



**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](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

**ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**NOVEMBER 7, 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 Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager.

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

**Applicants:** Linda Menerey, EMH&T; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; Kolby Turnock, Casto; and Brent Sobczak, Casto.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the October 31, 2013, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

**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 this request was introduced at last week's ART meeting and that this is still considered Pre-Application Review. He indicated that after meeting last week, staff had met to discuss the proposal and had identified a few areas of concern based on the preliminary analysis:

- *Architecture.* Mr. Goodwin stated that, based on the architectural renderings, there is not enough variety or diversity across the site. He said 29 buildings across with the same or very similar architecture could feel very monotonous and suggested character transitions be incorporated to provide variety. He noted suggested solutions, such as varying the roof forms using various styles and elements to help break up the mass of the buildings.

- *Breezeway Design.* Mr. Goodwin said that the breezeway design is a concern because it does not meet the intent of the principal entrance design requirements of the Code. He stated that an actual enclosed building entrance was preferred.

Ray Harpham stated that if the breezeways were intended to avoid the need to install sprinklers in the building, they may need to have them anyway given the number of units and the size of the buildings.

Mr. Goodwin continued with additional feedback on the proposal:

- *Street Network & Block Layout.* Mr. Goodwin said that the mid-block pedestrianway shown mid-way through the north/south blocks was good, but the length of these blocks exceed the maximum length per Code and would require a Waiver from the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said Planning and Engineering would like to see another neighborhood street running east/west through the site to break down the size of the blocks further. He said that the street could be a yield street and would provide street frontage for those buildings currently located interior to the blocks. He noted that the south block containing the greenway also exceeded the maximum block length, which would also require a Waiver, but there was a benefit to reducing the number of vehicular interruptions to the greenway.
- *Access.* Mr. Goodwin pointed out the proximity of the proposed alley access points with street intersections. He noted that a few on-street parking spaces would likely need to be eliminated. He suggested that different building footprints, such as an "L" shaped building, could help provide additional space between the intersections and driveway access points.
- *Open Spaces.* Mr. Goodwin said the addition of a new street would affect the amount of open space provided, but could allow for the interior courtyards to now have street frontage, which could allow those open spaces to count toward the requirement. Mr. Goodwin referred to the greenway shown along John Shields Parkway and commented on the proposed dimensions. He said that the dedicated greenway area was shown with an 80-foot width, measured up to the face of the buildings fronting on the greenway. He said that some private space should be preserved between the building fronts and the greenway, which would likely mean the greenway width would need to be reduced.

He said that reconfiguring the pocket parks would add diversity and variety. Mr. Goodwin noted the suggestion from last week's meeting about adding a pocket park in front of the clubhouse as a place to gather. He commented that additional thought needed to be given to the design of the greenway, since it should seamlessly connect to the portions to the east and west of the site. He noted that the City still needs to develop concepts for the character and landscape design details of the greenway.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, stated there is flexibility for the open space configuration. She requested direction for the design of the greenway.

Fred Hahn asked about the character of the buildings and the overall landscape design intent. He said he was not satisfied with the greenway design currently shown on the plans, and the greenway should feel consistent.

Mr. Goodwin commented further:

- *Yield Street Design*. He said that the neighborhood street would have a 51-foot right-of-way, and that Planning and Engineering would provide typical section details.
- *John Shields Parkway*. Mr. Goodwin stated that adjustments were needed to the alignment of John Shields Parkway to the east of the site as it passes through the Byers property to the intersection with Village Parkway.

Ms. Menerey said the internal street reconfiguration would likely result in a loss of units. She asked how the greenway would be configured to the east, and how or whether units should be placed on the south side of the greenway in this area.

Mr. Goodwin referenced the Hobbes Landing street connection to Greystone Mews to the south, and said that it may need to shift slightly to be shown correctly.

Ms. Menerey asked about MI's involvement, and who was designing the Hobbes Landing connection.

Mr. Goodwin stated that the street connection related to the overall street phasing within the 17-acre site, as well as for fire access. He asked if Hobbes Landing was part of the next phase. He said that when the Basic Plan is brought forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission, they will need as much context as possible to understand how the phasing is anticipated. He added that the Commission will also be required to review any proposed Waivers, including to the proposed block sizes if necessary, and that the Waivers should not be viewed as guaranteed or necessarily supported by the ART at this time.

Ms. Menerey said she was concerned with the potential for very tight turning radii if the blocks were broken down further, which would complicate fire access.

Alan Perkins said the fire trucks were not likely to require alley access, and the block layout should provide adequate fire access to the buildings.

Barb Cox pointed out that it will depend on how the buildings are laid out.

Mr. Goodwin concluded that at this point, staff's preliminary feedback had been covered. He asked the applicants if they had any questions about the initial comments.

Ms. Menerey said that the project architect, Joe Sullivan, was unable to attend, but he had already begun to rethink the larger buildings. She thought there may be concerns with adding doors to the breezeway buildings, but they would look into the comments related to the buildings.

Steve Langworthy said the project feels very suburban at this stage, mainly because of the number of buildings shown of the same architectural character. He stated that variation among the blocks will be critical, and the lack of diversity is a problem.

Mr. Goodwin clarified that it is not necessarily the contemporary design of the buildings that is concerning, but the sameness of all buildings.

Mr. Langworthy suggested creating small neighborhoods and a different feel for each one.

Ms. Menerey asked if the desire for diversity also needed to be reflected in the pocket parks.

Mr. Goodwin said if they were linked together as pedestrianway concept, a more coordinated design may be appropriate, but if they are split up, he suggested that they differ from one another.

Mr. Hahn agreed that symmetry appeared to be a theme in the current plans.

Kolby Turnock, Casto, asked for clarification for providing diversity within the blocks.

Mr. Goodwin suggested that the desire was for a unique character for each street, as perceived by pedestrians at the street-level, as opposed to opposite sides of one block having the same character.

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

Mr. Perkins said he liked the street network, but more detail would be necessary as the project advances. He said the number of buildings would require close attention to hydrant placement and spacing. He would also need more information about the street phasing.

Mr. Harpham commented that three levels of flats would likely require fire suppression, but he would check the Building Code. He added that each unit may also require an independent means of egress.

Mr. Turnock stated he would have Joe Sullivan research these Building Code comments further.

Mr. Goodwin referenced the minimum finished floor elevation requirement, which states that units were required to have their first floors a minimum of two and a half feet above the sidewalk, with entrances to common spaces being the exception. He stated that a reconfigured site plan could afford opportunities to provide the accessible units in appropriate locations to reinforce the objective of maximizing privacy from the street level.

Ms. Menerey asked whether buildings could have frontage on an open space, and how that would affect the building's required building zone.

Mr. Goodwin clarified that buildings can front an open space.

Mr. Harpham suggested alternative roof forms be used to help break up the building massing. He said that contemporary architecture was not the problem but variations on the theme were necessary.

Mr. Goodwin recommended that they consider including some more traditional styles or design elements in addition to the contemporary style.

Mr. Turnock stated that Casto has a variety of building types to choose from.

Mr. Hahn said he is concerned with the character of the John Shields Parkway greenway, and

how it will be phased. He said some additional thought internally needed to be given to the greenway.

Ms. Cox commented on the alignment of John Shields Parkway to the east, which Mr. Goodwin had referenced earlier. She said that cycletracks would be needed on John Shields Parkway, and EMH&T has the dimensional requirements for these. She said that for the 65-foot right-of-way streets, more detail on the parallel parking spaces and intersection design would need to be considered. She asked the applicants to begin thinking through stormwater management, trash collection, and water lines once the streets are laid out.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, said that they had begun looking at pervious pavement in the parallel parking spaces, and linking stone layers beneath the parking and open spaces. He said they were also looking at options to provide a StormTech layer instead of stone. He said there was no good outlet for stormwater, and a stormwater line extension was probably necessary with John Shields Parkway.

Ms. Cox noted the storm sewer on Tuller.

Mr. Quackenbush stated that his biggest concern is water. He said that Columbus has not allowed private water lines to cross under public streets. He said that this presents serious issues with master metering, and alternatively, requiring separate tap fees would be very expensive.

Mr. Turnock asked about the possibility of providing the streets within public access easements, designed to public street standards, and not actually dedicating the right-of-way.

Mr. Goodwin stated that this approach was not ideal.

Mr. Quackenbush said he is meeting with Columbus next week to discuss this issue further.

Mr. Langworthy reiterated that altering the architectural character of the buildings and adding streets will help improve the plan. He asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Mr. Goodwin reiterated the next steps in the process and said he will provide a written summary of these comments next week.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments regarding this application. [There were none]. He thanked the applicant.

## **2. 13-107MPR – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Christoff Retail Center – 6465 Sawmill Road**

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant is not here today; they will be resubmitting plans. He said the new target determination will be November 21, 2013.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE**

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