

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 19, 2014

AGENDA

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. BSC Historic Core – Chelsea Borough Home
14-101ARB-MPR
(Approved 5 – 0) | 54 South High Street
Minor Project Review |
| 2. BSC Historic Transition – Bridge Park West
14-099ARB/BP
(Approved 4 – 0) | 94 and 100 North High Street
Basic Site Plan Review |
| 3. BSC Historic Transition – Bridge Park West
14-105ARB
(Approved 4 – 0) | 94 and 100 North High Street
Demolition |
| 4. BSC Historic Transition – Bridge Park West
14-106ARB/DP
(Approved 4 – 0) | 94 and 100 North High Street
Development Plan Review |

Robert Schisler called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were Neil Mathias, David Rinaldi, Bob Dyas, and Thomas Munhall. City representatives were Jennifer Rauch, Joanne Shelly, Devayani Puranik, Marie Downie, Alan Perkins, Katie Ashbaugh, and Laurie Wright.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Dyas seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Mathias moved, Mr. Schisler seconded, to accept both the October 22, 2014, meeting minutes and the October 28, 2014, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; and Mr. Mathias, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Mr. Schisler briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] He swore in anyone who intends to address the Board on these cases.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. BSC Historic Core – Chelsea Borough Home
14-101ARB-MPR | 54 South High Street
Minor Project Review |
|--|--|

Jennifer Rauch said this application is for a new 8-square-foot wall sign for an existing building on the east side of South High Street, between Spring Hill and Eberly Hill. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch presented the site and the existing historic structure. She said the applicant proposes to locate a new 8-square-foot wall sign between the two windows on the south end of the building, 7 feet to the top of the sign from grade. She reported originally the sign was proposed at 9.5 square feet and the ART recommended the sign be reduced to meet Code. She said the applicant has revised the sign to meet Code, which was distributed to the ARB in the packet. She explained the proposed sign is a 1-inch thick MDO plywood panel wall sign with scalloped corners with a dark chocolate brown background, a green outer border to match the existing window trim, a white inner border, and white text.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended with no conditions as the proposal meets all applicable review standards.

Neil Mathias inquired about the light fixtures. He said this was a good opportunity to do something different to better light up the sign. Bruce Sommerfelt, Signcom, Inc., said he thought something could be done with the lighting but was uncertain of the budget.

Ms. Rauch asked if better lighting should be added as a condition of approval. The Board determined a lighting condition was not necessary for approval.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Mathias seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

2. BSC Historic Transition – Bridge Park West 14-099ARB/BP

94 and 100 North High Street Basic Site Plan Review

Jennifer Rauch said this application is for a development of a two-story mixed-use building, 42 condominium units in a seven-story building with associated parking 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 review and approval for a Basic Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.057-153.066.

[Mr. Mathias recused himself]

Ms. Rauch said there are three different Bridge Park West applications to be reviewed this evening that included a Basic Site Plan Review, Demolition, and Development Plan Review.

Ms. Rauch began with the Basic Site Plan Review, which is a conceptual level plan showing uses, buildings, building locations, site, open space, plans, landscaping, and architecture.

Mr. Dyas requested clarification on the process for approval. Ms. Rauch referred the Board to the Planning Reports for specific review criteria and Zoning Code Sections for each application to distinguish what is reviewed for each application.

Ms. Rauch presented the proposed Basic Site Plan and pointed out the three Historic Mixed-Use Buildings on North High Street, the Apartment Building on the future North Riverview Street, the internal Parking Structure, and the green space as part of the future public plaza on the southeast corner of the applicant's project limits. She said part of the applicant's site will incorporate the proposed future pedestrian bridge but is not included in this application as the details need to be finalized. She explained this site sits on two large parcels of land and a future path is planned for along the creek to the north and one of the conditions of approval is the applicant work with Parks and Open Space to coordinate that effort. She said this will entail adjusting the property line which would be handled as part of the future development agreement approved by City Council.

Ms. Rauch said there are eight Site Plan Waivers the ART has recommended for approval:

- 1) Loading Facility Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Apartment Building
- 2) Entry for Parking within Building Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Apartment Building
- 3) Maximum Building Height permitted at 4.5 Stories (7 requested) – Apartment Building
- 4) Parking within Building Permitted in Rear on 3 floors (5 requested) – Apartment Building
- 5) Ground Story Height – 10 to 12 foot (14.16 requested) – Historic Mixed-Use Building
- 6) Loading Facility Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Historic Mixed-Use Building
- 7) Entry for Parking within Building Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Historic Mixed-Use Building (Buildings 1 and 2)
- 8) Entry for Parking within Building Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Historic Mixed-Use Building (Buildings 2 and 3)

Robert Schisler said the last time this application was presented, all of this was considered Historic Mixed-Use and the approval for height greater than 2.5 stories was based on that and now there is an apartment building. He asked for clarification.

Ms. Rauch explained the Basic Development Plan Waiver regarding the height approval was because the site is zoned Historic Transition District, it is adjacent to the Historic Core. She said as part of the Historic Transition, there is a requirement under the neighborhood standards that the height limit would be 2.5 stories. She confirmed the ARB approved a building taller than 2.5 stories but the specific height of that was not approved. She added the buildings along North High Street are Historic Mixed-Use Buildings and the building along future North Riverview extension is an Apartment Building.

Mr. Schisler asked if the Board reviews the whole site, what would be the basis for lot coverage percentages. Ms. Rauch said the applicable requirements are based on the building type.

Mr. Schisler said different uses have different percentages on lot coverage. He said Historic Mixed-Use Buildings are allowed 85 percent maximum coverage and an Apartment Building 70 percent. Ms. Rauch said all those final details related to the Site Plan and Open Space will all be worked out before the applicant submits the Site Plan.

Ms. Rauch said at the October 28, 2014, meeting, there was an Informal Review and past elevations that had been shown were discussed. She presented the comparisons from August 2014 to October 2014 and the revised elevations. She said the direction from the October meeting was for the applicant to revise the design to ensure elevations relate to each other but also to look as they evolved over time. She said the applicant has made modifications particularly to the piece closest to the Historic Core so it has more of the typical Historic Dublin character, which then transitions further north where it becomes more contemporary. She said more significant changes were made to the southern elevation. She said the applicant has taken the ARB's comments into consideration as it relates to the North Riverview elevation as well. She said the applicant has provided the opportunity for these buildings to appear as separate buildings and have more recesses and projections to provide more depth. She said the materials on the North High Street elevation include metal panels and glass at the northern end but brick in the middle and more stone on the southern end. She said the towers were moved. She explained the dashed line was the approximate location of the pedestrian bridge and where it could possibly land.

Ms. Rauch reiterated there are eight Waivers as part of this request that the ART reviewed and recommended for approval for the Waivers and the Basic Site Plan application with conditions.

Mr. Schisler inquired about the future pedestrian bridge and where it landed. Joanne Shelly said the Master Plan for the park and the pedestrian bridge has not defined where the bridge will land but the general consensus now is that the landing piece of the bridge, which would be on podiums, would cross

over approximately where the two arrows are located on the illustration listed as project limits. She noted the area for the future plaza. She said the goal is to have a visual from the bridge to the wall.

Mr. Schisler said the intent is to try and maintain as much of this open space as possible. Ms. Shelly said Mr. Hahn said he did not want the bridge over open space but being able to access and not cover the open space. She said she recognizes it is not illustrated here but the conversations have been directed to that intent.

Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors, 101 Mill Street, Gahanna, Ohio, said at the October meeting, a lot of what was presented in August was discussed. He said he thought they heard the Board say that it was not looking for historic architecture but wanted the same massing and scale, more along the lines of proportions on High Street. He said the corner was important to anchor the plaza and the applicant wanted a tower. He said the overhangs were pulled back to be more pedestrian in scale, and the buildings were divided into 30-foot elements as they moved north for a more standard block. He said they pushed the next 30-foot element back and changed that to a symmetrical simple façade, again, another 30-foot width bringing in more stone for the rhythm. He pointed out the entrances to the offices and introduced elements that were unique so they would stand out a little bit with canopies. He said the applicant knows they are coming back so massing and proportion is important at this stage. He said they will tweak the colors or materials based on the feedback received this evening. He indicated their goal tonight is to find out if they got the massing and proportions correct and if they are on the right path. In a month he said, they will return with samples and final materials.

Mr. Sebach explained how they brought glass elements over the corner and then sprinkled glass through the façade. He noted the bridge over the garage entrance that was made more contemporary. He explained how the tower becomes a terminal vista and it helps mark where the public turns to go into the garage. He said coming from the north to the south, it provides a beacon of soft glow and indicated the cross over from Indian Run to downtown Dublin. He said the south elevation that was very heavy in glass and brick was stripped down so the buildings start to read as separate. He pointed out the open section to the garage with railings, which is still the elevator. He indicated as a pedestrian, you would walk down along the plaza and end up at the fourth floor lower level of the parking garage. He said the street elevation would be maintained for the dining patio. He noted the area where fresh air would go in/out via louvers. He said they broke the top cornice and started stepping pieces in and out. He said the top fourth floor will be a lighter limestone color and then the recessed brick will be visible creating shadow lines for recessed balcony areas. He noted the projections and recessions to promote shadow lines. He pointed out the areas that would have brick and others to be clad in limestone.

Mr. Dyas asked if the Board, collectively had requested, the architecture evolve from historic to modern on High Street. He asked if that was the Board's message last time as he did not recall that conversation.

Mr. Munhall said he did not recall that.

Mr. Schisler said the interpretation was good and the design of the historic transition complements the historic core. He said we did not direct the applicant to provide architecture that matches BriHI Square.

Mr. Dyas said he liked the North High Street elevation at the southern end with the steep gable and corner. He said he did not recall talking about flat roofs and metal panels on High Street, shown at the north building.

Mr. Sebach said the Board did not request flat roofs and metal panels and he is not recommending metal panels but rather a nice light colored brick. He said the applicant still has to work through the materials.

Mr. Dyas said he heard from a citizen of Dublin that saw this project on the website and said this project looks like Easton.

Mr. Schisler said he liked the northern portions of the North High Street elevations. He said the brick building is going to pop and you will be able to tell the commercial piece when you look at it. He said the transition on the south side is a little more abrupt. He said he likes how the buildings are separated. He said he is still trying to get over the apartment building side.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated the applicant has made vast improvements to the massing. He stated it is a very literal transition from the Historic Core to the north side but he thinks it works. He said the towers work better now. He said the office entrances are not highlighted but still need a cue for entrance. He said he was not thrilled with the metal panels. He said he did not have any huge negative comments. He said he sees a big improvement.

Mr. Sebach said they did stone on one side of the office and brick on the other to downplay the framing.

Mr. Munhall said his general comments were the same; he liked how the three sides developed. He said he did not see much value to the High Street elevation. He said he would prefer something more traditional but that is why there are four people on the Board.

The Chair asked if anyone from the public would like to speak with regards to this application. [There were none.]

Mr. Dyas asked if the Board was approving the elevations this evening. Ms. Rauch said the applicant is requesting the Board approve the conceptual architecture. She said the Board has the opportunity to provide specific direction on what needs to be changed as part of the review.

Mr. Munhall said he would vote yes if there was a condition to take the architecture back to a more historic approach on the High Street side. He said he likes the transition better now, the highlighting and the shadows on the North Riverview side. He agrees building materials can be revised later. He said the elevations do not have to be exactly like the August renderings but the roof lines changed dramatically.

Mr. Sebach said on all three buildings, there has to be a screen for anything on the roof. Mr. Dyas confirmed there is not a parapet wall, just screening on top of a flat roof.

Mr. Schisler said he would prefer to stick with at least a 42-inch parapet wall per Code to hide rooftop equipment. He said parapets would change the massing again, stepping down with a hill concept.

Mr. Sebach said he agrees with the perspective down the street. He said as the buildings get taller as they go north, the tops kind of line up still, and asked if the Board is okay with the height. Mr. Schisler suggested popping up the center one a little.

Mr. Dyas clarified there is a parapet on the north end of the south piece. He said he agreed with Mr. Munhall, he said he likes a lot of what the applicant has done, but not the north portion of the North High Street building and the transitions. He indicated something about the roofline on the northern portion does not work for him. He said he was not an architect so he could not provide any suggestions for the applicant to resolve his concern.

Mr. Sebach asked Mr. Dyas how he liked the tower location. Mr. Dyas said he liked the tower locations.

Mr. Schisler said it shows a nice visual cue and it shows on the perspective that this is more than just a drive, it is a wide alley. He said he liked the transition on the northern portion of the High Street elevations.

Ms. Rauch said she wanted to clarify the feedback for the applicant. She said the Board is saying the northern piece is okay but it is the middle piece they need to take another look at including the height.

Mr. Schisler said he would like to see a parapet to help hide the equipment.

Mr. Munhall said he was okay with that building but it had no real value. He said it just shows that the developer knows how to build new buildings in Dublin. He said if someone is new in town and asks to be taken to Historic Dublin, he is not sure what the reaction would be upon seeing that building.

Mr. Rinaldi said he did not have a problem with the transition.

Mr. Dyas asked the two architects on the Board if they liked the rooflines as he does not.

Mr. Schisler said he knows there is a separation.

Mr. Sebach said there is a lot of in/out movement to this elevation. Mr. Munhall said he liked the movement back and forth.

Mr. Dyas asked fellow Board members if they liked the parapet with the standing seam next to it. He said that is a gable front to back and then the parapet wall.

Mr. Sebach indicated the gable end would be visible. Mr. Dyas said he was not used to seeing that arrangement. He said the applicant went from gables and shingles to 6/10ths of the structure having a flat roof.

Mr. Schisler said that was a good point.

Mr. Sebach said as soon as they introduce that metal roof, he said it cannot be taken the whole way due to the roof pitch. He said they have to find a way to transition away from the metal, otherwise the whole roof is metal roof moving in and out and that would be too much.

Mr. Dyas referred to perspective 'F'.

Mr. Schisler said he liked how the alleyway works.

Mr. Dyas asked if the flat roofs were broken up enough.

Mr. Munhall said he liked the footprint of the project a lot more than what was done before, but not the skin, the rooflines, and the window use.

Mr. Schisler said the bridge will come very close to grade. Ms. Shelly said the intent would be for the bridge walk elevation to be where the black dashed line is, it is coming from a lower elevation to High Street, coming across the river at 805 feet with a 2 percent slope up. She said a pedestrian on the bridge would only see the top four stories of the building.

Mr. Schisler said the bridge drops from 805 to 780. He said the corner will be visible and will look like a five-story building. He said we permitted buildings higher than 2.5 stories but he was concerned with the development of a future building to the south along North High Street.

Ms. Shelly said the developer committed to limit the elevation on High Street to be 2.5 stories on the adjacent building site on the other side of the plaza.

Mr. Schisler confirmed the little lot that the developer owns is not part of this package; he said they are looking at a transition building. Ms. Shelly said the developer is looking at a transition building as well, which will also be 2.5 stories; everything on High Street is going to be this mass. She said from the perspectives we were shown, when you are standing on the bridge at ±818 feet, as far as the elevation on the bridge, you will only be able to see possibly the top stories.

Mr. Schisler asked about being halfway down the block, like at Oscar's, what the view would be. Ms. Shelly predicted the other building would be seen first.

Mr. Sebach said the grade wraps around and the building sits down in the hole so the bottom of the building will not be visible.

Ms. Shelly asked the Board if they wanted a condition whereas the building on the opposite side of the plaza is limited to 2.5 stories.

Mr. Schisler said it is still considered transition where it sits and maybe 3.5 or 4 stories would be appropriate.

Mr. Sebach asked for a summarization of feedback on the changes for High Street. He said he can change the section in the middle of the proposed High Street elevation. He suggested smaller windows to be more in scale with what is happening to the south. He said the applicant will reconsider the building to the north. He said the scale of the windows shows the transition. He said the massing is the same proportion and will bring the windows down a little bit. He said he is worried about doing pitched roofs, as they would be a challenge to transition.

Mr. Munhall said as we are going out of this Historic District, there is no more that is going to happen north of this at least as far as planning that he is aware of. He said he understands the library has nothing to do with this project because it has not been reviewed yet. He said at the end of the day this is the Historic District, even though it on the northern end of the District. He said he does think there is a transition. He said it is one building, which is located adjacent to woods and residential. He said he is one of four members on the Board, but he would like to see roof changes on the north elevation, smaller windows, and the changes on materials and windows. He said is not saying no to the project, but would like to add conditions.

Mr. Dyas said he feels the same way. He asked if a motion could be made, adding that condition.

Mr. Munhall asked how detailed the condition would need to be. He said he does not want to hold up the developer. He said in August, he thought we were pretty close with just a few changes. He suggested being detailed with the condition.

Mr. Sebach said they would like to get back to the Board an informal basis that would be preferable because the applicant really has to submit something. The Board members agreed.

Mr. Munhall asked if the Board can agree to the conditions are and approve the Basic Site Plan so the applicant can move forward with a Site Plan.

Mr. Sebach said there is a certain balance, rhythm, and scale to historic style and clearly the proposal is more contemporary.

Mr. Schisler said the only requirement on the Historic Mixed-Use is that it has to have a minimum 40 percent transparency on the lower level and 20 percent on the upper level. He said a shop owner will want as much glass as permitted on the bottom so a small amount of windows on top might not balance.

Mr. Munhall clarified his statement made earlier about wood windows; he said they do not have to be smaller. He said there can be 30 panes in one window to make it more historic.

Mr. Schisler clarified that it is not the scale that is important for the windows, it is the detail. Mr. Munhall agreed.

Mr. Munhall asked if anyone had an issue with the rooflines besides him, if not, it does not need to be a condition.

Mr. Schisler said he wanted the parapet to the flat roof added. Mr. Dyas said he wants flat roofs with parapets that comply with Code.

Mr. Munhall said he did not like the steel supports to the roof but does not want to be too much of a 'stick in the mud'.

Mr. Sebach said for his purpose, the Board does not have to worry about getting the wording right. He said the applicant is going to come back and have another bite at the apple. He said what he is hearing is the issue is really the middle and the north to work on scale and proportion and get something closer to historic without being too historic.

Ms. Rauch presented the revised conditions:

- 1) The following details to be presented with the Site Plan Review:
 - a) Architecture, landscaping, fencing, lighting, signs and other site development details or Building Type requirements noted as TBD or SPR in this report and attached analysis;
 - 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; and
 - c) Color palettes for façade materials be incorporated.
- 2) Terminal vista elements be provided and detailed to meet the intent of the Code;
- 3) The applicant addresses Engineering's comments as outlined in the report and as attached to this report, including traffic access, stormwater and utility details;
- 4) The applicant coordinate with the City and Washington Township Fire Department to ensure fire accessibility throughout the site as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 5) Parking calculation shall be included, identifying retail, restaurants, office area and residential unit counts as well as counts and labels for standard, ADA, compact and non-standard spaces, along with justification for the additional spaces provided;
- 6) The applicant will demonstrate the feasibility of a public path adjacent to the Indian Run Creek. The final location will be coordinated through and approved by the Director of Parks;
- 7) The applicant revise the proposed elevation along North High Street to incorporate design details including windows and materials, which are of scale proportional to Historic Dublin; and
- 8) The parapet be extended to screen the mechanicals in lieu of proposed screen wall on the middle building along North High Street.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Dyas motioned, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve the eight Waivers. The vote was as follows: Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Dyas motioned, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve the eight conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

**3. BSC Historic Transition – Bridge Park West
14-105ARB**

**94 and 100 North High Street
Demolition**

Jennifer Rauch said this application is for demolition of an existing 37,500-square-foot, four-story building and a 9,400-square-foot, single-story building located on the east side of North High Street, approximately 280 feet north of the intersection of North Street. She said this is a request for review and approval of a demolition request under the provisions of Code Section 153.176 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch presented the site highlighting the location of each building and parking located between the two buildings and the private drive that provides access to the site that is located along the eastern property line and intersects with North Street at the southeast corner of the site. She said there is a significant exposed rock face along the southwestern cliff of the site. She showed slides of each of the buildings as they stand today. She said neither building is on the Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) or the National Register of Historic Places. She said the applicant has provided information about these buildings as part of the criteria for this application. She said the stone-faced wall is a significant natural feature and will be preserved and incorporated in the redevelopment. She reported that at least two of the four conditions must be met for Demolition to prevail and the applicant has met conditions one and four of the Zoning Code.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended with two conditions:

- 1) The existing exposed, vertical rock face at the southwestern portion of the site will be retained and incorporated as part of the proposed redevelopment and shall be protected as part of the demolition and construction, subject to approval by Staff; and
- 2) The demolition will not occur until a demolition and construction plan outlining schedule, construction and demolition access, and additional relevant details have been reviewed and approved by Staff.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Dyas seconded, to approve the Demotion with two conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 4 – 0).

**4. BSC Historic Transition – Bridge Park West
14-106ARB/DP**

**94 and 100 North High Street
Development Plan Review**

Joanne Shelly said this application is for a development of a two-story mixed-use building, 42 condominium units in a seven-story building with associated parking 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 review and approval of a Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.057-153.066.

Ms. Shelly said she is presenting the third part, which is the Development Plan Review. She said as part of the Development Plan Review, the Board needs to look for the cohesiveness and the framework when developing Lots and Blocks and the Street Network for Historic Dublin as part of the larger Thoroughfare Plan and Community Plan. She asked the Board to access those Lots and Blocks, Streets, and Open Space as they relate to the development and this sets the stage for the placemaking elements for the Final Site Plan.

Ms. Shelly presented the site. She said to look at the block dimensions where the Principle Frontage Street is, the access to the site, the pedestrianways, the building massing, and the locations of the open space. She clarified these are the things being approved when the Development Plan is approved.

Ms. Shelly said an Administrative Departure was approved by the ART and three Waivers were approved by the Board on October 22, 2014.

Ms. Shelly reported the ART made a recommendation for approval of the Development Plan as it meets the review criteria with six conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with the City to establish a development agreement for this project, including providing the following information:
 - a) Resolution of design and construction of North Riverview Street extension; and
 - b) Resolution of shard parking agreements (existing and future);
- 2) The applicant continues to coordinate with the City and Washington Township Fire Department to finalize a plan, which ensures fire accessibility throughout the site;
- 3) The applicant provides an outline of the details for each open space type with exact acreages required as determined as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 4) The applicant describe the intent for the required BSD Historic Transition District placemaking elements at the Development Plan Review with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 5) The applicant provides a demolition/construction plan and schedule; and
- 6) The applicant continues to address Engineering details as part of the Site Plan Review.

David Rinaldi said as far as phasing, all the buildings are tied together.

Ms. Shelly agreed the buildings are tied together, but indicated it is more a matter of when the building is demolished, and when the street adjustments are made. She indicated we are at the understanding now that the rear building will be built first to a certain point and then the High Street elevation will be the last piece built out. She said it is just a matter of understanding how that happens in terms of how that will impact Dublin as a whole. She said that is why a Demolition Construction Planning Schedule has been requested. She said the City wants to know how the developer is phasing everything from starting demolition through final construction, and when the street sections go in.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall made the motion, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the Development Plan with six conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes, Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Communications

Ms. Rauch asked the Board if she had answered all their questions asked via email sufficiently. They confirmed.

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 8:09 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on December 10, 2014.