



City of Dublin

**LAND USE & LONG
RANGE PLANNING**

West Innovation District Development Plan Review

13-0100WID – DP

Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine-Anatomy Lab Expansion

7001 Post Road

This is a proposal for a $\pm 1,000$ square foot expansion and other associated architectural and site modifications to an existing anatomy lab at this 14.85 acre college campus at the southwest corner of the intersection of Eiterman Road and Post Road. This is a request for review and approval of a Development Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.042(D).

Date of Application Acceptance

Monday, September 9, 2013

Date of ART Determination

Thursday, October 10, 2013

Case Manager

Dan Phillabaum, AICP, RLA, Senior Planner | (614) 410-4662 | dphillabaum@dublin.oh.us



PART I: APPLICATION OVERVIEW

<i>Zoning District</i>	ID-1 Research Office District
<i>Review Type</i>	Development Plan Review (Innovation Districts)
<i>Development Proposal</i>	A ±1,000 square foot expansion and other associated architectural and site modifications to an existing anatomy lab at a 14.85 acre college campus.
<i>Administrative Departures</i>	None
<i>Property Address</i>	7001-7003 Post Road
<i>Property Owner(s)</i>	Ohio University
<i>Applicants</i>	Teri Umbarger, AIA, LEED AP, BHDP Architects
<i>Case Manager</i>	Dan Phillabaum, AICP, RLA, Senior Planner (614) 410-4662 dphillabaum@dublin.oh.us

Application Review Procedure: Development Plan Review

The purpose of the Development Plan Review is to provide an efficient and predictable review process for development projects within the West Innovation District. The Development Plan Review is necessary to ensure that applications for development meet the requirements of Chapter 153 of the Dublin Code. Following acceptance of a complete application for Development Plan Review, the Administrative Review Team shall approve the Development Plan application when all of the requirements of the Innovation Districts and the intent of the West Innovation District Plan (formerly EAZ Plan) is met, including Administrative Departures if applicable, as required by §153.042(D)(5)(e)1. The Administrative Review Team may alternatively issue a decision that the application should be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission as a Site Plan Review, based on the criteria of §153.042(D)(5)(e)2. A determination by the Administrative Review Team is required not more than 28 days from the date the request was submitted.

Summary

This existing anatomy lab was recently part of a more comprehensive Development Plan application approved on May 16, 2013. This approval involved architectural modifications to the three existing buildings on the 15 acre site including site modifications for the removal of a portion of the existing parking lot and the addition of landscape enhancements to create a campus green between the existing buildings.

The existing anatomy lab was formerly used as a garage, and the previous approval created a more prominent entrance at the southeast corner of the building by the addition of a highly transparent storefront system and canopy that wraps the corner. Windows were also added along the east and west elevations to increase the amount of natural light entering the lab. At the northern end of the west elevation a 14-foot tall mechanical screen wall was added using the same eight inch dimension split face block material in a banding pattern coordinated with the existing structure.

The proposed addition is for showers and locker rooms along the west elevation and adjacent to the mechanical screen wall. It is proposed to be the same width and height as the mechanical screen wall, with a very shallow pitched (flat) roof behind a low parapet wall. The addition extends to within five feet

of the south elevation. The same materials and banding pattern are proposed for the addition as were used on the mechanical screen.

Zoning Code Analysis

ID-1 Research Office

§153.038 – District Uses

Educational Facilities are Permitted Uses.

§153.039 – Innovation District Requirements

Architectural Requirements

- (1) *Design Purpose.* Structures within the Innovation Districts are expected to have a forward-looking, contemporary architectural expression typically associated with technology and research uses. The proposed addition is to an existing structure, and based on the Applicability standards, is not subject to the specific requirements but should meet them to the extent possible.
- (2) *Architectural Intent.* The ID-1 District is intended to accommodate larger buildings with multiple stories. As an addition to an existing structure, this intent is not required to be met.
- (3) *Applicability.* Specific architectural requirements apply to new construction. The design of additions to structures existing prior to the adoption of the Innovation District requirements may coordinate with the architecture of the existing structure but should meet the District's architectural requirements to the extent possible.

The Administrative Review Team engaged Mark Ford & Associates Architects to conduct an analysis of the proposed addition to determine the appropriateness of the addition relative to the architectural character of the existing structure as well as any potential modifications that would be recommended for the area of the addition to meet the architectural requirements for new construction in the Innovation District code, to the extent practical and appropriate. The consultant's recommendations are included in the relevant Architectural Requirements section of this ART report, and the full analysis is attached.

- (4) *Critical design components.* Not applicable.
- (5) *Elements of contemporary style.* Not applicable.
- (6) *Applying the pattern book.* Not applicable.
- (7) *Architectural variation.* All sides of a principal structure shall display a compatible level of quality and architectural interest, particularly those visible to the public. Single material, monolithic wall planes with lack of detail shall be avoided.

The consultant recommends that an offset or projection of 8 or 12 inches be created between the addition and the mechanical screen wall to interrupt this long wall plane and create an edge to identify each of these elements as separate volume in the building massing. To be consistent with code, variations in depth of wall planes shall be a minimum of 12 inches.

- (8) *Architectural detail.* Not applicable.
- (9) *Fenestration.* Not applicable.
- (10) *Entrances.* No new entrances are proposed with the addition.

(11) *Roofs.* The roof of the addition is a very shallow sloped PVC membrane roof with drainage scuppers behind a low parapet wall. The height to the top of the parapet is to be 14 feet, consistent with the height of the mechanical screen wall. Given this design objective of the applicant, and the limitations to other potential roof types created by the existing windows on the two-story portion of the west elevation and the eave line of the one-story portion of the existing structure, this roof style is appropriate and permitted by code.

(12) *Materials.* The addition will be constructed primarily of split face concrete masonry units. Per code, split face masonry units may be acceptable as a primary building material if combined with other masonry products to raise the level of visual quality.

The proposed addition is designed to coordinate with the existing building, but does not include the brick soldier course banding of the existing structure. In place of the brick soldier courses, smooth concrete masonry units are proposed in the same colors as the split face masonry units.

The consultant recommends that the brick soldier course be used on the addition along the south and west elevations and terminating at the recommended offset at the north end of the west wall. This would differentiate the addition from the mechanical screen wall, and increase the visual quality of the building.

§153.040 – Site Development Requirements

Tree Preservation. The addition will require the removal of a protected tree not identified for removal by the previous Development Plan approval. This tree measures approximately 10-caliper inches in diameter. The previously approved site modifications required removal of 97 caliper inches of protected trees; 113 caliper inches of deciduous trees were proposed as replacements, consistent with the inch for inch replacement requirement for protected trees and accommodating the removal of this 10-caliper inch tree.

Parking Requirements

The addition of shower and locker room facilities is ancillary in nature to the anatomy lab and other existing functions of the college, and is serving the same population of users. Therefore, no additional parking is required for the area of the addition.

PART II: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM COMMENTS

Land Use and Long Range Planning

Planning concurs with the recommendations of the architectural consultant as being effective modifications to improve the visual quality and architectural interest of the proposed addition, and consistent with the intent of the Architectural Requirements of the Innovation Districts.

Engineering

Utilities

The applicant must provide signed documentation as part of the site permit application that this project and the increased amount of impervious area has very minimal impact to the stormwater management plan for the campus.

Building Standards, Parks and Open Space, Police, Fire, Economic Development

No comments.

PART III: APPLICABLE REVIEW STANDARDS

The Administrative Review Team shall review this application based on the Innovation District requirements and the West Innovation District Plan, including Administrative Departures as may be applicable. The full text of the Review Standards of Section 153.042(D)(7) are provided at the end of this Report.

Development Plan Standards of Approval

In addition to meeting all other requirements of the District, a development plan application shall only be approved by the ART if the requirements of the District and the following criteria are met:

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| A. Site Design Characteristics | <i>Criteria Met</i> |
| B. Environmental Standards | <i>Criteria Met</i> |
| C. Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation | <i>Criteria Met</i> |
| D. Public Services | <i>Criteria Met</i> |
| E. Purpose and Spirit of this Chapter and Adopted Plans | <i>Criteria Met</i> |

PART IV: PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM DETERMINATION

Approval of this Development Plan Application consistent with the comments outlined in this report.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN STANDARDS OF APPROVAL

In addition to meeting all other requirements of the District, a development plan application shall only be approved by the ART or Planning and Zoning Commission, as applicable, if the requirements of the District and the following criteria are met:

- A. Site Design Characteristics.
 1. All elements of the site design shall be harmoniously and efficiently organized in relation to topography, the size and type of lot, the character of adjoining property, and the type and size of buildings.
 2. The site shall be developed so as not to impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted by the District.
 3. All buildings or groups of buildings shall be arranged so as to permit emergency vehicle access by some practicable means to all vehicles.
 4. Every structure or dwelling unit shall be provided with adequate means of ingress and egress via public streets and walkways.
- B. Environmental Standards.
 1. The landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practicable, by minimizing tree and soil removal, alteration to the natural drainage courses, and the amount of cutting, filling and grading. Natural features and the site topography shall be incorporated into the proposed site design to the maximum extent practicable.
 2. Landscaping buffers and/or greenbelts may be required beyond those otherwise required in the District to ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property.
- C. Vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
 1. The expected volume of traffic to be generated by the proposed use shall not adversely affect existing roads and the circulation thereon.
 2. Driveways shall be located to minimize conflict with traffic operations on the adjoining road. The number of driveways shall be the minimum needed to provide reasonable access to the site.
 3. The arrangement of public or common ways for vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall respect the pattern of existing or planned streets and pedestrian or bicycle pathways in the area.
 4. Safe, convenient, uncongested and well-defined vehicular and pedestrian circulation within and to the site shall be provided. Drives, streets and other elements shall be designed to promote safe and efficient traffic operations within the site and at its access points.
- D. Public Services. The scale and design of the proposed development shall facilitate the adequate provision of services currently furnished by or that may be required of the city or other public agency including, but not limited to, fire and police protection, storm water management, sanitary sewage removal and treatment, recreational activities, traffic control, and administrative services.
- E. The general purposes and spirit of this chapter and the various provisions and components of the Community Plan, including the EAZ Plan.

To: Dan Phillabaum, AICP, RLA, Senior Planner, City of Dublin

From: Mark Ford, Ford & Associates Architects, Inc. 

Date: October 4, 2013

Re: Ohio University Heritage College of Medicine Anatomy Lab Expansion - Architectural Review

Per your request, I have completed a review of the architectural design documents prepared by BHDP dated September 13, 2013. It is my understanding that the proposed building addition is to be a single story masonry structure with a low slope roof system that will be concealed by masonry parapets. The previously approved building elevations are to remain unchanged.

Plan Comments – Sheet A-01:

1. I would suggest offsetting the plane of the west wall elevation from the plane of the mechanical enclosure by an increment of 8” or 12”. This additional dimension can be included within the locker room plan.

Elevation Comments – Sheet A-02:

1. As stated above, I would suggest offsetting the plane of the west wall elevation from the plane of the mechanical enclosure by an increment of 8” or 12”. This will create an edge that will identify each element as a separate volume.
2. The horizontal banding comprised of brick soldier coursing that is used on the existing two story building should also be used on this new addition. This banding should extend across the south and west elevations and return into the newly created offset at the north end of the west wall. This again will differentiate the proposed addition from the mechanical enclosure.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding the above review comments.

END OF MEMO