

Basic Plan Review

14-008BPR – BSC Residential District

Tuller Flats – 4313 Tuller Road

This is a request for review of a multiple-family residential development consisting of 392 apartment units within 30 three-story apartment buildings, a clubhouse/community center, and associated streets and open spaces on approximately 17 acres south of Tuller Road, approximately 700 feet east of Tuller Ridge Drive. This site is zoned BSC-R, Bridge Street Corridor Residential District. This combined Basic Development Plan Review/Basic Site Plan Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(D).

Date of Application Acceptance

Tuesday, January 28, 2014

Date of ART Recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 13, 2014

Case Manager

Justin Goodwin, Planner II, (614) 410-4677 | jgoodwin@dublin.oh.us



PART I: Application Overview

<i>Zoning District</i>	BSC Residential District
<i>Review Type</i>	Basic Development Plan Review and Basic Site Plan Review
<i>Development Proposal</i>	392-unit multiple-family residential development and associated site improvements on a ±17-acre site
<i>Use</i>	Multiple-Family Dwellings, Community Center and associated accessory uses
<i>Building Types</i>	Apartment Buildings (30); Accessory Structures (2)
<i>Administrative Departures</i>	None. To be confirmed at Site Plan Review.
<i>Development Plan Waivers</i>	Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) – To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block ‘C’ (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ±580 feet and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to ±2,015). Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) – To increase the maximum permitted block length for Block ‘G’ from 500 feet to ±665 feet.
<i>Site Plan Waivers</i>	Code Section 153.062(H)(1)(f) – To allow windows on street-facing façades of Apartment building types to be horizontally proportioned, where architecturally appropriate to the design of the building.
<i>Property Owner</i>	Thomas Family Limited Partnership
<i>Applicant</i>	Brent Sobczak, Casto
<i>Representative</i>	Aaron Underhill, Underhill Law Office, LLC
<i>Case Managers</i>	Justin Goodwin, Planner II, (614) 410-4677 jgoodwin@dublin.oh.us

Application Review Procedure: Basic Plan Review

The purpose of the Basic Plan Review is to outline the scope, character, and nature of the proposed development and to determine the applicable review process. The process is intended to allow the required reviewing body to evaluate the proposal for its consistency with the principles of walkable urbanism as described in §153.057, the Bridge Street District Plan in the Dublin Community Plan, and other related policy documents adopted by the City. The Basic Plan Review also provides an opportunity for public input at the earliest stages of the development process. Basic Plan Review is required prior to submission for applications for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews.

Following acceptance of a complete application for Basic Plan Review, the Administrative Review Team shall make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission to approve, deny, or approve with conditions the application based on the criteria of §153.066(E) applicable to Development Plan Reviews, §153.066(F) applicable to Site Plan Reviews and §153.066(I) for Waivers (if necessary). A determination by the Planning and Zoning Commission is required not more than 28 days from the date the request was submitted. As part of their review of the Basic Plan, the Commission shall determine the required reviewing body for the subsequent Development Plan and Site Plan Review applications based on the factors outlined in §153.066(D)(3)(a).

Application History

Pre-Application Review

The Administrative Review Team conducted a Pre-Application Review for this project on October 31 and November 7, 2013. Comments were provided to the applicant to ensure the application generally met the requirements of the Bridge Street District zoning regulations and the objectives of the Bridge Street District Area Plan.

Informal Review

The Planning and Zoning Commission conducted an Informal Review of this project on January 9, 2014. This step was included in the review process to provide an early understanding of the project because a development agreement between the applicant and the City will be necessary to implement significant public infrastructure improvements associated with this proposal, most notably, the extension of John Shields Parkway from Tuller Ridge Drive to Village Parkway.

Application Contents and Overview

Planning and Zoning Commission Determinations

The Basic Plan Review is intended to provide a higher level overview of significant development projects. While the Basic Plan Review is based on an analysis of the review criteria for the Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews (as applicable), it is not expected that all project elements will be finalized since the purpose of the Basic Plan Review is to obtain public input at the earliest stages of the development process.

The Administrative Review Team has conducted its analysis of the project based on the information submitted. The ART has also reviewed the proposal in light of the detailed review standards and the applicant is aware of the additional information that will be needed as this proposal advances to Development Plan and Site Plan Review.

Four actions will be required by the Planning and Zoning Commission:

- 1) Basic Development Plan Review, based on the review criteria of §153.066(E)(3) for Development Plan Review;
- 2) Basic Site Plan Review, based on the review criteria of §153.066(F)(3) for Site Plan Review;
- 3) Development Plan and Site Plan Waiver Review; and
- 4) Required reviewing body determination for the subsequent Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews.

The Administrative Review Team is required to make recommendations on items 1, 2, and 3.

Basic Development Plan Review

The project elements reviewed as part of the Basic Development Plan include the proposed street network and block framework and street types.

Basic Site Plan Review

The project elements reviewed as part of the Basic Site Plan include the proposed use, building types, open space arrangement and site development details.

Next Steps

The next step following this application is Development Plan and Site Plan Review. The ART recommends a combined Development Plan/Site Plan Review due to the comprehensive nature of this development proposal as a unified multiple-family residential neighborhood.

This project will also involve the dedication of public right-of-way for John Shields Parkway and additional public streets, and a public reserve for an adjacent greenway, which requires review and approval of Preliminary and Final Plats by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.

PART II: Administrative Review Team Comments

Planning

The proposal is the first significant step toward the creation of a gridded street network and block system between Tuller Ridge Drive and Village Parkway. Given its prominence along the planned John Shields Parkway, this new residential neighborhood will set the tone for future adjacent development. The site, building, and open space designs will serve as examples of desirable Bridge Street District development. This will be accomplished through adherence to Code requirements and the recommended conditions. The following are the primary considerations from Planning.

Land Use. During the Informal Review, the Planning and Zoning Commission expressed a desire for new developments in the Bridge Street District to include mixed uses. While the proposed residential neighborhood is consistent with the goal of creating a residential core as described in the Bridge Street District Plan for the [Tuller/Greenway Character District](#), the applicant has also begun conceptual planning efforts to include mixed use elements on the adjacent 17-acre site to be designed to complement the proposed development. The conceptual site layout shows commercial uses at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. Planning has encouraged the applicant to continue exploring the potential for mixed use components at this location to provide commercial and service destinations for residents within an approximate five-minute walking radius of the proposed Tuller Flats neighborhood. The conceptual layout for the adjacent property, though shown for context purposes, is not part of this application.

Street Network and Block Framework. This Basic Development Plan proposed a combination public/private street system, with John Shields Parkway dedicated as public right-of-way (to be platted), and all other neighborhood streets to remain privately owned with public access easements. However, this approach is not preferred by either the City of Dublin or the City of Columbus due to a number of concerns related to long term maintenance and serviceability of both the streets and the water service to the private development. The City will continue to work with the applicant to find an acceptable approach to providing water service to this development.

As shown, the access easement configuration was intended to allow for consolidated water meters to the north and south of John Shields Parkway because the City of Columbus does not allow private water lines to cross public rights-of-way.

If this approach was maintained, it would present a technicality that creates challenges with applying certain Code requirements, such as block size and street frontage requirements. The Bridge Street District zoning regulations anticipate a more typical situation in which public streets create individual blocks, which may then be subdivided into smaller lots. Street frontage requirements are then applied for individual buildings and open spaces on a lot-by-lot basis.

Regardless of this technical issue, the overall development pattern is largely consistent with the intent to establish a network of interconnected streets with walkable block sizes and pedestrian-friendly design. Under the private easement the design and construction of the private streets would look, feel, and function as public streets.

Block Size and Access. Proposed blocks to the west of Watson Street (Blocks A and B) and south of John Shields Parkway (Blocks F and G) are designed as partial blocks, to be completed with future redevelopment and street construction on adjacent properties. This phased development condition will be a common occurrence in many portions of the Bridge Street District. Easements for Watson Street and McCune Avenue are shown extending to the south and west property lines, where these streets would be extended with future development. These partial blocks meet the block size exemption of the Code.

The central block (Block C) is partially bisected by McCune Avenue, but will require a waiver for block length (± 580 feet) and perimeter ($\pm 2,015$ feet) due to the location of a centrally located clubhouse at the terminus of McCune Avenue's eastern leg. Mid-block pedestrianways are shown through this block, providing a pedestrian connection between both legs of McCune Avenue. To the east of the clubhouse, McCune Avenue separates Blocks D and E, and extends eastward with a future development phase. Blocks D and E meet block size requirements.



Block G will require a Waiver for block length (± 665 feet) along John Shields Parkway. Although Deardorff Street could be extended south to create two smaller blocks, the proposed street intersection spacing along John Shields Parkway establishes a relatively consistent pattern of streets crossing the greenway (as planned from Riverside Drive to Village Parkway). The proposed street layout minimizes vehicular interruptions to the both the greenway and the cycletrack network. The proposed 'T' intersection of John Shields Parkway and Deardorff Street also provides a terminal vista opportunity for a building on the south side of the greenway. A mid-block pedestrianway is shown in the center of the block, aligned with the Deardorff Street intersection.

Street Types. The plans incorporate typical street sections developed by the City that are appropriate for John Shields Parkway, Watson Street and Deardorff Streets. The proposed street section for McCune Avenue does not provide sufficient width for sidewalks and planting zones. Engineering has provided a typical street section for a 'yield' street, appropriate for this low volume residential street that should be incorporated in the plan as part of the Development Plan Review submittal.

Interior Open Space and Building Orientation. Four pocket parks are located in the center of the site at the intersection of McCune Avenue and Deardorff Street. Each of these pocket parks is framed by two 10-unit apartment buildings with front façades facing the open space and side façades along the street. However, Code requires front façades and main entrances to face a street. Although the Code does allow buildings to front open spaces in some circumstances, this orientation is anticipated primarily for greenways (as proposed for the six buildings south of John Shields Parkway), consistent with the Bridge Street District Area Plan. The

proposed configuration results in two streets with no front façades along them (with the exception of the clubhouse).

These buildings should be reoriented with their front façades in the required building zone and main entrances facing the street with direct sidewalk connections. The adjacent pocket park dimensions should be adjusted accordingly. This will also create a more typical urban pocket park condition, in which the open space is framed by the sides of adjacent buildings, providing a greater sense of enclosure with landscaping along the edges of the space.

Interior Vehicular Circulation, Surface Parking, and Landscaping. The site plan adjustment described above also provides an opportunity to create a more efficient vehicular circulation system on the interior of Blocks 'C', 'D' and 'E'. The current plan shows linear landscape islands separating two, 22-foot drive aisles, each intended for two-way traffic. A residual green space is shown adjacent to the interior 10-unit buildings, with adjacent head-in surface parking. These green spaces are labeled as pocket parks on the open space plan, but as they do not meet open space size or location requirements, are not counted toward the minimum open space dedication requirement. The adjusted building orientation described above will improve vehicular turning movements within the alley system and allow the linear island and residual green space to be consolidated into a larger interior landscape island. This may also provide opportunities for additional surface parking spaces around the perimeter of the island and/or integrated rain gardens within the islands.

Architecture. The plan proposes 30 multiple family residential buildings, all of which are considered Apartment Building Types per the Bridge Street District zoning regulations. The plan includes a series of 8-, 10-, 12-, and 20-unit apartment buildings in seven relatively consistent models.

Proposed renderings show a contemporary architectural style emphasizing geometric forms, with parapet roofs emulating a flat roof appearance. The apartment building models are generally divided into two categories:

- 10- and 20-unit buildings: single-level units and at-grade shared building entrances having front façades with architecturally integrated balconies and patios.
- 8- and 12-unit buildings: combination of two-level and single-level units with shared walk-up entrances. Front façades include elevated planting beds with an architecturally integrated masonry wall.

The City asked its architectural consultant to conduct a high level review of the proposed plans and elevations to determine if the Code provisions related to this plan have resulted in architectural designs that reinforce the desired character for buildings in the BSC Residential District. The consultant's comments have been attached to this report and the applicant has had an opportunity to meet with staff and the consultant to discuss the comments.

The consultant noted that the elevations generally comply with the architectural standards of the Code. Many of the comments identify a need for additional details to verify compliance with specific architectural requirements, which will be required with the Site Plan Review. Planning has also identified some aspects of the proposed architecture that will require adjustments to comply with Code requirements, determinations of architectural appropriateness, and/or waivers to Code requirements as identified in the ART Analysis and Determinations at the end of this report.

Building Variety. One of the goals of the Bridge Street District Plan is to create new neighborhoods with interesting and varied architecture that establishes a sense of place, particularly to be distinguished from what might be considered typical suburban development. To achieve this the Bridge Street District zoning regulations include specific building variety requirements that require building designs that vary from adjacent buildings by the type of dominant material (or color, scale or orientation of that material). In addition, the

Code requires that building designs vary through at least two of the following:

- (1) The proportion of recesses and projections
- (2) A change in the location of the entrance and window placement
- (3) Changes to the roof design, including roof type, plane, or material

While adjacent buildings vary from brick to stone throughout the development, a significant number do not meet a sufficient number of the required additional design variety, which presents a more suburban apartment complex character. A more detailed building-to-building comparison is provided in the Zoning Code analysis at the end of this report. The applicant will need to introduce additional building variety elements to comply with the Code requirements. Absent this, a request for a Waiver for the building variety requirements will be necessary at the Site Plan Review.

Open Space Type, Distribution, Suitability and Design. The proposed open spaces exceed Code requirements for minimum dedication (± 1.8 acres). Other residual green space areas do not meet open space size, dimension and location standards. The main entrances of all buildings meet the walkable distance requirements to publicly accessible open space type. Recommended site plan adjustments described earlier in this report will involve some adjustments to pocket park dimensions, but are not expected to create Code conflicts. A 60-foot wide greenway is provided along the south side of John Shields Parkway in two segments, separated by Watson Street, and totaling ± 1.2 acres. Portions of an existing tree row are proposed to be preserved and incorporated into the landscape design of the greenway. A tree survey will be required with the Site Plan Review application along with additional details of the open space design.

Adherence to Zoning Code regulations. Refer to the ART Analysis and Determinations at the end of this report following the recommendations for a preliminary analysis of the applicable Code regulations.

Engineering

Refer to attached Engineering Memo.

Building Standards

Detailed installation specifications for façade materials, material samples, and section panels should be provided with the Site Plan Review to ensure high-quality and durable construction. It is anticipated that the specifications will include the construction of mock-ups of exterior material installations to confirm necessary construction conditions for review and approval by staff as a minimum standard for the quality of construction.

Parks and Open Space

Parks is in the process of developing a conceptual plan to establish the intended character and function for the greenway along John Shields Parkway and will provide guidance to the applicant for design details to be incorporated as part of the Site Plan Review.

Fire and Police

Additional analysis of the revised McCune Avenue street section, building access zones and fire hydrant locations will be necessary to ensure adequate fire service to buildings in this portion of the site, to be conducted as part of the Site Plan Review.

Economic Development

No comments.

PART III: APPLICABLE REVIEW STANDARDS

1. Basic Plan Review Criteria – Development Plan

The Administrative Review Team reviewed this application based on the review criteria for applications for Development Plan Review, which include the following proposed responses:

(a) **Development Plan is Substantially Similar to Basic Plan**

Not applicable to Basic Plan Review.

(b) **Lots and Blocks Meet Requirements of Section 153.060**

Met with Development Plan Waivers.

(c) **Street System is Consistent with the BSC Street Network Map of Section 153.061 and Traffic Can Be Adequately Accommodated**

Met. The proposal creates an interconnected street network in the general pattern of development depicted in the Bridge Street Corridor Street Network Map (Fig. 153.061-A) and the City of Dublin Thoroughfare Plan. Engineering has determined that the provided and planned street network are adequate to accommodate generated traffic from this development.

(d) **Street Types are Consistent with the Principles of Walkable Urbanism of Section 153.057-058 and Coordinate with the Proposed Development**

Met with condition. Typical sections for John Shields Parkway, Watson Street and Deardorff Streets meet City of Dublin standards for streets in the Bridge Street District. This development will provide a significant portion of a planned cycletrack system along John Shields Parkway. Future bus stop locations should also be planned along John Shields Parkway. McCune Avenue must be revised to provide adequate sidewalk width and planting zones as described in this report.

(e) **Buildings and Open Spaces are Appropriately Sited**

Met with condition. The overall relationship between buildings and opens spaces proposed with this development is consistent with the intent of the Bridge Street District Plan and regulations. Some adjustments should be made to building and open space orientation as described in the Site Plan Review criteria.

(f) Application is Consistent with the Neighborhood Standards of Section 153.063

Not applicable to the BSC Residential zoning district.

(g) Phasing

Met with condition. This proposal will be completed in two phases. Construction of Phase II of this development should be contingent on the construction of the Hobbs Landing Drive extension between John Shields Parkway and Tuller Road.

(h) Consistency with Bridge Street District Vision Principles, Community Plan and other Policy Documents

Met. The proposal is consistent the goal of creating a residential core within the Tuller Greenway Character District of the Bridge Street District Plan and is consistent with the principles of walkable urbanism described in Code Section 153.057.

(i) Adequate and Efficient Infrastructure

Met. The applicant is working with the City to establish a development agreement that will include the construction of John Shields Parkway from Tuller Ridge Drive to Village Parkway (to the west and east of the proposed development site). This is an important transportation connection that will serve both this development and the Bridge Street District as a whole. This public improvement will create a significant link in the street network that, when coupled with other planned improvements, will provide a continuous connection from Riverside Drive to Sawmill Road as an alternative to Tuller Road.

2. Basic Plan Review Criteria – Site Plan

The Administrative Review Team reviewed this application based on the review criteria for applications for Site Plan Review, which include the following proposed responses:

(a) Site Plan is Substantially Similar to Basic Plan

Not applicable to Basic Plan Review

(b) Consistency with Approved Development Plan

Not applicable.

(j) Meets Applicable Requirements of Sections 153.059 and 153.062 through 153.065

Met with conditions or Site Plan Waivers. As reviewed in this report, all appropriate sections of the Code are either met, met with conditions, met following approval of a Site Plan Waiver or are details that would be anticipated as the development progresses to Site Plan Review.

(k) Safe and Efficient Circulation

Met with conditions. The proposed street network, with revisions noted in the Planning comments of report, will provide for safe and efficient circulation within and around this site. Internal alley circulation should be revised as described in this report to provide for more efficient circulation and an improved relationship between buildings, streets and open spaces in the center of the site.

(l) Coordination and Integration of Buildings and Structures

Met with condition. Buildings fronting John Shields Parkway and Tuller Road should be oriented at a consistent setback within the required building zone with direct front walk connections to the public sidewalk to create a consistent architectural edge along these principal frontage streets. The 10-unit buildings in the center of the site should be reoriented with their front facades in the required building zone and main entrances facing the street.

(f) Desirable Open Space Type, Distribution, Suitability, and Design

Met. This proposal provides a significant piece of a greenway connection depicted in the Bridge Street District Area Plan that, when coupled with other nearby development, will provide a continuous greenway connection from the planned riverside park to the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. The proposal also provides a series of smaller pocket parks to serve the residents of the new neighborhood. Design details will be determined at the Site Plan Review.

(g) Provision of Public Services

Met with condition. This proposal provides a new public 8-inch water line along John Shields Parkway, consistent with Engineering's overall plan for water service in this area of the Bridge Street District. The applicant will need to provide calculations showing that the downstream sanitary sewer system is able to accommodate the development, as described in the Engineering memo attached to this report.

(h) Stormwater Management

Met with condition. The plans should be revised to incorporate a de-centralized stormwater management system, using stormwater controls appropriate for the Bridge Street District as described in the City of Dublin Stormwater Design Manual.

(i) Phasing

Met with condition. This proposal will be completed in two phases. Construction of Phase II should not be completed prior to construction of the Hobbs Landing Drive extension between John Shields Parkway and Tuller Road.

(j) Consistency with Bridge Street District Vision Principles, Community Plan and other Policy Documents

Met with condition. The proposal is consistent the goal of creating a residential core within the Tuller Greenway Character District of the Bridge Street District Plan and is consistent with the principles of walkable urbanism described in Code Section 153.057. Revisions to proposed architectural concepts to incorporate more building variety will make this development consistent the place-making goals of the Bridge Street District Plan.

3. Waiver Review Criteria

Development Plan Waivers. The Administrative Review Team reviewed the proposed Waivers based on the following review criteria, and made the following findings. The Waivers, if approved, would permit:

1. Maximum Block Size (Block 'C') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) – To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block 'C' (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ± 580 feet and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to $\pm 2,015$).
2. Maximum Block Size (Block 'G') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) – To increase the maximum permitted block length for Block 'G' from 500 feet to ± 665 feet.

(a) **Request is caused by unique site, use or other circumstances.**

Maximum Block Size (Block 'C') – Criterion met: The proposed design of Block 'C' incorporates a centrally located clubhouse/community center to serve the residential neighborhood.

Maximum Block Size (Block 'G') – Criterion met: The proposed design of Block 'G' incorporates a planned greenway connection and minimizes vehicular interruptions to this open space corridor.

(b) **Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience**

Maximum Block Size (Block 'C') – Criterion met: The waiver is requested to achieve a site design objective for the proposed neighborhood.

Maximum Block Size (Block 'G') – Criterion met: The proposed design of Block 'G' is coordinated with City plans for the greenway system along John Shields Parkway.

(c) **Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District**

Criterion met for all Waivers.

(d) **Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality**

Maximum Block Size (Block 'C') – Criterion met: The proposed location of the clubhouse creates an opportunity for a terminal vista and adds visual interest and variety to the development. Mid-block pedestrianways will be provided to maintain walkable access.

Maximum Block Size (Block 'G') – Criterion met: The larger block length will enhance the quality of the greenway and bicycle transportation system along John Shields Parkway. Mid-block pedestrianways will be provided to maintain walkable access.

Site Plan Waivers. The Administrative Review Team reviewed the proposed Waiver based on the following review criteria, and made the following findings. The Waiver, if approved, would permit:

1. Window Proportions – Code Section 153.062(H)(1)(f) – To allow windows on street-facing façades of Apartment building types to be horizontally proportioned, where architecturally appropriate to the design of the building.

(a) **Request is caused by unique site, use or other circumstances.**

Window Proportions – Criterion met: Horizontally proportioned windows are generally consistent with the proposed contemporary architectural style.

(b) **Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience**

Window Proportions – Criterion met: The proposal is requested to achieve an architectural character objective.

(c) **Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District**
Criterion met.

(d) **Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality**
Window Proportions – Criterion met with condition: Additional details for window design, placement and installation will be necessary with the Site Plan Review to ensure architectural appropriateness and overall design quality, as described in this report.

PART IV: PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATION

Basic Development Plan

The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the request for Basic Development Plan Review with 4 conditions:

- 1) That the street section for McCune Avenue be revised to a typical section for a neighborhood street acceptable to Engineering;
- 2) That a mid-block pedestrianway connection be provided to the south property line of Block 'G';
- 3) That development of buildings in Phase II be contingent on the construction of the Hobbs Landing Drive extension between John Shields Parkway and Tuller Road.
- 4) That the applicant address Engineering's comments referenced in the attached memo, as applicable to the Development Plan Review.

Basic Site Plan

The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the request for Basic Site Plan Review with the following 11 conditions:

- 1) That the following details be presented with the Site Plan Review:
 - a. Architecture, landscaping, and other site development details noted in this report;
 - b. Detailed installation specifications for façade materials and material transitions, including material samples and section panels, be provided to ensure high-quality and durable construction, and addressing specific items as described in this report;
 - c. The applicant provide examples of successful, high quality installations (local or in a comparable climate) of the proposed fiber cement cladding panel;
 - d. That additional color palettes for façade materials be incorporated; and
 - e. That a Master Sign Plan be provided.
- 2) That the following building locations be altered as follows:
 - a. 10-unit buildings in the center of the site be reoriented with front façades in the RBZ and main entrances facing the street with direct sidewalk connections, to the maximum extent practicable;
 - b. That buildings fronting John Shields Parkway and Tuller Road be oriented at a consistent setback within the RBZ with direct front walk connections to the public sidewalk;
- 3) That main entrance canopies be designed to provide adequate protection from the elements and to reinforce the visual prominence of the entrance;

- 4) That transparency requirements be calculated for each story, and that transparency requirements and blank wall limitations be met for each individual story;
- 5) That terminal vista elements be provided as described in this report;
- 6) That building elevations be revised to meet the building variety requirements of Code Section 153.062(K), or that a Waiver request be submitted at the Site Plan Review;
- 7) That the applicant incorporate design details to achieve the goals of the minimum finished floor elevation requirement, as described in this report;
- 8) That the RBZ for buildings 16-21 be shown along the south edge of the greenway;
- 9) That bicycle parking be provided in more prominent, publicly accessible locations, such as open spaces and within the street furnishings zone;
- 10) That the plans be revised to incorporate a de-centralized stormwater management system to the maximum extent practicable, as described in this report; and
- 11) That the applicant address Engineering's comments as attached to this report;

Development Plan Waivers

The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **approval** of the following 2 Development Plan Waivers:

- 1) Maximum Block Size (Block 'C') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) – To increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for Block 'C' (increasing maximum block length from 500 feet to ± 580 feet and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 feet to $\pm 2,015$).
- 2) Maximum Block Size (Block 'G') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) – To increase the maximum permitted block length for Block 'G' from 500 feet to ± 665 feet.

Site Plan Waivers

The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **approval** of the following Site Plan Waiver:

Window Proportions – Code Section 153.062(H)(1)(f) – To allow windows on street-facing façades of Apartment building types to be horizontally proportioned, where architecturally appropriate to the design of the building.

ART ANALYSIS AND DETERMINATIONS – BASIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Applicable Development Plan Review Criteria

Includes 153.060 – Lots and Blocks and 153.061 – Street Types.

153.060 – Lots and Blocks		
Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(C)(1)	Interconnected Street Pattern	Met. The proposed development establishes a grid of interconnected streets and provides for the continuation of planned streets from adjoining areas. The street system includes street terminations ('T'-intersections) at proposed open spaces and building facades (see Site Plan Review Analysis for additional information).
(C)(2)	Maximum Block Size	<p>Met with waiver approval. Maximum block length in the BSC Residential District is 500 feet. Maximum block perimeter is 1,750 feet.</p> <p>Two of the proposed blocks meet the maximum dimension requirements. Partial blocks along the west edge of the site meet block length requirements, but block perimeter will be determined with future redevelopment of the adjacent property. A partial block at the southwest corner of the site will be part of a larger block including an adjacent city park (existing Sycamore Ridge Park). The resulting block will exceed maximum block dimensions, but is exempt because the existing open space limits the extension of the street network.</p> <p>Block 'G' is also a partial block, but exceeds the maximum block length within the development, requiring waiver approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission. This block includes a planned greenway connection, providing a practical reason to limit extension of the proposed street network in this location.</p> <p>Block 'C' in the center of the development is partially bisected by a proposed street (McCune Avenue). A proposed clubhouse (see Site Plan Review Analysis) limits extension of the street network. The resulting block exceeds the maximum length and perimeter, requiring waiver approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission.</p>
(C)(3)	Block Configuration	Met. Proposed blocks are rectangular in shape. All blocks are arranged with front property lines on at least two sides, except where partial blocks (to be completed with adjacent development) make this requirement impractical.
(C)(4)	Principal Frontage Streets	Met. Tuller Road and John Shields Parkway (planned) are designated as Principal Frontage Streets (PFS) on the BSC Street Network Map. Front lot lines are located along these streets, providing frontage for buildings and open spaces. Alley and driveway access is limited to adjacent side streets.
(C)(5)	Block Access Configuration	Met. Alley/driveway access is provided from proposed Neighborhood Streets (non-PFS) and is consistent with recommended configurations.

153.060 – Lots and Blocks		
(C)(6)	Mid-Block Pedestrianways	<p>Met with conditions/DPR. Mid-Block Pedestrianways are required on all blocks exceeding 400 feet in length, and must be located within the middle third of such blocks. All proposed blocks include either complete or partial mid-block pedestrianways. Pedestrianway design details will require further analysis with the final Development Plan Review.</p> <p>The intent of the mid-block pedestrianway is to provide continuous (and generally direct) pedestrian access through larger blocks. Proposed pedestrianways through Block C (from Watson Street to Deardorff Street) are circuitous; more direct path connections should be provided in the clubhouse location. Proposed pedestrianways through Block 'G' provide access from the rear alley/parking area to the proposed greenway and John Shields Parkway. At least one of these pedestrianways should be planned to continue across the south property line, providing a connection to the adjacent Scyamore Ridge apartment complex, which could redevelop in the future. This detail can be addressed with the Development Plan Review.</p>
(C)(7-9)	Typical Lot Dimensions, Lot Configuration, and Street Frontage	<p>DPR/SPR. Lot dimensions are determined by building type. Lots must be regularly shaped and all lots must have street frontage. It will be necessary for the required reviewing body to determine which lot lines and block frontages will serve as front, corner side, and rear property lines for the purpose of analyzing the street frontage requirements for individual buildings and open space types as part of the Development Plan and Site Plan Review.</p>

153.061 – Street Types		
Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(C)	Street Network	<p>Met. The proposal creates an interconnected street network in the general pattern of development depicted in the Bridge Street Corridor Street Network Map (Fig. 153.061-A) and the City of Dublin Thoroughfare Plan.</p>
(D)	Principal Frontage Streets	<p>Met. Tuller Road and John Shields Parkway (planned) are designated as Principal Frontage Streets (PFS) on the BSC Street Network Map. Front lot lines are located along these streets, providing frontage for buildings and open spaces. Alley and driveway access is limited to adjacent side streets.</p>
(E)	Typical Street Elements	<p>Met with condition. Typical sections for John Shields Parkway, Watson Street and Deardorff Streets meet City of Dublin standards for streets in the Bridge Street District. McCune Avenue must be revised to provide adequate sidewalk width and planting zones. Engineering has provided a typical section for use on McCune Avenue.</p>
(F)	Curb Radii at Intersections	<p>DPR. These details will be determined with the Development Plan Review.</p>
(G)	Fire Access	<p>DPR. Fire access routes and building access zones will be determined at the Development Plan Review.</p>

ART ANALYSIS AND DETERMINATIONS – BASIC SITE PLAN REVIEW

Applicable Site Plan Review Criteria

Includes 153.059 - Uses, 153.062 – Building Types, 153.064 – Open Space Types, and 153.065 – Site Development Standards (Parking, Stormwater Management, Landscaping and Tree Preservation, Fencing Walls and Screening, Exterior Lighting, Utility Undergrounding, and Signs).

153.059 – Uses		
Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
Table 153.059-A	Principal Uses	Met. Proposed principal uses (Multiple-Family Dwellings) are permitted in the BSC Residential District.
	Accessory Uses	Met. Proposed accessory uses include a clubhouse, swimming pool and maintenance facility. The plans do not indicate an administration or rental office; but this is also a permitted accessory use and is expected for this development. All of these accessory uses fall within the 'Dwelling Administration' accessory use category.

153.062 – Building Types		
Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(B)(3)	General Requirements	Met. Zoning Districts: The Apartment building type is permitted in the BSC Residential District.
(B)(3) (C)	General Requirements General Building Type Layout and Relationships	Met. Uses: Proposed uses are permitted in the district and in the building type without further use restrictions or use specific standards.
		Met. No Other Building Types: Proposed buildings are generally consistent with the intent and requirements of the Apartment building type.
		Met. Permanent Structures: No temporary structures are proposed.
		Met. Accessory Structures: During its Informal Review of this project, the Planning and Zoning Commission generally confirmed that the clubhouse should not be considered a Civic building type. This building, and the proposed maintenance building, should instead be considered accessory structures. Design details to be determined at Site Plan Review.
(D)(1)	Parapet Roof Type Requirements	Met. No building type incompatibilities present.
		Met. Parapet Height: The applicant has submitted preliminary building plans that show a parapet roof type on all buildings, with parapet heights varying between ±2 to ±4 feet above the roof deck. Total building height to top of the parapet is ±35 feet. Portions of the parapet will be used to screen rooftop mechanical units. Details to be verified at Site Plan Review.
		Met. Parapets wrap the buildings along all façades.
		SPR. Horizontal Shadow Lines: Elevations show a horizontal cap element at the top of the parapet, but this detail is not consistently shown on the renderings. Additional information is needed to determine if requirement is met. Details to be verified at SPR.

153.062 – Building Types		
Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
		Met. No occupied space or half story is included in the roof line.
(E)(1)	Façade Materials	<p>Met with condition/SPR. Proposed façade materials include: brick, synthetic stone, fiber cement lap siding and fiber cement panels. Permitted primary materials are cultured stone, brick, wood, fiber cement siding, and glass. Use of brick and stone is proposed to vary from building to building.</p> <p>Code requires that, for individual facades over 1,000 sq. ft., a combination of primary materials be used to meet the 80% requirement, unless otherwise approved by the required reviewing body. The side façades of Building Type 'E' exceed the 80% requirement with stone veneer. This should be considered for architectural appropriateness at the Site Plan Review.</p> <p>Planning has interpreted 'fiber cement siding' to include rectangular fiber cement cladding panels, which are proposed with this development, in addition to traditional lap siding. The applicant should provide examples of successful, high quality installations (local or in a comparable climate) and detailed installation specifications for façade materials, material samples, and section panels to ensure high-quality and durable construction.</p>
(E)(2)	Façade Material Transitions	<p>Met with condition/SPR. Vertical transitions in façade materials generally occur at inside corners. Some side facades (<i>i.e.</i> Building Types 'B' and 'G') include a 'notched' façade transition between stone and fiber cement materials at the second story. Additional detail is required to verify this design meets the intent of the façade transition requirements and should be considered for architectural appropriateness at the Site Plan Review. Alternatively, this notch element could be eliminated so that the stone veneer serves as a consistent transition between the second and third stories and the stone material serves as a visual 'base' to the fiber cement material.</p> <p>Brick and stone materials are generally proposed below fiber cement materials. Some front facades (<i>e.g.</i> Building Type 'D') show brick wrapping around a window bay with fiber cement located below some portions of brick. This design should be considered for architectural appropriateness at the Site Plan Review. Alternatively, the façade could be redesigned with brick elements serving as a horizontal 'base' to the fiber cement materials.</p> <p>In general, additional details regarding material transitions and installation specifications will be necessary at the Site Plan Review to verify Code requirements are met and to ensure high quality, durable construction.</p>
(E)(3)	Roof Materials	N/A. Roof materials for parapet-screened roofdecks must meet Building Code requirements.

153.062 – Building Types		
Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(E)(4)	Color	<p>Met with condition/SPR. Plans include a preliminary exterior finishes palette, to be verified at Site Plan Review. Plans show the use of a single brick color palette and a single stone color palette. At the Informal Review, the plans included two brick color palettes, without the stone option. Additional color palettes should be incorporated with the Site Plan Review as one means to introduce additional architectural variety to the development.</p>
(F)(1)	Entrances & Pedestrianways – Quantities and Locations	<p>Met with condition/SPR. Principal entrance location is required on the primary street façade of the building. One entrance per 75 ft. of the street façade is required. Mid-building pedestrianways are not required based on the length of the proposed buildings.</p> <p>Buildings vary in length and entrance quantity as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 76 feet with a single entrance • 152 feet with 2 entrances • 132 feet with 3 entrances • 88 feet with 2 entrances <p>The 76-foot and 152-foot facades fall within the 10% Administrative Departure threshold for the entrance quantity requirement. This can be addressed at the Site Plan Review once final elevations are submitted.</p> <p>Most buildings are oriented with main entrances facing the street or the greenway adjacent to John Shields Parkway. Eight 10-unit buildings in the center of the site are oriented with entrances facing adjacent pocket parks rather than the street. These should be re-oriented with entrances facing the street and direct sidewalk connections wherever possible.</p>
(F)(2)	Recessed Entrances	<p>Met. All entrances are recessed a min. of 3 ft. from property lines.</p>

153.062 – Building Types		
Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(F)(3)	Entrance Design	<p>Met with condition. Entrances are required to be of a pedestrian scale, effectively address the street, and be given prominence on the building façade; the main entrance is required to be on the street-facing façade, be fully functioning, and connect to the street with a sidewalk.</p> <p>Entrance designs vary as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At-grade entrance, recessed relative to adjacent façade projections (balconies), with a cantilevered canopy projecting from the façade; • At-grade entrance, recessed relative to adjacent façade projections (balconies), with canopy aligned with adjacent façade projections; • Raised stoop, recessed relative to adjacent façade projections (balconies), with a cantilevered canopy projecting from the façade; • Raised stoop, not recessed, with cantilevered canopy. <p>The architecture is generally designed to highlight the main entrance with a canopy feature and a vertical multi-story window design. Some canopies appear to have a minimal depth that may not effectively provide shelter from the elements. These canopies should be extended to cover a greater portion of the stoop. Canopy projections should also be considered where entrances are recessed as a means to provide greater prominence to the entrance.</p> <p>Most buildings are oriented with main entrances facing the street or the greenway adjacent to John Shields Parkway. Eight 10-unit buildings in the center of the site are oriented with entrances facing adjacent pocket parks rather than the street. These should be re-oriented with entrances facing the street and direct sidewalk connections wherever possible.</p>
(G)	Articulation of Stories on Street Façades	<p>SPR. Building designs generally use fenestration to differentiate stories. Vertical, multi-story windows are used to give prominence to entrance locations. Some façades use recessed offsets in fiber cement panels surrounding windows to create vertical ‘gangs’ of windows across multiple stories. This design element should be considered for architectural appropriateness at the Site Plan Review.</p>

153.062 – Building Types		
Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(H)	Windows, Shutters, Awnings, and Canopies	<p>Met with waiver approval/condition/SPR. Transparency and other window details will be verified with the Site Plan Review. The intent of the transparency requirements is to be applied to each story independently. The applicant has provide transparency calculations for each façade as a whole. Calculations should be provided for each story on each façade. Some side elevations do not appear to meet transparency requirements and blank wall limitations on the ground floor and should be revised at the Site Plan Review.</p> <p>Flush-mounted windows are prohibited. Some facades include partially recessed window bays. This design will require further review at the Site Plan Review to verify compliance with Code. Projecting sills are required but not consistently depicted in the proposed elevations.</p> <p>Windows are required to have vertical proportions with architecturally appropriate window divisions. Windows proportioned horizontally are permitted only for non-street facing facades. Horizontally proportioned windows are used throughout the street-facing facades and will require Waiver approval.</p>
(I)	Balconies, Porches, Stoops, and Chimneys	<p>Met. All buildings include architecturally integrated balconies. A maximum of 40% of the front and corner side facades may be covered by balconies. The elevations meet this requirement. Architecturally integrated ground-level patio spaces are located below balconies on some front facades. Raised stoops are provided for some buildings. Dimensions meet Code requirements.</p>
(J)	Treatments at Terminal Vistas	<p>Met with condition. Street terminations are proposed in three locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intersection of McCune Avenue and Deardorff Street (front of clubhouse) • The McCune Avenue 'stub' (rear of clubhouse/swimming pool) • The intersection of John Shields Parkway and Deardorff Street (greenway) <p>Terminal vistas at building facades must incorporate one of the following treatments: a tower, a bay window, a courtyard with a sculpture, or other similar treatment incorporating a distinct vertical element. Terminal vistas at open spaces must incorporate a vertical element such as a stand or grid of trees, a sculpture, or a fountain.</p> <p>Additional analysis of existing trees to remain within the greenway is necessary to determine if the terminal vista requirement will be met at this location. Terminal vista requirements do not appear to be met at the McCune Avenue locations; vertical elements should be provided with the Site Plan Review.</p>

153.062 – Building Types

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes				
(K)	Building Variety	<p>Met with condition. Building designs must vary from adjacent buildings by the type of dominant material (or color, scale or orientation of that material). Building designs must also vary through at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The proportion of recesses and projections (2) A change in the location of the entrance and window placement (3) Changes to the roof design, including roof type, plane, or material <p>Plans indicate that all adjacent buildings will vary from brick to stone throughout the development. However, a number of adjacent buildings do not appear to meet the additional variety requirements. The table below summarizes which building variety techniques are used or not used, focusing primarily on front façades. Additional measures must be taken to introduce building variety within the development, or waivers will be necessary at the Site Plan Review.</p>				
		Adjacent Buildings	Dominant Material	Recesses and Projections	Entrance and Window Placement	Roof Design
			Required	2 of 3 Required		
		A and B	Yes	Yes	No	No
		C and G	Yes	Yes	No	No
		D and E	Yes	No	No	No
(M)	Signs	<p>SPR. To be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review. The plans show Three ground/monument signs, two of which are located within raised planter beds at the front façade of the walk-up style buildings. The applicant has also indicated an intent to incorporate building-mounted signs. A Master Sign Plan should be provided at the Site Plan Review.</p>				
(N) & (O)	Individual Building Type Requirements	<p><i>Refer to following section. Details to be verified at Site Plan Review; the analysis below is based on the information submitted at this time.</i></p>				
<p>SPR: Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Waiver.</p>						

153.062 – Building Types

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
<p>Note: Because the Basic Development Plan proposes to establish a combination public/private street system, the resulting development will include only two platted lots (one north of John Shields Parkway and one to the south). Development Plan Waivers are being requested to allow blocks to be measured from public access easement lines rather than property lines. With this approach, each resulting 'block' should also be viewed as a separate lot for purposes of determining building siting requirements, such as Front Property Line Coverage.</p> <p>The applicant has provided a Building Type Requirements summary for each of the proposed apartment buildings and for the clubhouse. Review of building siting requirements necessarily involves a review of the site plan details for building location and orientation on the site.</p> <p>Some requirements appear to have been calculated differently than the actual Code requirement (i.e. transparency calculated for an entire façade rather than for each story individually).</p>		

153.062(O)(4) – Apartment Building Requirements

Building Type Requirements	Code Requirement	Provided	Analysis/Notes
Number of Principal Buildings Permitted (per Lot)	Multiple	Multiple	DPR/SPR
Front Property Line Coverage (%)	Min. 75%	Varies	SPR. Building 16, as currently shown, is eligible for an Administrative Departure to FPL requirement, to be addressed at Site Plan Review.
Occupation of Corner Required (Yes/No)	Yes	Varies	Met for most buildings. Building 28 may require an Administrative Departure due to the irregular property line at the corner of Tuller Road and planned Hobbs Landing Drive, to be addressed at Site Plan Review.
Front Required Building Zone Required (range, ft.)	5-20 ft.	5-20 ft. (typ.), Some exceptions	Met for most buildings. Buildings 24 and 5 met with condition. RBZ should be measured along edge of greenway for Buildings 16 through 21.
Corner Side RBZ Required (range, ft.)	5-20 ft.	5 ft. (typ.), Some exceptions	Met for most buildings, where applicable.
Side Yard Setback Required (ft.)	Min. 5 ft.	10 ft.	Met
Rear Yard Setback Required (ft.)	Min. 5 ft.	10-15 ft.	Met
Minimum Lot Width Required (ft.)	50 ft.	±580 ft.	Met
Maximum Lot Width Required (ft.)	None	N/A	N/A
Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage (%)	80%	Unspecified	SPR
Semi-Pervious Lot Coverage (%)	10%	Unspecified	SPR

153.062(O)(4) – Apartment Building Requirements			
Building Type Requirements	Code Requirement	Provided	Analysis/Notes
Loading Facility Permitted (location relative to principal structure)	Rear	N/A	N/A
Entry for Parking within Building (relative to principal structure)	Rear/Side Façade	Rear Façades	Met
Minimum Building Height Permitted	2 stories	3 stories	Met
Maximum Building Height Permitted	4.5 stories	3 stories	Met
Story Height (ft.)	9-14 ft.	±9-10 ft.	Met
Minimum Finished Floor Elevation	2.5 ft. above sidewalk*	At Grade	Met with Condition. *Where the principal building entrance is a lobby or other common space, the minimum finished floor elevation is not required. The goal of the minimum FFE is to provide privacy to ground floor units and to create a visual 'base' along the ground floor of larger residential buildings. The applicant should incorporate design details to achieve these objectives.
Parking within Building	Rear of first 3 floors	Rear of first floor	Met
Minimum Occupied Space Required (ft.)	Minimum 20 ft. depth facing street	Provided	Met
Street Façade Transparency (%)	20%	Varies	Measurement to be verified at SPR.
Blank Wall Limitations (Street Façade)	Required	Varies	Met for Front Facades. Met with Condition for Corner Side Facades.
Non-Street Façade Transparency (%)	15%	Varies	Measurement to be verified at SPR.
Blank Wall Limitations (Non-Street)	Required	Varies	Met for Rear Facades. Met with Condition for Side Facades.
Principal Entrance Location Required	Primary Street Façade of Building	Varies	Met for most buildings. Met with Condition for additional buildings.
Number of Street Façade Entrances Required (per ft of façade)	1 per 75 ft. of façade	Varies	Met with Administrative Departure
Parking Lot Façades: Number of Entrances	1 per 100 ft. of façade (min.)	N/A	N/A
Mid-Building Pedestrianways Required (# per ft. of façade)	Not Required	N/A	N/A
Vertical Increments Required (location on principal structure)	No greater than every 40 ft.	Varies	Met

153.062(O)(4) – Apartment Building Requirements			
Building Type Requirements	Code Requirement	Provided	Analysis/Notes
Horizontal Façade Divisions Required (per ft. of façade)	On buildings 3 stories or taller; within 3 ft. of the top of the ground story	Appears to be Provided	SPR
Permitted Primary Materials (types)	Stone, Brick, Wood, Fiber Cement Siding and Glass	Brick, Stone, Fiber Cement lap Siding/ Panels, Glass	Met
Changes in Roof Plane/Type Required (per ft. of facade)	80 ft.	Varies	Met
Roof Type(s) Permitted (types)	Parapet, Pitched, Flat	Parapet	Met
Tower(s) Permitted (Yes/No)	Yes, at terminal vistas	None	N/A
SPR: Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.			

153.064 – Open Space Types		
Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(C)	Provision of Open Space	Met/SPR. A total of 1.79 acres of publicly accessible open space is required for this 392 unit residential development. The plans show a 1.18-acre greenway and a series of other open spaces labeled as pocket parks for a total of 2.64 acres of open space. Only four of the pocket parks (Pocket Parks 'B', 'C', 'D', and 'E') meet minimum size, dimension and street frontage requirements. The minimum required amount of open space is met regardless. The Site Plan Review submittal should differentiate between Code-required publicly-accessible open spaces and other private amenity spaces. Open spaces are proposed with the required 660 feet (walking distance) of the main entrance for all multiple-family buildings.
(D)	Suitability of Open Spaces	Met/SPR. The conceptual design and siting of the greenway and centrally-located pocket parks is consistent with the objectives for open space in the Bridge Street District.
(E)	Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space	N/A. The applicant is providing the required open space on-site.
(F) (G)	Open Space Types & General Requirements: Pocket Park	Met. Pocket parks are intended to provide small scale, primarily landscaped active or passive recreation and gathering spaces for neighborhood residents within walking distance. The conceptual pocket parks are located within a central 'quad' design at the intersection of McCune Avenue and Deardorff Street.

153.064 – Open Space Types

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
		Pocket Park Dimensional Requirements: Met/SPR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size (Min. 0.1 ac.; Max. 0.5 ac.): Met. • Min. % Along Street/Building (30%): Met. • Zoning Districts Permitted: Met. • Frontage Orientation (Front or Corner): Met. • Uses/Structures (Playgrounds and small scale recreation courts permitted): Met (none proposed). • Impervious + Semi-Pervious (Max. 80%+10%): SPR. • Max. % Open Water (20%): Met (none proposed).
	Open Space Types & General Requirements: Greenway	<p>Met. Greenways are intended to provide a combination of informal and well organized, primarily linear open spaces that serve to connect open space types and major destinations within and outside of the Bridge Street District. The conceptual greenway runs parallel to John Shields Parkway, generally as depicted in the Bridge Street District Area Plan.</p> <p>Greenway Dimensional Requirements: Met/SPR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size (Min. 1 ac.; No Max.): Met. • Minimum Dimension (30 ft.; 60 ft. Avg.): Met. • Min. % Along Street/Building (50%): Met. • Zoning Districts Permitted: Met. • Frontage Orientation (Any): Met. • Uses/Structures (Playgrounds Permitted): Met (none proposed). • Impervious + Semi-Pervious (Max. 20%+10%): SPR. • Max. % Open Water (30%): Met (none proposed).
<p>SPR: Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.</p>		

153.065(B) – Site Development Standards – Parking and Loading

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(1)(b)	Parking Location	Met. Provided in a combination of garage spaces integrated with the apartment buildings, off-street surface parking on the interior of blocks and parallel on-street parking spaces.
(1)(d)&(e)	Parking Lot Lighting & Landscaping	SPR. The applicant will be required to demonstrate compliance with applicable lighting and landscaping requirements for parking areas at the Site Plan Review.
(1)(f)	Parking Plan Required	SPR. The overall development provides more than the minimum number of required parking spaces, including garage spaces, off-street surfaces spaces and on-street parking. However, adjustments to on-street parking spaces are necessary due to dimensional offset requirements near intersections. The applicant will need to confirm parking requirements are met with adjustments to street designs and alley circulation areas.
(2)	Required Vehicle Parking	Met. The total parking requirement is 440 spaces. The plan includes 481 spaces. Parking requirements are calculated as follows:

153.065(B) – Site Development Standards – Parking and Loading

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes		
		Unit Type	Minimum Required	Maximum Permitted
		Studio/Efficiency and One Bedroom Units (296)	1 per dwelling unit (296 spaces)	2 per dwelling unit (592 spaces)
		Two Bedroom Units (96)	1.5 per dwelling unit (144 spaces)	2 per dwelling unit (192)
		Total Units (392)	440 Spaces	784 Spaces
(3)	Required Bicycle Parking	Met with condition/SPR. A minimum of 1 bicycle parking space is required for every 2 dwelling units (196 spaces). The plans indicate that garages will be used to provide 148 bicycle parking spaces and 48 bicycle racks (96 spaces) will be provided throughout the site. Details will be determined at the Site Plan Review. Bicycle parking is currently shown within landscaped medians in rear alleys and between some buildings. Bike racks should be provided in more prominent, publicly accessible locations, such as open spaces and within the street furnishing zone.		
(4)	Off-Street Parking Space and Aisle Dimensions	SPR. Surface parking lot design details to be verified with the Site Plan Review.		
(5)	Parking Structure Design	N/A. No parking structure proposed. Garage parking is integrated into the buildings as permitted for the Apartment building type.		
(6)	Surface Parking Lot and Loading Area Design and Construction	SPR. To be verified with the Site Plan Review.		
(7)	Required Loading Spaces	N/A. No loading spaces are required for this project.		

SPR: Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.

153.065(C) – Site Development Standards – Stormwater Management

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
153.065(C)	Stormwater Management	Met with Condition. Table 6-4 of Stormwater Design Manual indicates the preferred, allowed and not suitable stormwater control measures for the different building types in the Bridge Street District. The plans indicate that multiple underground detention facilities are proposed. While this is indicated in the chart as permissible for an apartment building type, this is not the preferred method of managing stormwater. The table indicates that the preferred methods include: media filters, the various vegetated bioretention systems (traditional bioretention, swales, planter/tree boxes, and curb extensions) and green roofs. None of these methods have been employed in the proposal. The applicant should integrate a de-

153.065(C) – Site Development Standards – Stormwater Management

		centralized system utilizing these other methods to the maximum extent practicable, employing the underground detention to supplement them to bring the site into compliance.
SPR: Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.		

153.065(D) – Site Development Standards – Landscaping & Tree Preservation

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(2)	General Requirements	SPR. The applicant has provided typical landscape details and specifications. These details will be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review once final revisions to site layout have been completed.
(3)	Street Trees	SPR. Plans indicate street tree species and locations. These details will be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review once final revisions to site layout and street designs have been completed.
(4)	Perimeter Landscape Buffering	N/A.
(5)	Surface Parking and Circulation Area Landscaping	SPR. These details will be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review once final revisions to site layout have been completed.
(6)	Required Building Zone (RBZ) Treatment	SPR. A landscape RBZ treatment is shown for all buildings. Details to be verified with the Site Plan Review.
(7)	Foundation Planting	SPR. The applicant has provided typical foundation planting details and plant schedule options for each building type and for various sun/shade arrangements. These details be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review once final revisions to site layout have been completed.
(8)-(11)	Tree Preservation and Replacement	SPR. Plans indicate general areas of trees to be removed and preserved. A tree survey will be required with the Site Plan Review. All efforts should be made to preserve protected trees and tree stands and incorporate them into the site design. Plans indicate an intent to incorporate portions of existing tree rows within the greenway.

SPR: Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.

153.065(E) – Site Development Standards – Fencing, Walls, and Screening

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(1)	Fence and Wall Standards	SPR. Plans show a fence surrounding the swimming pool behind the clubhouse. Material and installation specifications will be required with the Site Plan Review.
(2)	Street Wall Standards	SPR. Plans indicate street walls located at some alley entrances. Details to be verified with the Site Plan Review.
(3)	Screening	SPR. The applicant will be required to screen the proposed dumpster, transformer, and ground-mounted mechanical equipment with appropriate screening that meets this requirement. Additional details to be verified at Site Plan Review.

153.065(E) – Site Development Standards – Fencing, Walls, and Screening

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
<p>SPR: Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.</p>		

153.065(F) – Site Development Standards – Exterior Lighting

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(4)	Fixture Power and Efficiency	<p>SPR. Exterior site lighting details will be required at the Site Plan Review.</p>
(5)-(8)	Shielding, Lighting Uniformity/Trespass, Light Poles	
(9)-(10)	Wall & Canopy Lighting	<p>SPR. Exterior light fixtures are shown on the rear of buildings over the garage doors. Details for these and other exterior building lighting will be required at the Site Plan Review.</p>
<p>SPR: Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.</p>		

153.065(G) – Site Development Standards – Utility Underground

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(G)	Utility Undergrounding	<p>Met. No overhead utilities in this area for undergrounding. Existing overhead utilities are located on the north side of Tuller Road.</p>

153.065(H) – Site Development Standards – Signs

Code Section	Requirement	Analysis/Notes
(H)	Signs	<p>SPR. Only conceptual sign placement in the current plans. Project identification signs are shown in three locations: in raised building planters at the intersections of John Shields Parkway/Deardorff Street and Tuller Road/Deardorff Street; and in front of the clubhouse. The applicant has indicated an interest in incorporating building-mounted signs as well. A Master Sign Plan should be submitted as part of the Site Plan Review.</p>



To: Justin Goodwin, Planner II
From: Barbara Cox, PE, Engineering Manager - Development
Date: February 6, 2014
Re: Case 14-008BPR – Tuller Flats

Engineering has reviewed the drawings that were submitted on January 14, 2014, for the Basic Site Plan and Development Plan review for the above-referenced project. At this time, we have the following comments and notes on this project (in no particular order).

Basic Plan (Site Plan & Development Plan)

Streets

1. Engineering's understanding of the street designations are (understanding the "public ROW" is still yet to be defined for this project):
 - a. John Shields Parkway is district connector street and a principal frontage street (76-foot ROW) & built in Phase 1;
 - b. Deardorff Street and Watson Street are neighborhood streets (65-foot ROW/public access easement) & built in Phase 1;
 - c. Hobbs Landing West is a neighborhood street (65-foot ROW) & built in Phase 2; and
 - d. McCune Avenue is a yield or a neighborhood street and the section needs to be modified.
2. The plans do indicate a phasing plan for the construction of the buildings and a portion of the private site improvements. All "public" streets are indicated to be constructed in Phase 1.
3. The curb radius at the intersection should be in general:
 - a. When intersecting with existing Tuller Road – 25 feet
 - b. Intersecting within project – 20 feet
 - c. Intersecting with alley – 15 feet or need to see turning exhibits
4. Street lighting is to be provided on all new "public" streets.
5. An area should be designated along John Shields Parkway that could be converted to a bus stop in the future.
6. Sight distance triangles at the public street intersections need to be shown on the Site Plan in order to review the elements within those areas for compliance with visibility standards.

Parking

1. The locations of the parallel parking spaces near the intersections need to meet the AASHTO requirements (Section 4.20, Figure 4-26). This requires the parking to end 20 feet in advance of an intersection and a tapered (in a straight line) curb line over 8 feet (a 45° angle). A few spaces may be lost due to this.

2. Handicap accessible spaces are required for the parallel parking. Two are shown: by the clubhouse on Deardorff Street and on Watson Street. Depending on the greenway design, an additional one may be needed on John Shields Parkway. A discussion with Building is needed to determine if the spaces noted as "in Garage" are acceptable.
3. The spaces just north of John Shields Parkway and south of Tuller Road on both Watson and Deardorff may not be viable after Item 1 in this list is applied.
4. No allowance for any bicycle parking has been shown along the public streets.
5. No loading spaces are identified.
6. No fire access zones are identified.

Pedestrian Connectivity

1. Sidewalks are shown on both sides on all roadways that are proposed to be public. All hardscape elements included in the public right of way are to be constructed with concrete.
2. Additional work will be needed to detail how the cross walks are designed. A special pavement treatment may be required.
3. A redundant sidewalk is shown in front of the units that face Tuller Road. It would increase the use of the existing path to connect these units directly to the existing path and this would eliminate an expense for the developer.

Utilities

The plans indicate that both sanitary and storm sewer would be located within the greenway along John Shields Parkway. This warrants further study as this could limit the usefulness of the greenspace into the future.

Sanitary

1. There is a public 12-inch sanitary sewer which runs along the northern side of the Tuller Road and has a small extension under the roadway that is proposed to be the connection point.
2. Calculations showing that the downstream system is able to accommodate these apartments and other proposed uses will be needed with the Development Plan and Preliminary Plat.

Water

4. This proposal includes providing a new public 8-inch water line along John Shields Parkway. This matches with Engineering's overall plan for water service in this area of the Bridge Street District.
5. Public 8-inch water lines should be installed with Deardorff, Watson, and Hobbs Landing West. The proposal includes two master water meters (near Tuller and John Shields) to provide public water to the individual buildings. The defining of the "public ROW" mentioned earlier will provide guidance to finalize the water service for this project.

6. If needed for fire service, 6-inch water lines or loops may need to be installed with the development.

Grading & Stormwater Management

1. The site generally drains east to west and falls about 17 feet in elevation.
2. The plans do include a preliminary grading plan for the site. There may be issues on the property lines with getting the grading to blend into the existing ground on the adjacent properties.
3. Additional information will be needed to verify that the proposed grades for John Shields Parkway work with the needed extensions of this roadway to the east and west of this site.
4. Table 6-4 of Stormwater Design Manual indicates the preferred, allowed and not suitable stormwater control measures for the different building types in the Bridge Street District. The plans indicate that multiple underground detention facilities are proposed. While this is indicated in the chart as permissible for an apartment building type, this is not the preferred method of managing stormwater. The table indicates that the preferred methods include: media filters, the various vegetated bioretention systems (traditional bioretention, swales, planter/tree boxes, and curb extensions) and green roofs. None of these methods have been employed in the proposal. We would like to encourage the use of a decentralized system utilizing these other methods and employing the underground detention to supplement them to bring the site into compliance.
5. A preliminary Stormwater Management Plan was not included in the submittal. The project will have to meet both quantity and quality standards.

Other

1. No signs are identified.
2. Verify that there are no private utility easements beyond the right of way of Tuller Road. There may be conflicts with the proposed buildings.
3. Is irrigation proposed?
4. Addressing for this apartment complex needs to be determined before building permits can be applied for.

Please let us know if you have any questions on these comments.

City of Dublin Ohio

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MEMORANDUM

To: Justin Goodwin
City of Dublin

From: Moody Nolan Architects

Date: February 12, 2014

Project: Tuller Flats of Dublin
Case # 14-008 BPR
Architectural Review

Per your request, Moody Nolan has completed an architectural review of the design documents prepared by Casto Development and Sullivan Bruck Architects that were included in the Basic Plan Submittal package dated January 24, 2014. The overall building organization and façade design generally complies with the architectural standards of the Bridge Street Code, however, there are several specific items that should be addressed as part of this application:

General Comments:

1. There is no indication of ADA compliance and at grade accommodations. Please identify accessible units, parking and accessible routes.
2. Roof Drawings: The Roof Plans indicate positive drainage to the rear of the buildings with scupper and downspout locations to be determined. Since these buildings will have continuous parapets, the location of adequate scupper openings and downspouts could have a significant impact on the rear elevations. Please provide elevations indicating drainage and downspouts.
3. Window Details: Window material is not indicated. Provide product information and head, jamb and sill details of the typical window types. Confirm that all glass selections have a minimum visible light transmittance of 60%.
4. Trash Pickup: Please indicate how trash is being handled. Dumpster pickup or individual canisters at units?
5. Mail: Indicate location and appearance of group mailboxes (this assumes that mail will not be delivered to individual apartment buildings).
6. Site and Road Connections: The site layout appears to conform to the guidelines with the exception of block size and length issues for which variances have been requested.

Architectural Variety

The proposed development has multiple buildings with four different plan types. Within these plan types the elevations of the buildings have been varied to create seven different elevation designs. These elevations vary in the selection and placement of finish materials as well as in the design of recesses and projections. The site is laid out so that no two identical buildings are side by side on the same block.

Although there are necessarily several identical buildings in the development as a whole, the layout appears to meet the basic requirement that adjacent buildings will vary from each other.

It can be argued that more variations would be desirable if it can be done without sacrificing any quality in finish materials and details.

Elevation Comments:

1. The elevations generally comply with the architectural standards. Some additional information should be provided.
2. Details between horizontal and vertical transitions are unclear. What is the material capping typical masonry veneer as it projects beyond cement board siding or fiber board panels above? What is the capping at the top of the various parapet conditions? Show how vertical changes in material will be clearly delineated where there is no full inside corner. For instance, the end elevations on Building Type B where the siding creates a “notch” between the masonry veneer, could be considered a violation of the requirement for vertical transitions to occur at inside corners. In this case we feel this will be an appropriate transition if the masonry clearly projects creating a defined corner detail.
3. Window sills are not shown consistently on the elevations. What is the material and detail?
4. Fiber cement panels indicated on the elevations of all Building Types are not listed as a primary material. Please provide large samples of this material demonstrating the color and texture, joint details and corner conditions.
5. Section 153.062(E)(2) requires that the visually 'heavier' facade material occur below a 'lighter' material (i.e. brick or stone below siding, rather than the opposite). For Buildings 'D', 'E', and 'F', the brick wraps over top the recessed siding infill between the windows. In this case we feel this is appropriate given that the masonry creates a “frame” for the siding and windows, creating visual interest.
6. Provide material and detail of the projecting canopies, fascia and soffit conditions.
7. Currently, the only exterior light fixtures indicated are above the garage doors on the Rear Elevations. Provide cut sheets of those fixtures as well as proposed fixtures at the entrances on the front elevations
8. Provide details for exterior railings.

Trash / Mail

1. The site drawing appears to indicate a potential conflict with the maneuverability of the trash truck and the curb. If the assumption is that a traditional truck will make the pick-up, the dumpster and curb are mis-aligned.
2. There appears to be only one Mail Kiosk. Is this adequate for the number of units or are two Kiosks on opposite sides of the development more appealing?

Landscaping

1. We appreciate the overall amount of green space and the continuation of the Greenway through the development. There also seems to be adequate walking paths and pocket parks.
2. There is a lack of site benches indicated.

Context of surrounding buildings

1. There are several apartment / condominium developments adjacent to the proposed Tuller Flats. Generally these are a combination of brick or stone with varying amounts of fiber cement siding.

Generally, these adjacent buildings have peaked roofs over the main body of the building and a few have flat roofs over the garages.

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