



**Land Use and Long  
Range Planning**

5800 Shier Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600  
fax 614.410.4747

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**OCTOBER 16, 2014**

**ART Members and Designees:** Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager, Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; and Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director.

**Other Staff:** Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer, Landscape Architect; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

**Applicants:** Nelson Yoder and Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying; Mike Burmeister, OHM Advisors; James Peltier, EMH&T; and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan (Cases 1, 3, & 4).

Gary Gunderman called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the October 9, 2014, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

**DETERMINATION**

**1. BSC Historic Transition – Bridge Park West 94 and 100 North High Street  
14-099ARB/BPR Basic Development and Site Plans**

Joanne Shelly said this is a request for a development consisting of a two-story 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 review and approval for a Basic Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.057-153.066.

Ms. Shelly presented the site layout and noted the area that will be demolished. She stated the development proposal on a ±2.4 acre site consists of 42 units of multi-family residential, 16,650 square feet office, 11,800 square feet restaurant, and 4,200 square feet retail; 375 parking spaces (garage, private and public); 0.21 acres of open space; and associated site improvements.

She said approval of a request for an Administrative Departure is recommended:

- 1) Midblock Pedestrianway – Section 153.060(C)(2)(a): Apartment Building, North Riverview Street extension may be exempted by reviewing body 153.063(D)(3)(d) requested due to site constraints.

Gary Gunderman asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding the Administrative Departure. [There were none.]

Ms. Shelly stated that a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board is recommended for three Development Plan Waivers:

- 1) Maximum Block Size – Section 153.060(C)(2)(a): Increase the maximum permitted block dimensions for the Apartment Building (increasing maximum block length from 300 feet to  $\pm 400$  feet on the east and  $\pm 378$  feet on the west façade; and a maximum block perimeter from 1,000 to  $\pm 1,271$  feet).
- 2) Midblock Pedestrianway – Section 153.060(C)(6)(a): Waive requirement of midblock pedestrianway for a Historic Mixed-Use Building.
- 3) Building Heights – Section 153.063(D)(4)(b): Waive requirement of 2 1/2 story limit for the Apartment Building.

Rachel Ray confirmed that all of the Waivers requested come down to topography and the size of the site.

Jennifer Rauch said the Administrative Departure is acceptable since there is a visual break on High Street.

Ms. Shelly explained the issue with two vehicular accesses off of High Street, which requires Engineering's approval that she included in the conditions for the Basic Development Plan.

Mr. Gunderman asked if there were any issues for the one Administrative Departure or any of the three Waivers. [There were none.] Mr. Gunderman confirmed the ART's approval for the Administrative Departure and ART's recommendation of approval for the Waivers.

Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended for a Basic Development Plan with the following five conditions to be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board:

- 1) That the applicant work with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;
- 2) That the applicant address Engineering details as part of the Development Plan Review, including finalizing the drive access off of a principal frontage street;
- 3) That 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;
- 4) That the applicant describe the intent for the required BSD Historic Transition District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review; and
- 5) That the applicant provide an outline of the details for each open space type, including the intended uses, exact acreages required and provided, and general program, at the Development Plan Review, with determinations as part of the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Gunderman asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application for a Basic Development Plan. [There were none.] Mr. Gunderman confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval of this application for a Basic Development Review with five conditions to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

## INTRODUCTIONS

### 2. BSC Historic Core – Chelsea Borough Home 14-101ARB-MPR

### 54 South High Street Minor Project Review

Andrew Crozier said this is a request for a new 3.8-square-foot panel sign and associated wooden post for an existing building on the east side of South High Street, between Spring Hill and Eberly Hill. He said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Crozier presented the site layout and the proposed sign. He explained the top of the sign, as it is hung from the pole, reaches 5 feet, 10 inches, while the overall height of the pole is seven feet. He stated the Code maximum height requirement is measured to whichever is higher, and in this case it is the post, which exceeds the Code requirement of six feet by one foot. He presented the illustration of the proposed sign, which encroaches within the right-of-way. He explained that all ground signs must be eight feet from the right-of-way or the property line. He said the proposed sign type is inconsistent with surrounding signs as most buildings have projecting signs. He showed the ground sign next door, which is permitted as it is set back from the right-of-way and meets other requirements. He summarized that Planning's initial view is that a ground sign is not recommended for this site because the existing structure is sited at the right-of-way. He suggested a wall sign or a projecting sign as an alternative.

Mr. Crozier suggested that the ART consider recommending approval for the proposed aluminum sign material because metal is permitted in the Historic District, and an aluminum sign was recently approved by the ART in this area.

Jeff Tyler asked if the sign would be illuminated. Mr. Crozier answered it would not.

Gary Gunderman asked if a projecting sign would fit on this structure and still meet Code. Mr. Crozier said an eight-foot clearance above the sidewalk is required. He referred to a photo of the site, and stated he was not sure that there would be enough clearance based on the height of the building. He stated that a wall sign might be the only appropriate option.

Jennifer Rauch indicated a wall sign should be recommended.

Mr. Gunderman confirmed ART's recommendation of a wall sign as the best option.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant desired the Architectural Review Board meeting on November 19, needing an ART determination by November 13. She said a Time Extension could be requested to allow the applicant to work through these issues, and the applicant could still meet the November dates for determinations.

Mr. Gunderman asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

**3. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project, Phase 1**  
**14-071DP-BSC** **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive  
Development Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this is a request for review and approval for four new blocks for development on approximately 17.28 acres, including new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Bridge Street District Development Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E).

Ms. Husak said this case 14-071 was changed from the first phase of a final Development Plan Review back to a revised Basic Development Plan and Preliminary Plat for all of Bridge Park East. She explained there is no longer any underground parking and includes public streets and eliminates the private drives that were to be located within reserves. Ms. Husak said Staff is still reviewing the other case on this agenda, (14-095 for Blocks B and C), processing the cases simultaneously but they will be presented separately as Informal Reviews at PZC's Special Meeting on October 21, 2014. She indicated she would provide a quick overview presentation for the PZC and allow the applicant to inform the Commission of all the changes and explain how they came about. She said this platform would allow for the Commission to provide feedback to the applicant on the architectural component.

Ms. Husak confirmed the timeline; whereas the process would move forward quickly as the applicant is expecting an ART recommendation on November 6 to be advanced to the PZC on November 13, 2014. She said in the next week, a detailed case review was needed and any changes would need to be conveyed to the applicant. She explained issues on the old review outline have been resolved, creating more blocks so block Waivers may no longer be necessary. She reiterated the accelerated timeline of receiving feedback from the Commission on Tuesday for a quick turnaround for the ART on Thursday.

Ms. Husak invited the applicant to address any concerns. [There were none.]

Gary Gunderman asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He reiterated that a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this request was scheduled for the ART meeting on November 6, 2014.

**4. BSC Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park East Mixed-Use Development –**  
**Blocks B and C** **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive**  
**14-095BPR** **Basic Site Plan Review**

Discussion for this case was covered in the previous case (14-071) review.

**5. Zoning Code Amendment – Bridge Street District**  
**13-095ADMC** **Zoning Code Amendment**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for amendments to the Bridge Street District Zoning Code focusing on Code Sections 153.062 through 153.066. She said this is a review and recommendation of approval to City Council regarding proposed Zoning Code amendments under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232 and 153.234.

Ms. Ray said the Zoning Code amendments have been informally reviewed by the PZC and ARB and are now ready for final approval. She asked the ART to review the amendments and let her know if there are any outstanding concerns. She reported that Justin Goodwin with MKSK had reviewed the Code and

provided a few clarifications and recommendations, which she is currently incorporating into the final draft. She said an ART recommendation is expected next week.

Gary Gunderman asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated that a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this request was scheduled for the ART meeting on October 23, 2014.

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

Gary Gunderman asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 2:37 pm.