City of Dublin
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

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 28, 2014

AGENDA

1. BSC Historic Transition – Bridge Park West **94 and 100 North High Street**
14-099ARB/BPR **Informal Review**

Robert Schisler called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were David Rinaldi, Bob Dyas, and Thomas Munhall. Neil Mathias was absent (due to conflict of interest). City representatives were Jennifer Rauch, Joanne Shelly, Alan Perkins, and Laurie Wright.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Dyas moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

1. BSC Historic Transition – Bridge Park West **94 and 100 North High Street**
14-099ARB/BPR **Informal Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this application is for a development consisting of a two-story mixed-use building, 42 condominium units in a seven-story building with associated parking (375 parking spaces) and site improvements along the east side of High Street approximately 280 feet north of the intersection of North Street. She said this is a request for informal review and feedback for a future Basic Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.057-153.066.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant submitted a Basic Site Plan, which includes the detailed basic information such as the architecture that is slated for the November 19, 2014, ARB meeting. She said the review tonight will allow the applicant to further refine the proposed design based on the ARB's comments, as well as Jon Barnes' architectural review as the City's outside consultant, and previous ART comments and return at the end of November.

Ms. Rauch presented the site and explained there are two existing buildings that will be demolished. She pointed out the Historic Mixed-Use buildings along North High Street and the Apartment Building along the river that will face the North Riverview Street extension with a parking garage located internally. She also showed the elevations from August 2014 and now. She noted the previous North High Street elevation on the top of the slide showing the large garage entrance. She said when this proposal was reviewed by the Board in both May and August the character, access, architectural detail, and transitions around the sides between the two Building Types were discussed.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant has made some modifications to the architecture. She showed the proposal on the North High Street elevation, where it appears as three separate buildings, noting the main access garage to parking at the northern end of the proposed buildings and a secondary entrance for the five residential units on the top. She pointed out two tower elements, one at the northern most point of the building and another on the south used to make the transition between the elevations.

Ms. Rauch said as part of the review, a number of discussion questions were included in the Planning Report and are as follows:

1) Are the proposed architectural concepts appropriate to the adjacent area?
   a) North High Street
   b) Scioto River

2) Does the site, site elements, and architecture relate properly to North High Street?
   a) Architectural Character
   b) Scale
   c) Relationship to street
   d) Commercial elevations
      i) Storefront façade
      ii) Variety vs customizable blank storefront
      iii) Signs
      iv) Circulation
         (1) Pedestrian
         (2) Vehicular
         (3) Service
   e) Tower – Gateway
      i) What characteristics are important?
      ii) Where are the height considerations in relation to the building mass?
   f) Residential
      i) Architectural character
      ii) Scale of façade details
      iii) Relationship to site
      iv) Circulation
         (1) Pedestrian
         (2) Vehicular
         (3) Service
      v) Tower – Vista
         (1) What characteristics are important?
         (2) What are the height considerations in relation to the building mass?

3) Other considerations by the Board?

Ms. Rauch turned the floor over to the applicant to provide their perspective of the changes since August.

Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors, 600 Creekside Plaza, Gahanna, OH 43230, provided an overview. He presented the project site where the library sits right now and the Indian Run subdivision. He presented an enlargement of the improvements along the roadway in relation to the existing buildings. He showed the green space and how it related, as well as some additional green space inside that courtyard.

Mr. Sebach said there has been a lot of discussion about this future plaza and the pedestrian bridge that will connect in this area. He noted the grade change from 775 feet to 820 feet and the location of the pedestrian bridge landing would be a nice way to have a landing platform and circulation down. He noted the intended sidewalk and how it would connect into Historic Dublin and then another connection to Indian Run. He said there are currently two entry points on either side of the driveway for the public to access the lower level of the garage. He highlighted the stairs and the vertical circulations enclosed for the residents. He pointed out where the cars come into the garage at a flat entrance on P4 that is at grade and circulate to reach the lower levels, P3, P2, and P1 to then egress.

Mr. Sebach pointed out the stairs that were discussed at the last meeting providing vertical circulation from P1 up to P5. He pointed out the two internal stairs and elevators and the drive that goes up to P5, which is the private parking deck. He noted the at-grade entry point that becomes the lobby to the office above. He said there is a stair and elevator, whereas the stair goes down to P3, the last level of parking under this side. He said the same could be done on the other side. He pointed out the proposed tower providing access to the public right-of-way that will tie into the plaza. He said the path leads naturally along the plaza and straight into that tower.

Mr. Sebach said the dumpsters are four feet wide, eight feet long, and six feet tall on wheels, and attach to each other like little train cars. He said these types of dumpsters are used at Creekside in Gahanna, Ohio. He said they are hooked together early in the morning (or any off-peak hours) and taken through the garage to where the trash is collected. He said he would make sure the Board saw how this all worked and said a similar concept is used at Easton. He said there is an inside trash room with a back-of-house enclosed circulation. He noted where two restaurants are proposed. He said the trash will be collected in the residential section to be brought over to the trucks that will be scheduled, off-peak hours.

Bob Dyas asked if it would be a private trash service to which Mr. Sebach said it would.

Mr. Sebach showed the two stair towers that can be used by the public from the garage to get out on the lower level. He said there is private access, (be buzzed in per intercom) for the doors to be released for entry. He said there are public lobbies that connect so the public could come down the elevator and exit to access the walking path to old Dublin.

Mr. Sebach said they have been trying to stay “honest” to Dublin. He said they wanted the scale, the materials, and appearance to fit in, be fresh, and not foreign. He started describing the North High Street elevation and said the tower is the focal point that terminates that plaza, anchors the public to any circulation, and allows for transition of some of the architectural elements from the larger seven-story piece to the two and a half story piece. He pointed out the larger glass to make an easier transition. As he moved from the south end of the High Street elevation to the north, he further explained the architecture by highlighting the rhythm, scale, brackets, deep overhang, stone blend, and fiber-cement panels to not be heavy like stucco or siding. He showed the standout entrance features for the office buildings. He said there is a landscaped retaining wall out front to maintain access into the building. He showed the entrance to the garage and the bridge across. He said the flat roof downplays the bridge as much as possible. He explained how the architecture was changed again to avoid repetition, having its own tower to provide a beacon on the corner, changed scale of glass and windows but allowed for transition to the other architecture, working in concert with the rest of the architecture.

Mr. Sebach explained the architecture for the south elevation with the dotted line that represents the proposed future bridge. He said it was not right up against the building but wanted to show the landing point at about 820 feet to slowly slope to the river. He said the future pedestrian bridge would pass the building at about two stories up. He pointed out the large scale glass and the tower that becomes the visual terminus to the plaza. He started at the left of this elevation and moved to the right, describing the architecture.

Mr. Sebach described the architecture for the North Riverview Street elevation before ending with the north elevation descriptions.

Ms. Rauch asked if anyone from the public would like to speak with respect to this application.

Thomas McCash, 6864 Fallen Timbers Drive, said he had a past history with Dublin as he had served on Council in 1995 and has seen a tremendous transition in this area. He said this proposal looks like it should be in Upper Arlington along Tremont Road or down on the OSU campus. He said the towers are going to appear as lighthouses on the corners. He said the proposal appears to be too big and does not

fit in the context of the Historic District. He added the architecture is not quite there and too modern on the Scioto River side. Mr. McCash concluded he is supportive of having a project like this but is concerned it will look like an elephant along High Street.

Thomas Munhall asked Mr. McCash if the North High Street façade and the south elevation with the tower were changed to more traditional architecture or closer to what was created in August would the residents be more receptive.

Mr. McCash said it starts to reflect Historic Dublin and allows the backside more room for something different because it is not necessarily seen from the Historic District area but rather from the side of the river. He said the top would still be seen from High Street and was not sure the metal panels were appropriate for the Historic District. He indicated metal panels may be more appropriate on the backside.

Mr. Munhall said he thought Mr. McCash's comments were a reflection of what the ARB has been discussing. He added the backside has not been as crucial.

Garrick Daft, 21 Indian Run Drive, said he likes the previous illustration better. He thought Dublin would desire a design more like a historic castle, using stone like Dublin, Ireland. He said he did not see this as a landmark type building as presented today, it can be seen anywhere, and he is not excited about the drawings.

Mr. Munhall asked if the High Street side was the concern or the river side, or both. Mr. Daft replied when he saw the High Street elevation online in August he was not concerned and could live with that. He said he does not like the renderings proposed today; it is monstrous and very visible.

Mr. Munhall said the discussion has been it will only be visible from the pedestrian bridge. He indicated if the Scioto River elevation is developed in a more modern approach it allows the transition from old to new. He said the front elevation should be more historic in nature.

Mr. Daft said this is an opportunity for something very iconic to be built for Dublin.

Robert Schisler said it is hard to see the building that is there now and it is four stories tall and if you are across the river, it is not highly visible. He indicated this project would not appear as massive due to the way it is situated in the site; he said it is hard to see the whole building from a distance.

Mr. Daft said Riverside Drive is being moved up and understands more modern architecture on the east side but thought Historic Dublin should stay more in historic character. He suggested perhaps 'castle meets modern'.

David Rinaldi said as a point of reference, Riverside Drive is 785 feet in elevation and the roof is at 860 feet, about 65 feet higher than the current Riverside Drive elevation.

Bob Dyas said he appreciated the public feedback on the proposed project and would ensure it meets the expectations of the community.

Mr. Rinaldi said something successful was beginning to happen in August when the High Street elevation had the appearance of developing over time and believes that has gone away with the new High Street elevation proposed today. He said this definitely looks and feels like a large development.

Mr. Munhall said he wanted to make the point that the Board does not necessarily care about transitioning the two buildings. He said when this was discussed in the past, there were two separate buildings, one traditional and one modern.

Mr. Dyas said he did not have a problem with modern architecture in the back and more traditional detailing in the front.

Mr. Schisler said he preferred the original elevation because they appeared to all be in the same family but each had their own character. However he said, the glass connector still made it look massive and now that this is opened up, it cuts down on the scale. He suggested some different architectural elements. He said this sits on a large parking structure to give us everything we want but it still looks like two buildings and was disappointed to find it was connected on the south elevation, as the corner was turned. He suggested a flat area for a plaza before reaching the apartments where now it appears to take up a whole city block, which increased the scale by connecting it. He added people are mainly going to see the top two levels. He said he understands the transition aspect but is not certain he wants to deviate that much.

Mr. Schisler indicated he recently drove down High Street in the Short North area and the Arena District and noticed they used a lot of different materials in a lot of different ways; some of it is modern infill, in between some of the more historic buildings. He said more modern materials were used in a more traditional way. He said some of it was done very well and some not but it seems like the applicant is "over doing it" by bringing in stone, brick, and glass. He said it is a mixture, not really modern or traditional but rather a mixture of style. He said being so flat, it increases the scale. He said the perspective rendering looks like a whole city block, which it is at 400 feet long. He suggested a building 'A' and a building 'B', both with their own character would reduce the scale. Mr. Schisler said the stairs that do not come to the outside, they have to and wants to see the changes now rather than later.

Mr. Sebach said the two stairs in the office buildings empty directly outside.

Ms. Schisler said he understands but the towers that go up and down, he noted the stairs that empty into a lobby and not directly to the outside.

Mr. Sebach said there are stairs at the other ends but did not show those as they are the points of public access.

Mr. Schisler explained it has to pass Code without changing the plan and the elevation. He does not want to see the whole façade changed because the stairs had to be moved to the outside. He said it is an issue, now.

Mr. Schisler inquired about the mechanicals, specifically the heating and air conditioning in all the residences. Mr. Sebach said they are working on a ventilation and garage solution. He said they have talked about how they are going to heat and cool the units independently. He said screened condensing units will be on the roof. He said units on the front of the building will have louvers for fresh air intake. He said toilet exhaust out of the building is done typically on the outside of the building. He indicated all those pieces will have to be shown when the applicant returns.

Mr. Schisler said he wanted the vertical circulations inviting and walkways enhanced. Mr. Dyas agreed with Mr. Schisler's assessments.

Mr. Rinaldi said the higher elevations are important and the High Street elevation will get the most attention. He said he would like the buildings to appear smaller and developing over time. He said the towers at the terminals that create the transition between buildings makes a lot of sense and can be successful. He asked if the towers would be illuminated; he will be interested to see if they will become big beacons at night on High Street. He stated he did not have a problem with the modern style for the Scioto River elevation. He suggested relating the front to the back with materials. He said the Scioto River elevations are so close and the two halves almost want to be symmetrical but it is not quite there.

He said he is not sure about metal panels. He asked if the intent on the sloping roofs was for shingles or metal standing seam elements.

Mr. Sebach said in the transition district, it suggests that metal be used and that is what we prefer.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the big heavy brackets. Mr. Sebach answered the brackets will probably be a powder-coated aluminum for a flat finish. He said the applicant is struggling with the transition area as much as the Board. He said the discussion has been when is "enough is enough" and we are going to be honest and do architecture of this century and not historic. He said the applicant wants to please the client and the community and it is a tough decision to rip the band aid off.

Mr. Munhall said the problem is this is in Historic Dublin and these areas are expected to be quaint. However, he said, when the corner is turned to these new condominiums, a more modern style can be understood. He said an architect's standpoint is different than the public's standpoint or policy standpoint. He said the issue is what is going to sell at the end of the day and what is not going to be a problem. He said he has no problem with modern architecture, but there is an appropriate time and place. He said he does not feel the public or the speakers that are here tonight feel like this is the time and place. He believes the most vocal folks want it to be traditional. He said the Board is trying to reflect that in the comments today.

Mr. Sebach said he understands this is a process. He said a large castle does not fit either and believes there has to be a transition from front to back.

Mr. Munhall asked if the Board needs to make decisions on the skin of the building or is that something that can be worked through, as opposed to their discussion last Wednesday.

Ms. Rauch explained the applicant will submit the Basic Site Plan, which will show conceptual architecture the Board will be expected to sign off. She added the point of tonight is to figure out if the applicant's proposal is heading in the right direction and the Board will feel comfortable approving moving forward. She said the very fine details will be worked out as part of the Final Site Plan, which comes later, but this is the Board's opportunity to give informal feedback before the applicant returns. She said the Basic Site Plan will need to meet Code, Historic Guidelines, and the context of the Historic District.

Mr. Schisler said he does not like the side elevation with the mansered roof, which will then get flat in the back. He said that is going to be a difficult elevation to work out. He said we want it separate so it does not feel like a full city block without any breaks. He noted which corners would be easier to transition and not look like they were cut or dropped.

Mr. Schisler said the problem is to separate from the scale. He said as an architect and a resident, he does not have an issue with more modern architecture; it is the character and side character that each one is a nice piece that we are going to be proud of. He said he was concerned about the rooflines being cut when a height limit is reached. He wants these buildings to have character where it looks like people can walk along all sides. He reiterated his desire for smaller scale, again suggesting building 'A' and 'B' and being able to see all the way through.

Mr. Dyas said he agreed with the public input tonight and did like the August elevation better than this. He said the proposal tonight is beautiful but he is not sure it fits. He said he understands a lot of work has gone into this application but it needs fine tuning. He said his biggest fear is we collectively as a team approve this and make a mistake. He said there is nothing we can do once it is constructed and have to get right.

Mr. Sebach indicated we thought we were going in the right direction, based on feedback they have received. However he said, if there is a strong consensus, he does not want to come back again to hear

the Board was wrong, we changed their mind. He said he wants to make sure the Board has time to digest this. He said the applicant will go back and do their best to address all the concerns. He said it was a big shift to go from where we were in August to here and back to there.

Mr. Munhall asked from the City's standpoint or feedback to the applicant if there has been a shift toward more modern architecture on the High Street side.

Mr. Sebach said they have been trying to interpret what they heard at ARB about consistency the last time. He said obviously there were studies done by Elkus Manfredi and Goody Clancy, and the applicant is trying to follow the Bridge Street Corridor plan. He said ultimately, someone has to take a stand.

Joanne Shelly confirmed this is in the Historic Transition District and not in the Historic District. She said she hears concerns that while this is not in the Historic District, it is visible.

Mr. Munhall said his concern was what people expect that live in the Dublin area. He said people on High Street are not going to recognize they are 50 feet from the Historic District so it is supposed to look modern.

Ms. Shelly agreed there was not a dashed line on the street that separates the Historic Transition District from the Historic District. She asked for confirmation that she was hearing a modern style was more comfortable on the north end because that is at the other end of the building and as you move towards Historic Dublin, you want see more of the detailing that is typical of Historic Dublin.

Mr. Dyas said that was part of his point and agrees with Mr. Schisler that the center building jumps out at him like it does not fit as well as the long roof on the other side.

Ms. Shelly said the northern building has a distinct character and then there are two buildings that have very similar character. She noted it has been said that the Board wants to see this look as though it has been built over time. She asked if each of those buildings were seen as a separate character, if the Board would be more comfortable.

Mr. Rinaldi said nobody wants to design a historic building and as you go down High Street there is a rhythm to the buildings, 40 feet, 50 feet, whatever the depth is, and here we have changed that dramatically. He said in terms of detail this has to be historic architecture; it does not have to mimic a Disneyland version of historic architecture. He said the rhythm needs to be carried through. He said he referred back to the August meeting minutes. He pointed out that at that time, we thought the project was headed in the right direction and what was important was how the corner was turned. He said using an element like a tower or something is a successful way to make that transition from the front to the back. Mr. Rinaldi said he is a little shocked that we have made this drastic change when the Board's indication was the application was headed in the right direction.

Mr. Munhall said he was going to say the exact same thing. He said the residents that this Board represents would have a pretty big problem if we started interviewing them all the time saying here is what it is going to be, what do you think.

Mr. Schisler asked if the library was just across the street. He pointed out that the library is more modern, and at some point it will be torn down and something totally modern may be built there. He said we do not know what is going to happen across the street but it will not be a historic building.

Ms. Shelly suggested taking cues from what may happen with the library from the two most recent libraries that the developer has been done. She said the developer is using the same architect and she believes it is going to be a more contemporary building, attracting people to the library with new needs.

She said there will be the virtual library, it will be very child friendly, and there will be a lot of public space.

Mr. Schisler said he does not mind more modern as long as the traditional materials are used that we are used to in Dublin. He pointed to the Recreation Center as an example. He said it comes down to the details and that is how you transition from front to back. He stated the proposal tonight is very stark. He sees the materials transitioning but the scale and character is still not right and this architecture is making it look massive.

Mr. Sebach said he has some good feedback and understands what the concerns are; he said he did not want to come back with pure historic architecture.

Mr. Munhall asked to see the split screen again to compare the renderings from August to October and noticed a floor was removed from the back. Ms. Shelly pointed out the elevations from August were much taller and when speaking of pedestrian scale and scale that is in Historic Dublin, those buildings are one to two stories high and the ones presented in August are significantly taller than that. She said the Board would actually be getting a bigger mass and thought the Board preferred a smaller mass.

Mr. Schisler said he likes the elevations that step down and use the site better. Mr. Rinaldi said he did not have a problem with the height, he said it is the vertical rhythm. Mr. Dyas agreed.

Mr. Munhall said this has to work economically. He added this Board did not want to hold the applicant up from acting in a proper economic way; he thought this was pretty close in August. However, he said, he does not want to "just go with something" as it will be here for the next 100 years.

Mr. Munhall said he mentioned the economics because there are many projects such as these in other cities that have not gone anywhere due to these types of issues. He said the Board wants to be as reactive as possible and the intention between August and now was not to delay matters or keep the development from happening.

Russ Hunter, 555 Metro Place, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said as a developer, they want to see this go forward and are really excited about this project. He said as far as the architecture goes on the High Street side, we have talked ourselves into both ways – modern or traditional. He said the roof lines really jump out at him and thought the Board's comments were right on the money. He said he is trying to understand all the steps and every week we delay, pushes all those other steps back months and months and we all want to see this happen.

Mr. Munhall said we have all said this is a very important project and understands it may take additional time to process.

Mr. Schisler thought that working out the massing and footprints on the High Street elevation is easier than the condominium issues.

Mr. Hunter said the condominium side of the building has not really been discussed tonight and is not sure how to steer that ship. He asked Mr. Sebach if he had a good grasp on the direction for the condominiums.

Mr. Schisler said to break up the scale of the condominiums, they should not be symmetrical. Mr. Rinaldi said what bothers him is when it is really close but not quite.

Mr. Schisler commented on the use of the glass and said he was not thrilled with the top.

Mr. Munhall asked for more ideas on the condominiums regarding materials and top.

Mr. Schisler said in the Arena District, some of the buildings transition to the metal panels after using brick, which seems elegant where this is stark. Mr. Hunter indicated the difference between the Arena District and this building is the best units in the house want openness so this would straddle the line between traditional and modern architecture and asked for further direction.

Mr. Schisler offered suggestions for architectural changes.

Mr. Rinaldi said the top sections do not bother him and understands what the applicant is trying to do with the expanse of glass.

Mr. Dyas requested the windows and long roofs be broken up somehow. He said he was not sure if it was the materials or the actual structure but similar to the way we looked at elevations from August and now.

Mr. Hunter said he was sure there are ways the applicant could break the mass up a little bit. He said it was a balance as these units will be someone's home so layout and function need to be considered. He agreed verticality it could go a long way.

Mr. Rinaldi suggested maybe part of the problem was in the rendering itself.

Mr. Hunter clarified he has heard from the Board that it is ok for the back to be different from the front and maybe transition is not as important. Mr. Rinaldi said transition is still important. Mr. Munhall suggested the tower could be more traditional.

Mr. Hunter thanked the Board for the additional comments on the back side.

Mr. Daft asked from the audience, what the inspiration was for this project. Mr. Sebach said the inspiration has always been transitional architecture for the Historic Transitional District. He said the challenge is, not too modern, not too historic but rather something in between. He added we are blazing new territory so the inspiration is not to look like the Arena District or Historic Dublin.

Mr. Munhall emphasized the issue is economic. He said we need parking, we want to live here, and we want restaurants. He concluded, at the end of the day, this Board has to represent Dublin to get the best product.

Ms. Shelly said there is a vision for the Bridge Street District that is slightly different than the vision for the rest of the Dublin community. She said this vision includes taking the community forward into the next century. She said Dublin has a solid foundation but it also needs to continue to attract new businesses, the next generation of people that are going to live here and buy here. She said what the Community Plan and other studies have shown is that something different is desired so this small area was carved out to create something that is more contemporary in nature while respecting the history of Dublin. She said by respecting it, you do not try and copy it; you try and look at the features that make it so beloved, which is the pedestrian scale and materials. She said what is proposed for the backside is the next generation of Dublin.

Communications
[There were none.]

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 8:19 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on November 19, 2014.