the railings appear to have with details and a balcony railing with design characters add tons of life to a building. He said that with buildings like this in a district like this, you experience the building at different levels and cannot let the detailing fall down in any part. He said it has to be richer as they approach the building, so elements such as the type of brick, window frames, railings, cornices and materials are vitally important.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she finds it an attractive building and wanted to make sure the bar is set very high with this project. She said that this takes a tremendous amount of faith on the part of the Commission, far more than she is comfortable with, but it is the charge that has been set before the Commission, and the product better be good or this Commission will request Code changes. She stated that this is their chance to get it right, or they will do things differently in the future.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she would move on to the recommendations, if the Commission had no further comments at this time. She referred to the Development Plan Waivers and asked if the Commissioners had any concerns with the two requested Waivers for the block dimensions or the shopping corridor.

Ms. Newell said she is okay with the block design that is proposed and is also okay with the street "T-ing" into the building, since she thought the goal was to provide pedestrian-friendly streets, and she thought much of the conversation on this topic was on being car-friendly.

Mr. Taylor agreed with Ms. Newell and said he has no problem with the building size and is only concerned with the lack of a mid-block pedestrianway. He said he rejects the notion that the building looks like it has an inset on both sides and that somehow satisfies the intent of the Code for mid-block pedestrian access. He said he is in favor of the Waiver for block dimensions, but he doesn't agree with the stated reason. He said he thought the building being too big is not a reason for the Waiver.

Mr. Hardt said he agrees with Mr. Taylor, and the comment in the staff report that says that the Waiver request to maximum block size is caused by the proposed building type, and he said he cannot think of a worse reason to ask for a Waiver. He said the whole intent of the Bridge Street Corridor is to create a network of lots and blocks and streets, and then fill those blocks with buildings. He said that the notion that because the building is too big they want to leave the mid-block divisions out is not a good argument. He said he can support this Waiver because of the specific block. He stated that there are two specific characteristics about this lot that are unique; the bend in the road north of the theater, and the slight southward trend of Tuller Parkway. He said that if the mid-block alleys were omitted as development occurs to the west, the subsequent blocks (whether they have mid-block crossings or not) are going to fall into line with the required dimensions. He said that if that weren't the case he wouldn't support the requested Waiver because he was concerned that a precedent would be set that would carry on down to the river. He said that in sum, he does think this specific request meets the threshold of the unique site characteristics and that is why he supports the Waiver.

Ms. Kramb said she had the same comment and the reason for the Waiver.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see a terminal vista treatment at the areas where a street might "T" into the Edwards block based on the best information they have on hand at this time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that the second portion of the Development Plan Waiver regarding the Placemaking Elements, Shopping Center did not need conversation. The Commission agreed that all were in support for this Development Plan Waiver to not require a shopping corridor as part of this application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any questions or additional conditions to be considered for the Basic Plan Review.

Motion #1 and Vote – Development Plan Waivers

Mr. Taylor made a motion, and Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the two waivers. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes reviewed the additional four conditions added by Planning and Zoning Commission:

Motion #2 and Vote – Basic Plan Review for the Development Plan
Mr. Fishman moved, and Mr. Taylor seconded, to approve the Basic Plan Review for the Development Plan with 12 conditions:

1) That the applicant coordinate driveway access along John Shields Parkway (Street Segment 1) to direct pedestrian activity, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
2) That driveway access points along the neighborhood streets (Street Segments 2 and 3) be coordinated and aligned, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
3) That heightened architectural detailing and an open space node be provided at the intersection of Street Segments 1 (John Shields Parkway) and 2 at the southwest corner of Block B;
4) That the applicant work with the property owner to reconfigure the proposed open space to provide the required open space "node" at the intersection of Street Segments 1 and 2, with open spaces (pocket plazas or pocket parks) at a minimum of three, if not all four corners of the intersection and provide the minimum required 1.49 acres of open space on-site and/or within 660 ft. of the development site;
5) That the applicant submit a demolition plan in addition to a plan for the interim site conditions, including grading, seeding, parking lot reconfiguration, etc. as part of the Development Plan Review;
6) That the applicant coordinate the timing of the improvements to Tuller Road with the City Engineer;
7) That the applicant provide a phasing plan as part of the Development Plan Review;
8) That the applicant provides all necessary public and private infrastructure plans as part of the Development Plan Review;
9) That the applicant provide a designated bicycle way and enhanced pedestrian pathways on John Shields Parkway;
10) That the applicant provide additional sidewalk width on the eastern north-south street;
11) That the applicant work with staff to address concerns regarding theater exits and safe roadway crossings for pedestrians; and
12) That the applicant provide greater architectural detailing at the terminal vista of a potential road connection east of the proposed apartment building.

Mr. Hale agreed to the conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion #3 and Vote – Site Plan Waiver for Façade Materials
Mr. Taylor moved, and Ms. Newell seconded, to disapprove the Site Plan Waiver for Façade Materials.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Disapproved 7 – 0.)

Motion #4 and Vote – Basic Plan Review for the Site Plan
Mr. Taylor moved, and Mr. Hardt seconded, to approve the Basic Plan Review for the Site Plan with 9 conditions:

1) That the ridge lines parallel to the streets be interrupted to meet Code Section 153.062(D)(2)(c);
2) That the applicant provide a pedestrian circulation plan demonstrating safe access to the building for residents and visitors;
3) That the building's architecture be modified to provide the appropriate vertical façade divisions (no spans greater than 40 feet), horizontal façade divisions (detailing required within 3 feet of the top of the ground story), and required change in roof plane (changes required every 80 feet) to meet the Podium Apartment Building Type requirement

4) That Pocket Park D be redesigned to eliminate the proposed bioretention facility and reconfigure the stormwater management facilities (if needed) to maintain usable, accessible open space area;
5) That the applicant provide publicly available bicycle parking facilities within the streetscape and within the pocket parks and plazas for visitors and residents;
6) That the applicant provide additional details regarding the parking structure operation and circulation at the Site Plan Review;
7) That the surface parking lot plans be modified to provide a street wall consistent with Section 153.065(E) with the landscape treatment required by Sections 153.065(D)(5)(a) and (c);
8) That the applicant work with Planning and Engineering to reevaluate the proposed dumpster location in relation to the proposed right-of-way, prior to Site Plan Review; and
9) That the applicant work with the City to execute a suitable agreement that provides the full amount of required open space as required by Code as part of a future phase development of the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District.

Mr. Hale agreed to the conditions.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion #5 and Vote – Open Space Fee-in-Lieu
Mr. Hardt moved, and Ms. Newell seconded, to disapprove the request for payment of a Fee-in-Lieu of open space land dedication.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Disapproved 7 – 0.)

Pete Edwards, Edwards Communities Development Company, thanked the Commission for the Waiver to the maximum block size, because it was much more important than they realize. He said he understood what was being said about the materials. He said he had been working with Brian Jones for 10 to 15 years and relies a lot on his guidance on architectural design. He added that they would like to build much better building even than the Commission does, but he was concerned that some of the material choices would drive up the development costs so much to the point that the units could not be rented at a marketable rate. He said that one bedroom units are becoming increasingly popular as people want to live alone, and the size of the apartments has also gotten much smaller. He said that his units are upscale, and at the same time, he has found that vinyl is a much better product with using light colors that do not fade or need painted. He said they are learning and they have hired the best people and they will give them all a good product.

2. Community Plan Update
12-046ADM **Administrative Request**

Mr. Goodwin said he wanted to give a quick summary of what has changed from the last Commission meeting. He said they had a thorough review at that time and Planning has summarized the changes made since then in the Planning Report. He said that Planning has gone through and done a comprehensive effort at formatting the site and taken the track changes off, so the Commission can see what the Plan is going to look like.

Mr. Goodwin said there are still some tweaks to the formatting that will be done. He said the bulk of the plan is what will be adopted as seen now. He said you can click on different chapters and see the previous track changes in a PDF format. Mr. Goodwin said Planning has placed a lot of images throughout the Plan to help illustrate the points.

City of Dublin
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

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

MAY 2, 2013

The Administrative Review Team made the following determination at this meeting:

2. **13-031BPR – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center – Edwards Apartment Building – Tuller Road and Village Parkway**
This is a request for review of a 324-unit podium apartment building to be constructed on an 8.32-acre site on the north side of a new public street in the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District to the northeast of the existing AMC Theater. This Basic Plan Review application is for future Development Plan and Site Plan Review applications and is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(D).
Property Owner: Whittingham Capital LLC; Stavroff Interests, Ltd.
Applicant: Pete Edwards, Edwards Communities Development Company; represented by Stephen Caplinger, Creative Design + Planning
Planning Contact: Rachel S. Ray, AICP, Planner II at (614) 410-4600

RECOMMENDATION: Basic Plan Review (Development Plan): The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 8 conditions:

1. That the applicant coordinate driveway access along John Shields Parkway (Street Segment 1) to direct pedestrian activity, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
2. That driveway access points along the neighborhood streets (Street Segments 2 and 3) be coordinated and aligned, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
3. That heightened architectural detailing and an open space node be provided at the intersection of Street Segments 1 (John Shields Parkway) and 2 at the southwest corner of Block B;
4. That the applicant work with the property owner to reconfigure the proposed open space to provide the required open space "node" at the intersection of Street Segments 1 and 2, with open spaces (pocket plazas or pocket parks) at a minimum of three, if not all four corners of the intersection and provide the minimum required 1.49 acres of open space on-site and/or within 660 ft. of the development site;
5. That the applicant submit a demolition plan in addition to a plan for the interim site conditions, including grading, seeding, parking lot reconfiguration, etc. as part of the Development Plan Review;
6. That the applicant coordinate the timing of the improvements to Tuller Road with the City Engineer;

7. That the applicant provide a phasing plan as part of the Development Plan Review; and
8. That the applicant provides all necessary public and private infrastructure plans as part of the Development Plan Review.

RECOMMENDATION: Development Plan Waivers: The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **approval** of the following:

1. Table 153.060-A, Maximum Block Dimensions, for Block B (Edwards Apartment Building site) to exceed the maximum permitted block length of 500 feet at approximately 658 feet, and exceed the maximum permitted block perimeter of 1,750 feet at approximately 1,987 feet, and allow Block C (AMC Theater site) to exceed the maximum permitted block length of 500 ft. at approximately 658 feet.
2. 153.063(C)(5)(a), Placemaking Elements, Shopping Corridor, to not be required to provide the minimum 600 linear feet of mixed use "shopping corridor" development as part of this Development Plan/Site Plan Review, and instead ensure that the shopping corridor is provided on the blocks south of Street Segment 1 (John Shields Parkway).

RECOMMENDATION: Basic Plan Review (Site Plan Review): The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the request with 8 conditions:

1. That the ridge lines parallel to the streets be interrupted to meet Code Section 153.062(D)(2)(c);
2. That the applicant provide a pedestrian circulation plan demonstrating safe access to the building for residents and visitors;
3. That the building's architecture be modified to provide the appropriate vertical façade divisions (no spans greater than 40 feet), horizontal façade divisions (detailing required within 3 feet of the top of the ground story), and required change in roof plane (changes required every 80 feet) to meet the Podium Apartment Building Type requirement;
4. That "Pocket Park D" be redesigned to eliminate the proposed detention basin and reconfigure the stormwater management facilities (if needed) to maintain usable, accessible open space area;
5. That the applicant provide publicly available bicycle parking facilities within the streetscape and within the pocket parks and plazas for visitors and residents;
6. That the applicant provide additional details regarding the parking structure operation and circulation at the Site Plan Review;

7. That the surface parking lot plans be modified to provide a street wall consistent with Section 153.065(E) with the landscape treatment required by Sections 153.065(D)(5)(a) and (c);
8. That the applicant work with Planning and Engineering to reevaluate the proposed dumpster location in relation to the proposed right-of-way, prior to Site Plan Review.

RECOMMENDATION: Site Plan Waiver: The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **disapproval** of the Site Plan Waiver for Section 153.062(E)(1), Façade Materials – Permitted Primary Materials.

RECOMMENDATION: Open Space Fee-In-Lieu: The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **disapproval** the request for payment of a Fee-in-Lieu of open space land dedication.

RESULT: The recommendations and conditions as amended will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission for determination on May 16th.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Steve Langworthy

Steve Langworthy
Director of Land Use and
Long Range Planning

City of Dublin

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

MAY 2, 2013

Attendees

Steve Langworthy, Director of Land Use and Long Range Planning; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Justin Goodwin, Planner II; Dan Phillabaum, Senior Planner; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Allan Woo, Fire Chief; Jeff Tyler, Director of Building Standards; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Manager; Steve Farmer, Police Lieutenant; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Teri Umbarger, BHDP Architects, representing Ohio University; Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities Development Company; Stephen Caplinger, Creative Design + Planning; Tim Volchko, EMH&T; Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests Ltd.; and Flora Rogers, Administrative Assistant.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order.

Case Introductions

None

Determinations

1. **13-038MPR – BSC Commercial District – Dublin Plaza – Awesome Skin and Body Care – Sign – 333 West Bridge Street**

Rachel Ray stated that the applicant had requested that this case be postponed.

2. **13-031ARB-MPR – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center – Edwards Apartment Building – Tuller Road and Village Parkway**

Steve Langworthy said this is a request for review of a 324-unit podium apartment building to be constructed on an 8.32-acre site on the north side of a new public street in the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District to the northeast of the existing AMC Theater. He said this Basic Plan Review application is for future Development Plan and Site Plan Review applications and is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). He noted that the Administrative Review Team was asked to make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission on this application at today's meeting.

Rachel Ray said there are no new plans to review at this meeting, so she would provide an overview of what had been addressed in the Planning Report. She noted that the report outlines the review process, addresses the comments raised by the ART members, and includes a detailed Code analysis. She explained that the detailed Code analysis was provided for the applicant's benefit, given their expedited project timeline, in anticipation of what information would be needed for future application reviews. She stated that this level of detail was greater than what might typically be expected with future applications for Basic Plan Review.

Ms. Ray said she would begin by identifying the higher-level issues requiring specific discussion by the ART. She noted that Planning had noted the proposed block layout as exceeding the maximum block dimensions permitted by the Code for two of the new blocks proposed, and that the applicant is requesting to provide open space a small portion of the required open space on site and is requesting to pay a fee in lieu of open space dedication for the remainder, which requires Planning and Zoning Commission approval. She stated that the overall street network is generally consistent with the conceptual network shown in the Code, with the exception of the two blocks that exceed the maximum permitted block lengths, and the maximum permitted block perimeter for the proposed Edwards development site. She said however that Planning was recommending approval of the Development Plan Waivers requested for these block dimensions because of the configuration of the proposed podium parking building.

Ms. Ray said that in addition to the block layout and open space, which would receive further discussion in a moment, Planning had some concerns with the architecture of the podium-style apartment building design. She explained that the parking structure being on the ground floor has the potential to deactivate the streetscape, and therefore a higher level of architectural detail, landscaping elements, and high quality building materials would be required to minimize the overall mass of the building and enhance the streetscape. She said this was a detail that would be examined further at the Site Plan Review, but she wanted to make note of this point at this stage in the process for the applicant's reference.

Ms. Ray stated that she would move on to the specific comments raised by Engineering.

Barb Cox stated that as this project moves forward, Engineering will continue to review the public improvements and their impact on the development. She said that Engineering and the applicant have scheduled weekly meetings to continue to work to refine the necessary infrastructure improvements for this site.

Ms. Ray said the ART report outlines the recommendations and had included the Engineering memo detailing the review of the drawings as submitted. Ms. Cox said they are moving through the Development Plan street network northeast of the theater building and have some concern with some of the intersections shown, including the intersection of Tuller Road with the new John Shields Parkway, and the intersection of that street with the new street proposed in front of the theater.

Ms. Ray presented the slide showing the proposed Edwards site plan. Ms. Cox noted that the dumpster is currently shown in the right-of-way for the new north/south street on the west side of the Edwards development.

Ms. Ray asked if there were alternative locations for the dumpster.

Stephen Caplinger, Creative Design + Planning, said this was the original location of the dumpster, designed to coordinate with the design of the building. He explained that the compactor and roll off container are shown near the maintenance office.

Ms. Cox said they could look at the easements and right-of-way lines, but encroachment into the right-of-way would require City Council approval. She said she was also concerned about sight triangles at the corner.

Mr. Langworthy asked if this particular issue could be resolved with the Site Plan Review. Ms. Ray said that it could. Ms. Cox noted that the condition of approval be reworded requiring the applicant to work with staff on the dumpster location.

Mr. Caplinger referenced the condition in the report to the Development Plan Review regarding the future improvements to Tuller Road. He said that they would like to go ahead in install all of the on-street parking now for use by the residents, rather than waiting until Tuller Road is completely redone.

Ms. Cox said that there was some concern with piecemeal improvements to Tuller Road, from driver predictability to the implications for the actual street section, but this topic could also be discussed further as the Development Plan application and Preliminary/Final Plat applications proceed.

Ms. Ray asked if the condition concerning the improvements to Tuller Road should be eliminated or reworded.

Ms. Cox suggested that the condition be reworded to reflect that the timing of the Tuller Road improvements should be coordinated with staff.

Ms. Ray asked that Parks and Open Space address the request for Open Space Fees-In-Lieu.

Fred Hahn said there was a lot of effort that went into developing the open space Code regulations, and it is important for this development to have public gathering spaces as amenities for the residents. He said that in addition to the open space serving as an amenity, it was important that land be dedicated with development as it occurs in order to achieve the open space network desired as a key component of the Bridge Street District plans.

Mr. Caplinger said he believed they were meeting the open space and gathering space needs of their tenants through the provision of the private courtyards.

Mr. Hahn stated that the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District is intended to be a public place and needs to have useable space that meets the spirit of the Code. Mr. Hahn said the Code does allow for off-site open space, so that was an alternative that could be explored.

Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities Development Company, said they have 1.6 acres of private space and 1.4 acres of proposed public open space, which is about 3 acres on an 8 acre site, which equates to approximately 40 percent of private and public open space, which is a lot of open space for a project of this size.

Ms. Ray stated that the Code does not require the applicant to provide private open space, and the Code requires high quality urban open spaces that serve as “oases” and amenities in an urban environment, and they need to uphold that objective.

Jeff Tyler said the 40 percent is a choice based on their design with the large block sizes and the podium parking configuration.

Mr. Hahn stated that in addition to providing the required open space, the open space would

need to be designed to be usable, and not taken up by significant stormwater facilities, as was shown with Pocket Park D. He said that stormwater could be integrated if designed as an amenity such as a rain garden, but should not take up the entire space with a detention basin.

Mr. Caplinger said page 13 item #3 pocket park was mislabeled should be identified as "D". Ms. Ray confirmed and noted that the condition referencing this pocket park would be amended.

Ms. Ray asked Mr. Tyler to comment on behalf of Building Standards

Mr. Tyler said the building's architectural treatment on the north elevation on Tuller Road looks like the "back door" to the project and needs to have a similar architectural character in terms of materials and details. He suggested the use of additional shutters and variety of materials to help break up the building's mass.

Mr. Caplinger acknowledged Mr. Tyler's concern and stated that they planned to come back with additional building design details. He said they are working on the selection of the specific brick specifications, potentially using a brick with 3 colors, different color awnings, and roof materials with color variations to ensure that the building appears to look like smaller buildings.

Mr. Tyler said the ART talked about bicycle parking and the alternative based on LEED requirements.

Ms. Ray said the Code allows the reduction of bicycle parking, although the applicant would be required to demonstrate the actual anticipated bicycle parking need, as well as to provide some bicycle parking spaces near the public entrances to the site and within the open space areas.

Mr. Caplinger said they could comply with the LEED standards for bicycle parking, but were not going to apply to be LEED certified, although they were planning to use a variety of development strategies that are consistent with LEED certification standards.

Ms. Ray said the request to use vinyl siding would require a Site Plan Waiver. She explained that the Code requires certain materials including brick, stone, glass, and fiber cement siding to be used for at least 80 percent of the façade, and the remaining 20 percent could include other materials, including high quality synthetic materials with demonstrated successful local applications. She stated that vinyl siding was not considered to be an acceptable material either as a permitted primary or secondary building material.

Mr. Caplinger thought they could get the vinyl use down below 20 percent and showed an example of the vinyl product Edwards uses on all their projects.

Mr. Ray said they need to provide documentation of successful installation and long-term maintenance to meet the criteria before its use could be considered.

Chief Woo asked if the proposed balconies shown on the elevations were planned to be functional. Mr. Caplinger said that most of them shown were intended to be usable.

Chief Woo said balconies shown against vinyl siding causes a concern for Fire, especially with the type of 13R sprinkler system proposed, being only a life safety system. He said the balconies with vinyl siding would become combustible areas. He said that other Fire comments

included that the setup zones should be established based on the size of the buildings and the type of systems being used, and he informed the applicant of the maintenance concerns he had with the 13R system, from installation and throughout the life of the project.

Mr. Simonetti said there was a detailed analysis completed and there will be strict rules prohibiting the use of grills or other devices on balconies.

Ms. Ray asked Mr. Farmer to provide Police's comments.

Steve Farmer said Police would like to note the potential security issues for the podium parking garage and the need for lighting and safety for the areas, since this area is currently experiencing a criminal element with property crimes.

Mr. Caplinger said there will be keycard access to door openings and the driveways into the parking areas.

Lt. Farmer said the parking areas need 24 hour lighting for safety.

Mr. Caplinger said the street lights will be standard.

Ms. Ray asked Ms. Gilger to provide Economic Development comments.

Colleen Gilger said they were supportive of the proposal, particularly with the projected demographics being empty nesters and young professionals desiring one and two bedroom housing options, since impact on the school district would be minimal.

Mr. Simonetti said the project is 70 percent one bedroom.

Ms. Ray reviewed the conditions and the next steps for Development Plan Waivers and Site Plan Waivers and the request for payment of fees in lieu of open space land dedication.

Mr. Langworthy said the applicants need to be prepared to make the case for these requests as part of the review by the Planning and Zoning Commission, noting that this is the first project to be reviewed under the Bridge Street District standards for Basic Plan Review, and as such, the project will be held to the Code.

Mr. Caplinger asked if it would be possible to schedule a meeting with Parks and Open Space to review the options for resolving the Open Space Fee-in-Lieu issue.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests, Ltd., stated that he thought the overall development could provide the appropriate amount of open space necessary for this development and other new development to the south, but it simply has not yet been designed, and that needs to be discussed.

Mr. Langworthy said the ART could consider the master plan for the entire area. Mr. Hahn agreed and encouraged the applicant to look at the areas immediately to the south of this site.

Mr. Simonetti said they are willing to provide an open space bank for the overall development master plan to fund the public spaces.

Mr. Hahn said he is open to ideas to resolve the issue of open space.

Ms. Ray agreed to arrange a meeting to discuss the issue of open space code requirements.

Ms. Ray showed the following slides to review each of the recommendations with their conditions (amended conditions in **bold**):

1. The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the request for Basic Plan Review (Development Plan) with 8 conditions:
   a. That the applicant coordinate driveway access along John Shields Parkway (Street Segment 1) to direct pedestrian activity, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
   b. That driveway access points along the neighborhood streets (Street Segments 2 and 3) be coordinated and aligned, subject to approval by the City Engineer;
   c. That heightened architectural detailing and an open space node be provided at the intersection of Street Segments 1 (John Shields Parkway) and 2 at the southwest corner of Block B;
   d. That the applicant work with the property owner to reconfigure the proposed open space to provide the required open space "node" at the intersection of Street Segments 1 and 2, with open spaces (pocket plazas or pocket parks) at a minimum of three, if not all four corners of the intersection and provide the minimum required 1.49 acres of open space on-site and/or within 660 ft. of the development site;
   e. That the applicant submit a demolition plan in addition to a plan for the interim site conditions, including grading, seeding, parking lot reconfiguration, etc. as part of the Development Plan Review;
   f. **That the applicant coordinate the timing of the improvements to Tuller Road with the City Engineer**;
   g. That the applicant provide a phasing plan as part of the Development Plan Review; and
   h. That the applicant provides all necessary public and private infrastructure plans as part of the Development Plan Review.

2. The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **approval** of the following Development Plan Waivers:
   a. Table 153.060-A, Maximum Block Dimensions, for Block B (Edwards Apartment Building site) to exceed the maximum permitted block length of 500 feet at approximately 658 feet, and exceed the maximum permitted block perimeter of 1,750 feet at approximately 1,987 feet, and allow Block C (AMC Theater site) to exceed the maximum permitted block length of 500 ft. at approximately 658 feet.
   b. 153.063(C)(5)(a), Placemaking Elements, Shopping Corridor, to not be required to provide the minimum 600 linear feet of mixed use "shopping corridor" development as part of this Development Plan/Site Plan Review, and instead ensure that the shopping corridor is provided on the blocks south of Street Segment 1 (John Shields Parkway).

3. The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the request for Basic Plan Review (Site Plan Review) with 8 conditions:
   a. That the ridge lines parallel to the streets be interrupted to meet Code Section 153.062(D)(2)(c);
   b. That the applicant provide a pedestrian circulation plan demonstrating safe access to the building for residents and visitors;
   c. That the building's architecture be modified to provide the appropriate vertical façade divisions (no spans greater than 40 feet), horizontal façade divisions (detailing required within 3 feet of the top of the ground story), and required change in roof plane (changes required every 80 feet) to meet the Podium Apartment Building Type requirement;
   d. That "Pocket Park **D**" be redesigned to eliminate the proposed detention basin and reconfigure the stormwater management facilities (if needed) to maintain usable, accessible open space area;
   e. That the applicant provide publicly available bicycle parking facilities within the streetscape and within the pocket parks and plazas for visitors and residents;
   f. That the applicant provide additional details regarding the parking structure operation and circulation at the Site Plan Review;
   g. That the surface parking lot plans be modified to provide a street wall consistent with Section 153.065(E) with the landscape treatment required by Sections 153.065(D)(5)(a) and (c);
   h. **That the applicant work with Planning and Engineering to reevaluate the proposed dumpster location in relation to the proposed right-of-way, prior to Site Plan Review**.

4. The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **disapproval** of the Site Plan Waiver for Section 153.062(E)(1), Façade Materials – Permitted Primary Materials.

5. The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **disapproval** the request for payment of a Fee-in-Lieu of open space land dedication.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the Administrative Review Team members had any further questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [There were none.] He confirmed the Administrative Review Team's agreement of the recommendations and the conditions as amended and that the recommendations will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 16th.

Case Review

3. 13-036WID-DP – ID-1 – Ohio University Heritage College of Medicine – Site & Architectural Modifications – 7001, 7003 Post Road

the character of the area and will review the plan with the applicant, but wanted to take the lowest tree waiver request to City Council as possible.

Bryon Sutherly said they will put together the documentation to make the request for waiver clear to City Council.

Mr. Goodwin said this application would be back before the ART for a determination on or before May 16th.

Mr. Harpham said they will be reviewed through "E-Plan" and would have a 21-day review process.

Determinations

4. 13-032MPR – BSC Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – White Dress Co. – Signs – 4455 West Dublin-Granville Road

Rachel Ray said this is a request to install an 18-square-foot wall sign and a 4-square-foot projecting sign for an existing retail facility in the Shoppes at River Ridge shopping center located at the southeast corner of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dale Drive. This Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said they are recommending approval of this Minor Project Review application with the following conditions:

1. That the wall sign be proportionally reduced in size to maximum of 15 square feet, subject to Planning approval; and
2. That the wall sign be centered over the tenant's main entrance to ensure that the sign is appropriately balanced on the building's façade.

Steve Moore, Moore Signs, stated that the tenant space is actually 32 feet wide, instead of 30 feet wide, allowing up to 16 square feet. He asked if the first condition could be amended.

Ms. Ray said it could, but Planning would need documentation of the actual width of the tenant space at sign permitting. She said approval is recommended with the following amended conditions:

1. That the wall sign be proportionally reduced in size to maximum of 16 square feet, subject to Planning approval; and
2. That the wall sign be centered over the tenant's main entrance to ensure that the sign is appropriately balanced on the building's façade.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the Administrative Review Team members had any further questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [There were none.] He confirmed the Administrative Review Team's approval of this application with two conditions.

Case Review

5. 13-031ARB-MPR – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center – Edwards Apartment Building – Tuller Road and Village Parkway

Ms. Ray reiterated that the ART determination and recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission on this application was targeted for the May 2nd ART meeting.

Brian Griffith distributed revised plans to the group. He said the additions have been updated and the elevations have been refined, the south phase and project description is updated with the new street.

Ms. Ray distributed a detailed Code analysis of the project and stated that these would be discussed in greater detail at the General Staff Review meeting scheduled for next.

Ms. Ray reiterated that this application is scheduled for Planning and Zoning Commission review on May 16th.

Administrative

Mr. Langworthy asked Ms. Ray to provide a brief update regarding potential upcoming applications. Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any changes to the April 18, 2013 meeting minutes. Mr. Langworthy clarified for the Jeni's Sign the calculation for the projecting sign is 6-square-foot and the minutes need to reflect the correct square footage. Mr. Langworthy accepted the minutes into the record as amended.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed there were no further items of discussion and adjourned the meeting.

existing brick sidewalk, subject to approval by Engineering.

Ms. Rauch said there will be two tables with chairs within the right-of-way. She said that she checked with Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer, who confirmed that because these tables and chairs are temporary in nature that there will not be a need for City Council review of a Request for Right-of-Way Encroachment.

Steve Langworthy said there is a potential issue over time to keep the tables and chairs pulled off the sidewalk. Anthony Zinder, representing the applicant, said they will keep them within the designated area.

Gary Gunderman confirmed that there were no further comments.

The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Architectural Review Board consider **approval** with two conditions:

1. The applicant work with Planning to provide and appropriately locate a trash receptacle.
2. The applicant uses the matching brick detail for the proposed area to coordinate with the existing brick sidewalk, subject to approval by Engineering.

Mr. Gunderman stated that this application would be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board at their next scheduled meeting on Wednesday, April 24, 2013.

Case Review

4. 13-031ARB-MPR – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center – Edwards Apartment Building – Tuller Road and Village Parkway

Steve Langworthy explained that staff members met with the applicants earlier in the week to review the vehicular access on the west side of the building. He said that the applicant brought three options for consideration, of which they wanted to ask the ART if they would agree that a 60-foot right-of-way on the west side with parallel parking would be a viable option, in lieu of a 65-foot right-of-way. He said normally 65 feet would be required to provide adequate pedestrian and planting facilities on both sides of the street, but because the development is one-sided at this time, the applicant would like feedback regarding whether 60 feet would be adequate at this time. He said that with this option, they would eliminate the need for a Waiver request for block size based on the east/west dimensions of the proposed block. He noted that the applicant is asking for a decision prior to revisions for the Planning and Zoning Commission review.

Barb Cox added that she was continuing to work with the applicant's engineering team on stormwater calculations and management strategies.

Stephen Caplinger, Creative Design + Planning, said he brought a new version of the plans with new renderings, stating the front shows a three-story building and the detail is more refined showing more brick. He said the project description is updated with more accurate parking numbers including the new on-street parking. He stated that the plans are showing a stormwater detention basin in the open space to the west of the building that was also intended to serve as an amenity. He said when they re-submit improved renderings will show the new

60 foot street as recommended by the Administrative Review Team.

Mr. Caplinger said the engineering plan included today read better with architecture and existing sewer lines, by pulling the building back from the sewer lines they were able to avoid any disruption and all other sewer lines will remain the same.

Mr. Caplinger said they are actively working on elevation drawings and material boards and will have them available for the May 2 meeting.

Ms. Ray reiterated that the ART determination and recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission on this application was targeted for the May 2 ART meeting. She requested that the architectural elevations be labeled with percentages of each material used on each elevation, and noted that any use of materials such as vinyl or other materials not permitted by the Code would require approval of a Site Plan Waiver from the Commission.

Jeff Tyler asked if vinyl was permitted in the Code. Ms. Ray stated that the Code permitted "other high quality synthetic materials…with examples of successful high quality installations," and the applicant would need to provide this documentation for any material other than the permitted primary materials such as brick, glass, or stone.

Ms. Cox said they met Monday to discuss the roadway network. She said Dublin Center Drive will be straightened out and there will be two new streets on each side of the proposed building. She noted that there will be some grading challenges on the theater site and how it interacts with the street intersections. She said that weekly meeting have been scheduled with the engineering team to talk about the roadway and work with EMH&T after the survey work is complete. She didn't know if the changes in the street layouts will cause them to lose parking.

Mr. Langworthy said the deadline for the plats to go to City Council is July 1st before their summer hiatus.

Ms. Ray said they are working on the overall schedule for the project and will circulate the schedule once finalized.

Mr. Langworthy said he wanted to verify that the 60 foot roadway on the west side was appropriate with the Administrative Review Team. [The ART members agreed.]

Alan Perkins said the new layout with the 60-foot right-of way and streets with parallel parking were better for the Fire Department to better access the building in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Caplinger said they will revise the plans accordingly and send a digital update as soon as possible for the team's review.

Ms. Cox confirmed with the applicant that she would work directly with Tim Volchko, EMH&T, on the stormwater management.

John DeJarnette asked what kind of security will be provided for the court yards. Mr. Caplinger said the access is limited to card holders/residents for the entrances and the parking garage. He said that during the day there will be an arm barrier and at night there will most likely be a gate.

Ms. Cox pointed out that they would need to determine at some point soon the best way to handle addresses for the building and the residential units. She said that given the number of units, it would not be practical to assign each unit its own address, so they would need to coordinate the addresses through the Police Department.

Ms. Ray asked Mr. Perkins if he had any comments relating to fire access at this time.

Alan Perkins said they will need to see the construction drawings to determine the use of fire protection within the building zones and access zones. He said the street widths are helpful and he would need to see the location of the fire hydrants and determine possible set up locations, but most likely the trucks will set up on the corners and the mid-points of the building, but with the drive aisles they will be able to get close to the building with the ladder truck and only needed 16 feet, but at this point there are no issues with the preliminary site review.

Mr. Tyler said they need to talk about the interior and the use of gas piping. Mr. Caplinger said they were not planning to use gas at this time.

Ms. Cox asked if the water line at 8 inches along John Shields Drive will be sufficient for the Fire Department and possibly reducing the line size to 6 inches on the east side of the building would be acceptable. Mr. Perkins said he would need to see the mechanical plans and indicate the hydrant locations and the water access provided inside the building.

Ms. Ray said the next review meeting will be Thursday, April 25. She said she would work with Planning to conduct a complete review of the plans for compliance with the Code to determine any possible waivers or other issues requiring discussion before the determination targeted for May 2nd.

Ms. Ray confirmed the application was received on April 11th and was posted to the website. There will be a General Staff meeting for this application after the ART meeting next Thursday, April 25, 2013.

Administrative

Mr. Gunderman asked Ms. Ray to provide a brief update regarding potential upcoming applications. Mr. Gunderman asked if there were any changes to the April 11, 2013 meeting minutes [there were none]. Mr. Gunderman accepted the minutes into the record as presented.

Mr. Gunderman confirmed there were no further items of discussion and adjourned the meeting.

restaurant located at the southeast corner of the intersection of South High Street and Spring Hill. She said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G). She said the Administrative Review Team would make a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board at the next meeting on April 18.

Ms. Rauch said this is a multi-tenant building with an existing 36-inch landscaped planting bed that will be removed and replaced with brick pavers that will match the brick used for the existing brick sidewalk. She said there will be two tables with chairs within the right-of-way. She said that she checked with Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer, who confirmed that because these tables and chairs are temporary in nature that there will not be a need for City Council review of a Request for Right-of-Way Encroachment.

Jeff Tyler noted that the existing landscape bed is not well maintained.

Fred Hahn asked if there would be any trash cans associated with the patio seating. Ms. Rauch said she would check to see if there are trash receptacles in the area, or if they would only be available inside the building.

Gary Gunderman confirmed that there were no further comments.

3. 13-031ARB-MPR – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center – Edwards Apartment Building – Tuller Road and Village Parkway

Rachel Ray introduced this request for review of a 324-unit podium apartment building on a 8.32-acre site to be constructed on the north side of a new public street in the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District to the northeast of the existing AMC Theater. She said this Basic Plan Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). She explained that this Basic Plan Review application was for future Development Plan and Site Plan applications for this proposal.

Ms. Ray explained that the Basic Plan Review is for part of the first phase of the overall Dublin Village Center redevelopment. She said that since the development is greater than five acres with new streets and infrastructure proposed, the applicant is required to first file a Basic Plan Review application, which requires review by the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said at this time, the applicants are targeting the Planning and Zoning Commission review on May 16.

Ms. Ray said this building will have podium parking on the 1st level and be constructed at 2 to 3 stories on top of the first floor parking. She described the new public street proposed to the south of the apartment building and the new street and vehicular access drives on either side of the project.

Stephen Caplinger, Creative Design + Planning, representing the applicant, said they have been working on this proposal for a couple of months, and had been meeting with the City to discuss the project's components. He distributed the application materials to the Administrative Review Team members and went through and described each page of the submittal package. He said there will be 100 two bedroom apartments and 220 one bedroom units. He said Edwards was only purchasing and developing this 8.32-acre site.

Mr. Caplinger said the building will be located close to the street and adhering to the Bridge Street District street sections and setbacks. He said they are requesting a waiver for the block

length, addressing the length issue with a break in the middle of the building with pocket parks and with park-like features in front of the building.

Jeff Tyler asked if the connector piece of the building is planned to be constructed with different building materials. Mr. Caplinger indicated it would be designed to look like a series of different buildings.

Ms. Ray said that Planning had discussed the block length Waivers with the applicant, and that they were generally supportive of the Waiver to the north/south block length given the building's dimensions resulting from the podium parking element. She said a second Waiver would be required for the block width, if a street was not provided on the west side of the apartment building, as currently shown, and the City was not supportive of that Waiver. She said however that the City was willing to work with the applicant on the design and character of that street to see how the applicant's objectives for private parking could be achieved on that side of the development.

Mr. Caplinger said there will be one single layer of parking on the first floor and the center court yard is a green roof with parking below. He said there will be court yards interior to the building to the north and south of the green roof element that go all the way down to grade.

Colleen Gilger asked if there were residences at grade level along the new public street on the south side of the building, or if they were planning to provide retail uses.

Mr. Caplinger said the building heights along the south side of the building are designed to potentially accommodate retail in the future, but the market will not support commercial uses at this time, so there are a few residential units at ground level on the south side of the building. He said that the clubhouse, administrative offices, fitness facilities, mail room, etc. are located along the public street frontage, which would help activate that streetscape.

Mr. Caplinger described the proposed open spaces shown on the plans. He said that based on the number of dwelling units, a total of 1.49 acres of open space were required, and the proposal was about .6-acre short of the requirement. He said the applicant planned to request a fee in lieu of providing that remaining open space, but would like to use those funds to make additional enhancements to the existing green spaces within the site. He said the court yards are not included within their open space calculations and will not be open to the public.

Mr. Caplinger said their parking ratio is at 1.7 spaces per unit including the on-street parking, so without the on-street parking included in the calculation, the proposal is about 1.5 spaces per unit.

Mr. Caplinger said they are enhancing the front entrance with urban landscape treatments, providing details of the pocket parks which are heavily landscaped.

Mr. Caplinger said having the residential units at grade will give a nice streetscape appearance. He said the trash will be deposited into trash shoots located on each floor and will be collected at the ground level by maintenance to the trash compactors.

Tim Volchko, EMH&T, went over the engineering plans that included the street, utility, site layout and grading plans.

Mr. Caplinger described the proposed building character and building access, which includes four stairwells and access halls on each side of the building, and one main entrance on the south side of the building. He said the buildings will be card access only.

Mr. Tyler said since there are no doors proposed for the Tuller Road side of the building that they would need significant landscaping and architectural treatments there to avoid the north side of the building just looking like the back of the building. Mr. Caplinger said that was their intent, and they would provide better detailed elevations with the next submittal.

Mr. Caplinger said all units have exterior balconies and all will have a residential character. He said the roof plan will include all of the air conditioning units within roof wells and will be screened with walls and will be hidden from the street.

Ms. Ray asked if the building is mostly brick and glass materials. Mr. Caplinger said there will be a small portion of high quality vinyl siding. Ms. Ray asked that the applicant calculate how much vinyl is proposed as a percentage of the building materials to be used.

Ray Harpham said the parking layout indicated a few dead ends and asked how they would handle someone getting to the end with no available spaces, and how maneuverability would work. Mr. Caplinger said the parking will be assigned, there will be a fee to have parking within the garage and a fee for an assigned or reserved space.

Ms. Ray thanked the applicant for the overview of the plans. She said that because this is the first Basic Plan Review, she wanted to make sure that the ART members understood the process and what they were being asked to review. She asked that the ART identify the “make or break” issues, any potential Waivers to certain Code requirements, and to identify any other inconsistencies with the code. She said after the May 16th Planning Commission meeting, the Commission will be asked to approve the Basic Plan application, and following the Commission’s decision, the next step is the Development Plan, and later the Site Plan Reviews, which are administrative reviews at that stage. She noted that the ART will have the opportunity to review this application at the next two meetings prior to being forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission, with a recommendation planned for the May 2nd ART meeting.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant to provide an update to their project timeline. Mr. Caplinger said they are hoping to start leasing units by March 2014 and would need to be under construction by this August 2013.

Ms. Ray said they are working with the applicant on the schedule and would soon be bringing forward the plats for the new roadways.

Mr. Tyler asked if this was a LEED project. Mr. Caplinger said they do not pursue LEED certification but they incorporate many LEED requirements such as green roof, redevelopment of an existing site, recycling, bicycle parking, water quality standards and neighborhood connectivity.

Barb Cox asked what part of the existing buildings will be demolished. Mr. Caplinger indicated the portion of the building on the aerial and said the demolition will be initiated very soon.

Mr. Tyler said Building will review the demo permit. He said he would like to consider how the ART will participate in the review process for the demolition.

Ms. Cox said they will be going through the platting process for the roadway and will be considering police and fire access with the plat.

Mr. Goodwin said there are fire access requirements with dedicated access to the building.

Alan Perkins said they will require a certain width for access and will work with the applicant to satisfy the requirements.

Gary Gunderman asked if there were any further questions at this time. [There were none.] He thanked the applicant.

Case Determination

4. 13-026WID-DP – West Innovation District ID-3 – AEP Substation – 7723 Plain City-Dublin Road (SR 161)

Justin Goodwin said this case was introduced last week and that this is a request for the development of a new electrical substation for electrical transmission and distribution on an approximately 4.8-acre site. He said the site is adjacent to City of Dublin land along Houchard Road and SR 161 in the West Innovation District. He said this Development Plan Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.042(D).

Mr. Goodwin said this AEP Substation development has requirements as part of a purchase agreement with the City dealing with landscaping and fence location. He said the report outlines comments from staff and that our Law Director has determined that the purchase agreement is flexible enough to accommodate the landscaping site restraints. He said the clarifications and changes to the plan will be dealt with during the permitting process, as well as easements.

Andrew Schall, EMH&T, asked who would take the lead on the documents for the easements.

Barb Cox said that EMH&T would start with definitions of AEP rights and obligations, legal descriptions, and surveys. She confirmed that the Law Director would assist with the easement language.

Mr. Goodwin said with the application EMH&T requested 3 administrative departures regarding two landscaping issues and a gravel drive. He said the departures are not necessary due to the nature of the agreement and the temporary access drive.

Mr. Goodwin said the fence departures regarding fence height and the use of barbed wire are however required, and approval is recommended with a condition that the barbed wire be coated black to match the fence.

Mr. Schall agreed as long as the barbed wire is available in coated black.

Mr. Schall said AEP was concerned with Fire having direct access to the compound with consideration to the high voltage and asked that they provide a 24 hour point of contact for the facility for safety reasons.