



**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

OCTOBER 31, 2013

ART Members: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; and Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst.

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

Applicants: Thomas Beery, Thomas Beery Architects Inc.; Chris Christoff; Jackie Trucco, Ivy Bridal Studio; Steve Moore, Moore Signs; Linda Menerey, EMH&T; Kolby Turnock, Casto; and Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the October 24, 2013, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

PRE-APPLICATION CASE REVIEW

1. Pre-Application Review (Bridge Street District) – BSC Residential District & BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Casto Residential Development – Tuller Road & John Shields Parkway

Justin Goodwin said this is a request for non-binding review of a potential application for a 384-unit residential development and associated site improvements on a 17-acre parcel. He said the proposal includes new public street connections including the extension of John Shields Parkway and an associated greenway connection. He said the site is located on the south side of Tuller Road between Tuller Ridge Drive and Village Parkway. He explained that this is a request for pre-application review prior to submission of an application for Basic Plan Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(C).

Mr. Goodwin explained that the purpose of the pre-application review meeting is to provide the applicant with a non-binding and informal review of the development proposal, including application review procedures. He noted that the proposal contains a hierarchy of streets that is composed of public connector streets and neighborhood streets, which are generally consistent with the street network shown in the Bridge Street District plans. He noted that on and off-street parking is included in this proposal.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, described the open spaces included in the proposal, including pocket parks and courtyards. She said the applicant understood that the courtyards without frontage on a public street will not qualify as meeting the open space requirements.

Ms. Menerey provided an overview of the proposed street network. She said she would like further direction on connecting the eastern-most north/south street through the Greystone Mews neighborhood to the south, but since that road would happen on the adjacent property to the east, it is not part of this future application.

Mr. Langworthy asked about the proposed block dimensions, and if any of the blocks were expected to exceed the maximum block dimensions.

Mr. Goodwin noted that some of the north/south block lengths may exceed the 500-foot maximum, but the overall maximum perimeter block length would not be exceeded.

Ms. Menerey provided an overview of the greenway connection.

Mr. Goodwin noted that further discussion on the greenway connection and its design would be necessary before the project proceeds.

Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects, described the proposed apartment building types, which were planned in three different configurations containing eight, twelve, or twenty units each. He explained that the proposed building materials included brick, HardiePanel, and siding. He pointed out that garages will be accessible from private alleys, while the front of the buildings along the principal streets will include elevated living spaces above the street on the first level. He said that retaining walls were shown around the front of the buildings to provide an accent on the front façade and help separate the public and private spaces. Mr. Sullivan stated that the architectural theme involved a modern, geometric composition of forms, and colors can be used to differentiate the buildings. He said that cementitious siding will be used in a contemporary manner.

Mr. Sullivan provided a detailed overview of the proposed unit configurations. He stated that townhouses were expected to be approximately 1,200 square feet, and flats would be around 800 square feet. He described the proposed "breezeway" configuration of the buildings, where units were accessed from a common stairway that was not fully enclosed.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed with Mr. Sullivan that the outside doors would be secured.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the proposed windows are recessed into the siding material.

Mr. Sullivan stated that there are a variety of window designs that establish a shadow line to accentuate the geometric theme, and that many of these designs incorporate a recessed window element.

Mr. Goodwin asked how long the 20-unit buildings were anticipated to be.

Ms. Menerey confirmed they will be approximately 150 feet long.

Mr. Goodwin asked if there are entrances along the street façade, and noted that a breezeway may not be enough to meet the building entrance requirements of the Code.

Mr. Sullivan said that the design is conceptual and adjustments could be made following the ART's feedback.

Mr. Goodwin noted that the long blocks are approximately 580 feet in length, and the Bridge Street Code allows for a maximum of 500 feet. He observed that this similar situation occurred with the Edwards development proposal earlier this year, and that the proposed block length had been approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission through approval of a Waiver.

Ms. Menerey noted that a few of the pocket parks shown in the proposal are just under the tenth of an acre requirement, but agreed that there may be other areas on the site where the requirement could be provided.

Ms. Menerey asked if hanging bike storage could count towards the bike parking requirement.

Mr. Goodwin agreed that hanging bike storage could potentially count, as long as other publicly accessible bike parking facilities were provided throughout the site.

Mr. Langworthy said there may be concerns with the lack of a strong terminal vista at the end of the north-south streets within the development, and more vertical elements to meet this code requirement may be necessary.

Mr. Goodwin said that there are architectural and building variety requirements in the code, and that the applicant should develop a palette of building options that meet these code requirements.

Mr. Goodwin reiterated that this Pre-Application Review was an introduction, and the applicant planned to return to next week's Administrative Review Team meeting for further discussion. He said that following next week's ART meeting, written comments would be provided to the applicant within 10 days.

Mr. Langworthy asked each ART member to provide initial feedback on the proposal.

Alan Perkins noted potential concerns with fire access until the phasing of the connection to Hobbes Landing and Greystone Mews was implemented. He stated that the furthest south east-west alley may have width and maneuverability issues.

Barb Cox suggested altering the parking layouts and noted they would need to provide handicap parking in the parallel spaces. She was also concerned with how John Shields Parkway would connect. She mentioned that Engineering would like to see decentralized stormwater management systems as much as possible. Ms. Cox suggested that the applicant consider providing a small pocket park in front of the clubhouse to serve as a gathering space and help meet the open space requirements.

Mr. Sullivan said they would consider the modifications to the pocket parks, and agreed to look at the on-street parking.

Ms. Menerey stated that she would be prepared to discuss Stormwater at the next Administrative Review Team meeting.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments regarding this application. [There were none]. He thanked the applicant and stated that this project would be on next week's meeting agenda.

DETERMINATION

2. 13-108MPR – BSC Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – Ivy Bridal Studio – Signs – 4455 West Dublin-Granville Road

Rachel Ray said this is a request to install a 15-square-foot wall sign and a four-square-foot projecting sign for an existing retail facility located in the Shoppes at River Ridge shopping center at the southeast corner of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dale Drive. She said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said this application was introduced to the Administrative Review Team last week. She reported that she had sent the proposal to Mark Ford, an architectural consultant, to review with our recommendations. She reported Mr. Ford's comments and concerns with respect to the sign's design.

Ms. Ray stated that although all dimensional zoning requirements were met on both signs, she was concerned that the signs do not adequately address the intent that signs be designed in a high quality manner and contribute to a pedestrian-oriented environment. She outlined concerns with the signs legibility and design. She said that, based on the architectural consultant's analysis, disapproval was recommended.

Steve Moore, Moore Signs, said he had reviewed Mr. Ford's comments and had made as many of the changes as possible without completely redesigning the sign before the application was submitted. He pointed out that he had introduced a black border around the projecting sign, changed the character spacing, modified the fonts, and other similar adjustments on both signs. He noted that the sign design is consistent with the branding of his client's business and her store's interior theme. He said that the only recommendation he did not address was changing the projecting sign's dimension from 48 inches to 42 inches.

Mr. Moore described the proposed sign's construction. He explained that the sign is constructed with a high-gloss finish and will have a halo lighting effect at night. He said that it is an aluminum structure with a three-dimensional design and illuminated with LED lights. He said that he believes he addressed all of Administrative Review Team's concerns. He agreed that the rendering of the sign may be somewhat misleading, since it is difficult to adequately reflect the three dimensional design and illumination through photographs.

Ms. Ray said she was not aware, prior to the meeting, that the applicant had made the adjustments he had described following Mr. Ford's suggestions.

Mr. Langworthy asked the Administrative Review Team members for comments.

The consensus of the Administrative Review Team was that they were comfortable with the sign as modified by Mr. Moore, particularly since the sign's design reflects the logo of a brand which represents Ms. Trucco's business, her store, and her aesthetic.

Ms. Ray said she appreciated the changes to the sign made by the applicant and noted that the changes would be noted for the record.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the Administrative Review Team members had any further comments regarding this proposal. [There were none.] He confirmed the Administrative Review Team's approval of this application with the modifications described by Mr. Moore.

CASE REVIEW

3. 13-107MPR – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Christoff Retail Center – 6465 Sawmill Road

Justin Goodwin said this is a request for review and approval of a new 3,064-square-foot Commercial Center Building and associated site improvements at 6465 Sawmill Road within the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. He said the site is located west of Sawmill Road and approximately 450 feet north of West Dublin-Granville Road. He said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.065(G).

Mr. Goodwin said that this application was introduced to the Administrative Review Team at last week's meeting. He reported that the discrepancy between the site plan and the parcel lines has since been resolved. He noted that the Administrative Review Team had had initial comments on the architectural details on the façade, and requested additional vertical divisions to be added as well as exterior building lighting. He stated that David Meleca, an architectural consultant, had provided architectural review recommendations. He said that if the intention is for one or two tenants, the ART had requested to see the different elevations for each scenario and compare.

Mr. Goodwin noted that the applicant had provided revised architectural elevations, incorporating Mr. Meleca's recommendations. He asked the applicant if they had considered using a different material for the base of building to incorporate a different color.

Tom Beery, Thomas Beery Architects, said that finding a complementary material is challenging so they are sticking with brick instead of introducing another color of brick.

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant had sent a markup of the site plan the morning of this meeting illustrating potential revisions to the site layout in order to incorporate a ground sign. Mr. Goodwin said that the Bridge Street District zoning regulations will not allow signs on the north and south elevations. He said the applicant will need to be creative with sign design to be visible to north and south-bound traffic.

Chris Christoff said the sign configuration that meets code requirements will deter tenants from locating in the facility.

Mr. Goodwin explained three options for sign configuration that may address Mr. Christoff's concerns. He explained that Mr. Christoff may seek approval of a Master Sign Plan from the Planning and Zoning Commission; the other option is the potential to include a ground sign. Mr. Goodwin stated that setbacks for ground signs are eight feet from either the public right-of-way or the minimum required building zone line (five feet). He said currently, the mark-up location of a potential ground sign is eight feet behind the right-of-way, and it needs to be 13 feet to meet these requirements. Mr. Goodwin also suggested exploring the potential for a ground sign around the corner of a street wall that could enclose the pocket plaza in the front of the proposed building.

Mr. Goodwin said that the inclusion of a ground sign would set the building back 14 to 15 feet to provide landscape space, which would force a loss of parking spaces. He explained that this would not necessarily under-park the site per code for a general retail use, but will not provide sufficient parking for a restaurant tenant. He said that if the tenants are retail, the site would contain more than enough parking than the code requires, thus the building setback adjustment for the ground sign could be an effective sign alternative. He said that if there is potential for a restaurant, it does not make sense to remove parking, and the ground sign may not work, depending on the design of the sign. He asked that they consider looking at different types or shapes of signs and consider whether they are willing to move the building back.

Mr. Christoff remarked that signs are a big issue for potential tenants. He commented that the Bridge Street sign regulations are geared toward pedestrian traffic, while this site will need to be visible to motorists driving on Sawmill Road.

Mr. Goodwin reminded Mr. Christoff that he may request a Master Sign Plan to address these concerns, which requires Planning and Zoning Commission approval. He clarified that only the Master Sign Plan would need to be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the Administrative Review Team would continue to have review and approval authority over the site plan; however, a revised site design will begin a new 14-day Administrative Review period.

Barb Cox asked that the applicant produce a revised stormwater report and show that there will be no increased impacts in the revised site plan design.

Mr. Goodwin said that the first possible meeting with the Planning and Zoning Commission would be December 5, 2013, but the Administrative Review Team will need to review the application first.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments regarding this application. [There were none]. He thanked the applicant and stated that this project would be on next week's meeting agenda.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further items of discussion. [There were none.]
The meeting was adjourned.