



**Land Use and Long
Range Planning**

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 13, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Spaces; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Justin Goodwin, Planner II; Brad Conway, Residential Plans Examiner; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicant: Alan Davis, EMH&T; Aaron Underhill, Underhill Law Office; Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects; Kolby Turnock, Casto; Bryan Quackenbush, EMH&T; Linda Menerey, EMH&T; and Brent Sobczak, Casto.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the February 6, 2014, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

1. 14-010MPR– BSC Indian Run Neighborhood District – OCLC – Brown Building Demolition – 6600 Kilgour Place

Justin Goodwin said this is a request for demolition and removal of approximately 31,800-square-foot building and associated site improvements, including removal of an enclosed building connector to OCLC "Building C." He said the site is on the north side of Post Road at the intersection of Post Road and Kilgour Place. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Mr. Goodwin said the Brown Building is connected to the larger Smith building by an overhead building connector and that OCLC no longer has a use for it. He said the building and connector will be removed along with eight parking spaces. He said the remainder of the connector will be capped with an aluminum and glass curtain wall to match existing, and the area will be graded and seeded and existing trees in the area will be protected.

Alan Davis, EMH&T, said there are no existing architectural plans for building due to its age. He said about 20 to 25 feet of the connector will remain, which is necessary for structural integrity.

Ray Harpham suggested there may be records from a project here about six years ago.

Mr. Goodwin said there were no conditions.

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

2. 14-008BPR – BSC Residential District – Tuller Road Flats Residential Development – 4313 Tuller Road Road

Justin Goodwin said this is a request for 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 on the south side of Tuller Road, approximately 700 feet east of Tuller Ridge Drive. He said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D) for a Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan.

Mr. Goodwin said the Basic Development Plan includes the proposed street network, block framework and street types. He said the Basic Site Plan includes the proposed use, building types, open space arrangement and site development details. He explained that the extension of John Shields Parkway from Tuller Ridge Drive to Village Parkway will also be included as part of this development.

Mr. Goodwin referenced the proposed block layout, and pointed out where private streets with public easements were planned. He said that public access easements may not be feasible with the City of Columbus' requirement against allowing private water lines to cross public streets. He noted that in the report he stated that the question of who would own the streets had not yet been determined. He said that the City will continue to work with the applicant to find an acceptable approach prior to the next step in the process.

Mr. Goodwin said he recommended last week and has since discussed further with the applicant the re-orientation of the centrally-located buildings on the site adjacent to the pocket parks, which the applicant is already addressing. He said the buildings will be re-oriented with their main entrances facing the street and adjacent pocket park dimensions adjusted accordingly. He said the applicant was exploring stormwater alternatives, as well.

Mr. Goodwin stated that some of the elements for specific building variety requirements that require building designs that vary from adjacent buildings have still not been met. He recommended this be addressed and met with a condition; if not, a Waiver will need to be requested at the next step of the process.

Mr. Goodwin explained that adjacent buildings are required to vary by materials, at a minimum, and in addition, the adjacent buildings must vary by at least two of the following: the proportion of recesses and projections, location of the entrances and window placement, and/or roof design including roof type, plan, or material. He said with respect to the building relationships of building types A & B, the recess/projections are varied but the window placements and entrances are in the same locations. He said the same is true for the

relationship of buildings C & G and the relationship of buildings D & E. He further noted that there are no roof variations between the buildings.

Mr. Goodwin provided a summary of the interior building orientation, alley system, building variety, vehicular circulation, and green space. He said since public street rights-of-way are yet to be defined for this project, both sanitary and stormwater locations will warrant further study.

Mr. Goodwin stated that Building Standards has requested more information to have a thorough understanding of installation specifications for façade materials, including material samples and section panels to ensure high-quality and durable construction. He said the construction mock-ups of exterior material installations will be reviewed to confirm necessary quality construction conditions.

Mr. Goodwin reported that 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.

Mr. Goodwin asked Joe Sullivan about the parapets wrapping on some of the buildings as they do not appear to meet the requirement of parapets wrapping all four sides.

Joe Sullivan described his approach to three-dimensional design of the buildings, and how the flat roof plane is sloped to allow water to drain into gutters at the back of the building. He explained the functionality of the returns, the gutters to extend with downspouts, and the parapets to hide the air conditioner units. He said his four-foot returns give it more substance than a thin veneer. Mr. Sullivan said it was his opinion that the design meets the intent of the Code requirement.

Mr. Goodwin recommended they continue to work on the parapets with the Site Plan Review, but as currently shown, a Waiver would be required.

Basic Development Plan

Mr. Goodwin summarized the ART recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the request for Basic Development Plan Review with four 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 addresses Engineering's comments referenced in the attached memo, as applicable to the Development Plan Review.

Mr. Langworthy asked Barb Cox to speak to her comments made in the memo presented from Engineering and about her meeting with the City of Columbus.

Barb Cox explained that the City of Dublin has a water service agreement with the City of Columbus where they provide water and do maintenance on the lines, which requires the City of Dublin to follow the rules of the City of Columbus. She said the City of Columbus has an administrative policy that states that private water lines cannot cross public rights-of-way, due to long-term maintenance and serviceability of both the streets and the water service to the private development.

Ms. Cox further explained master water meters, the complexity of lines tapping into those meters, and how fees were procured.

Jeff Tyler noted that all the buildings would need sprinkler service.

Ms. Cox added that a fire tap, sewer, and water were all tied together as a loop. She said both the City of Dublin and the City of Columbus charge for water.

Aaron Underhill, representing the applicant, said they were open to suggestions. He said these types of issues will need to be addressed over and over as the Bridge Street District is developed, given the expense associated with tap fees and a desire for a walkable block system.

Kolby Turnock, Casto, reiterated the need for suggested solutions for multiple taps. Fred Hahn said it would not be a Dublin decision.

Bryan Quackenbush said he could provide an analysis which shows that the cost could be upwards of \$2 million for Columbus sewer and water fees.

Mr. Langworthy said that the City was leaning toward requiring public rights-of-way, in lieu of public-access easements. He said that he appreciated the applicant's willingness to work through a solution to this issue.

Mr. Langworthy invited comments and questions from the ART members.

Alan Perkins said he was waiting on additional analysis of the revised McCune Avenue street section, building access zones and fire hydrant locations to ensure adequate fire service to buildings in this portion of the site, which will be part of the Site Plan Review. He said everything else was fine.

Mr. Goodwin reported the application had included a list of requested Waivers, although Planning had determined that some of the Waivers were not necessary, such as block access configuration.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if he understood and agreed to the four conditions for approval of the Development Plan. Mr. Underhill said he understood and agreed to the conditions. Mr. Langworthy confirmed the approval of the Development Plan to move forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the four conditions noted in the report.

Mr. Goodwin summarized the ART's recommendation of 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 addresses Engineering's comments as attached to this report.

Linda Menerey requested clarification on the four conditions under the Basic Development Plan. She was concerned that the midblock pedestrianway connection could be a challenge. Mr. Goodwin clarified that it was acceptable for the connection not to be precisely located in the center of the block and offered to work through this with the applicant as the project moves forward.

Mr. Underhill asked if there should be time periods noted in some of the conditions. Mr. Goodwin said that would be worked out on next step.

Mr. Quackenbush asked about condition #7, and asked if it could be modified to address the difficulty with meeting the 2.5-foot elevation requirement while maintaining ADA accessibility.

Mr. Goodwin explained that he had discussed this issue with Mr. Sullivan, and agreed to work with the applicant at the Site Plan Review to work to achieve the intent of the requirement, which is to provide an adequate separation between the building's public and private spaces and to provide a base to the building.

Rachel Ray suggested that the condition be modified to state "to the maximum extent practical."

Ray Harpham said he was concerned with "to the maximum extent practical" because it relies on a determination on what that maximum extent is.

Mr. Langworthy suggested omitting this condition altogether. The ART agreed to omit #7.

Mr. Turnock asked if there was a preferred style for bike racks. Mr. Goodwin said the inverted U is becoming a typical type, but no specific standard has been determined by the City. Laura Ball said diversity of types is acceptable, as long as they have two points of contact for the bike frame.

Mr. Underhill stated he was generally okay with the changes discussed. He inquired about the Commission's view on commercial uses.

Mr. Goodwin said the conceptual plan shows the potential for commercial and service destinations as part of a future phase of development along Village Parkway. He said this would be within an approximate five-minute walking radius of the proposed neighborhood.

Mr. Langworthy said he understood that commercial uses worked better when they are concentrated in an area with other commercial uses, yet still accessible by pedestrians and bicyclists. He said he had invited Terry Foegler, Director of Strategic Initiatives and Special Projects, to attend the Commission meeting on February 20 to speak to this issue further.

Mr. Langworthy asked members for any final comments regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] Mr. Langworthy said the ART recommends approval to the PZC for the request for Basic Site Plan Review with 10 conditions (including the elimination of condition #7).

Development Plan Waivers

Mr. Goodwin summarized the ART recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the request for the following two 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.

Mr. Langworthy asked members for any final comments regarding these two Waivers. [There were none.] Mr. Langworthy said the ART recommends approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the two Development Plan Waivers.

Site Plan Waiver

Mr. Goodwin summarized the ART recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the request for 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.

Mr. Langworthy asked members for any final comments regarding the proposed Site Plan Waiver. [There were none.] Mr. Langworthy said the ART recommends approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Site Plan Waiver.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed the Administrative Review Team's recommendation of approval of this application, to be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission on February 20, 2014.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm.