



**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**

**NOVEMBER 13, 2014**

**ART Members and Designees:** Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; and Laura Ball, Landscape Architect.

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

**Applicants:** Mike Burmeister, OHM Advisors; Brian Quackenbush and James Peltier, EMH&T (Cases 1, 3 & 4); and Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests Ltd. (Case 5)

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the November 6, 2014, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

**DETERMINATIONS**

**1. BSC Historic Transition – Bridge Park West 94 and 100 North High Street  
14-099ARB/BP Basic Site Plan Review**

Joanne Shelly said this is a request for a development of 3, two-story mixed-use buildings, and 42 condominium units in a seven-story building, with associated parking and site improvements east of North 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.

Ms. Shelly presented the Bridge Street District Zoning Map and the proposed Basic Site Plan pointing out the major development components: gateway towers, apartment building, historic mixed-use buildings, parking garage, and open space. She showed the elevations from August 2014 and the current proposal for comparison. She commented on the changes as seen in the North High Street/west elevation as currently proposed. She said the changes were prompted due to the ARB's review comments at their informal review on October 28, 2014, where they requested a clear transition between the architectural character and the front and back portions of the buildings, and more historic elements where appropriate. She explained the transition from the south side of the elevation that is more traditional and then moves to more contemporary features going north. She said this reflects the ARB's comments of requesting the buildings to look developed over time with different styles of architecture so the result did not look like one massive building.

Mike Burmeister, OHM Advisors, said he thought this proposal was the best solution to show the buildings to appear as they developed over time; the transition effect; and the mass of these buildings to appear scaled down.

Jenny Rauch indicated the ARB felt more comfortable with the August proposal than the more recent October version.

Mr. Burmeister added that the North High Street façade was the elevation the Board was most concerned with and not the river-facing elevation, where the majority of the residential units are located.

Ms. Shelly pointed out the front of the North High Street elevation with the river-facing portion of the building showing in the background, and noted the new relationship between all the components of the development. She said awnings were added and locations for signs will need to be added to complete the visual effect. She explained the entrance to the private drive will provide a view all the way through from the front to the back of the buildings to help visually separate them.

Mr. Burmeister explained the garage door will operate via a remote, and the gates will swing out towards the street. Ms. Shelly recommended some sort of barrier will be needed where the gates open out into the sidewalk area.

Mr. Burmeister described the newest façade, which is clad in red brick with two black awnings at street level and louvered sun shades over the top of the windows on the second floor. He indicated this reflects the style of a revitalized warehouse.

Ms. Shelly confirmed the residential units are behind. Mr. Burmeister added that the façade on North High Street is ±120 feet from the rear façade of the apartments.

Mr. Burmeister said vignettes were being created to show the perspectives at street level where the residential building behind the North High Street portion would not be visible.

Ms. Rauch reiterated the ARB's request for the vehicular entrance to be well lit and inviting. She said this current illustration makes the entrance look cavernous and dark. Mr. Langworthy suggested the applicant downplay the fact that it is a garage and asked if an awning or some other architectural feature could be added.

Mr. Burmeister said cornice detailing could be added. He said signs will be proposed over the entrance for wayfinding.

Fred Hahn inquired about the bridge above the garage and the white material.

Mr. Burmeister said the material was metal cladding, and the portion of the building over the garage entrance will have offices.

Jeff Tyler inquired about a scenario whereas the plaza scale does not work and if future direction could be given to the buildings sited across the future plaza, south of this building, for appropriate scale.

Ms. Rauch referenced the "jewel building" that the ARB had a lot of questions about, but is not included in this application. She said they had asked that the height be limited to 2½ stories. She reported Nelson Yoder had agreed to this during the ARB meeting last month, but she asked if a condition should be provided.

Mr. Tyler suggested that guidance be given so the building does not impose itself too much on this project.

Mr. Burmeister explained the pedestrian circulation path from the future pedestrian bridge to the plaza is uncertain until the site is graded out. He said at this point, the termination point is not known. He said it was shown by a dashed line on the south elevation.

Mr. Hahn asked if the discussion regarding the proposed extension of North Riverview Street was being pursued in earnest, to which Mr. Langworthy said it would need to be addressed through the development agreement.

Ms. Rauch explained the plan shows the road extended to intersect with Dublin Road, but it is unknown if it will be a park road or an actual road until an agreement is reached with the City.

Mr. Hahn asked if any determination had been made on this subject, and Mr. Langworthy indicated that none had been made, to his knowledge.

Ms. Rauch said the width of the road is the issue and additional discussion is needed. She indicated the road extension was a significant issue, because without it, Fire cannot access the building, and therefore will not be able to sign off on the building permit.

Ms. Rauch said the construction and staging needed to be determined for providing access to the site. She said construction access cannot occur directly from North High Street or between Oscars restaurant and this site due to the traffic disruption it would cause in the Historic District. She said serious consideration should be made for working through the details of demolition and the building process. She said the applicant can demolish their site with approval by the ARB, but at some point, the debris will have to be removed.

Ms. Rauch said nothing has been officially decided with regard to the proposed future pedestrian bridge location.

Mr. Burmeister said he understood that this project would need to have the least amount of intrusion to the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch said that a demolition and construction plan and schedule will need to be part of the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Burmeister referred back to the architecture and stated that the back upper two or three floors had a bay removed to make it bigger and provide more depth on the floors. He provided street level perspectives.

Mr. Langworthy said the ARB had requested more vertical elements than horizontal elements. Ms. Rauch added they requested more recesses and projections.

Mr. Burmeister said the applicant had looked at depth and shadow lines. He said there were detached residential units back towards the historic front by the garage opening.

Rachel Ray asked if the garage was mechanically ventilated. Mr. Burmeister said the garage would be.

Mr. Hahn inquired about elevator access. Mr. Burmeister said the tower is a terminal vista and as pedestrians come across the bridge they would be able to access all levels of the parking garage from the south. He said the entrance for the tower elevator is from inside the garage; there is no outer door.

Mr. Langworthy asked how the rock face integrates into the proposed open space.

Mr. Burmeister said the applicant is using it as a focal point for the public plaza open space below and to engage the back of the building. He said the triangle-shaped open park is accessible from the lower level and will be visible from the pedestrian bridge and tower elevator.

Mr. Hahn asked for clarification for the location of the bridge, which is not visible in the renderings. He asked if the bridge piers or supports for an elevated walkway would encroach the open space. Mr. Langworthy said it was possible, but the exact locations were still unknown.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the north end of the building. Mr. Burmeister explained the north elevation contained offices on the upper level, and the center stories were the kitchen area for the restaurant.

Mr. Hahn asked if the ground floor units would have walkouts. Mr. Burmeister said walkout patios would be provided from recessed doors with steps down to the sidewalk. He said these are right on the edge of the Indian Run.

Brian Quackenbush clarified the steps lead to the private sidewalk that is higher than the public path, which is at the bottom of the slope near the Indian Run. He said farther east, the path transitions up the slope and the exact location will depend on the location of the trees.

Mr. Burmeister said the slope would be gradual.

Mr. Hahn cautioned that these details be worked out now so it does not require the City to alter their plans causing design problems. He asked if there was an adjusted property line. He emphasized the need for the applicant to demonstrate that the public is well served. He suggested maybe shifting the sidewalk 10 feet and a somewhat parallel path but with trees in between to separate the two paths. He asked if this could be a condition and the location be coordinated with Parks and Open Space.

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

- 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
- 8) Quantity of Towers Required 1 Allowed (2 requested)

Mr. Langworthy asked about Waiver #8, for the towers. He said a Waiver would not be needed if it is determined that this proposal includes three buildings instead of one large building, and therefore, both towers would be permitted without a Waiver. A brief discussion ensued about how the buildings are characterized. It was decided that the Waiver #8 was not needed as the buildings are considered to be three separate buildings.

Mr. Langworthy said the above Waivers need to be revised to reflect the entry into the three buildings along North High Street and one apartment building. He said if the buildings along High Street are considered three separate buildings instead of one building then the Waivers need to reflect this as it relates the entrance to parking.

Ray Harpham said he liked the new proposal and asked if any problems are anticipated with any of these Waivers when proposed to the ARB. Ms. Shelly answered these Waivers were already agreed upon through the Basic Development Plan.

Mr. Langworthy requested that the language for the Waivers be improved and confirmed that the height was already agreed upon.

Ms. Shelly added that the ARB's concern with the seven stories was if the buildings would be physically separated with an additional building to the south. Her impression was that the ARB was favorable to the height Waivers.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any other issues for any of the Waivers. [There were none.] Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's approval of the eight Waivers as revised:

- 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)

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

- 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 and 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; and
- 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.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they agreed to the conditions. Mr. Burmeister said they did.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application for a Basic Site Plan. [There were none.] Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval of

this request for a Basic Site Plan Review with six conditions and eight Waivers and will be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board for their meeting on November 19.

Ms. Shelly cautioned the applicant that there will be additional questions about loading and Engineering will have concerns with sanitary management, particularly for restaurant use. She emphasized the fire access road has to be there, the stormwater bio-swale facility has to be very well-designed, and a lighting plan is also needed.

**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 9.58-square-foot wall sign for an existing commercial 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 said this application was introduced last month to the ART. He explained at that time, the sign was proposed to be attached to a wooden post in the right-of-way. He reported that the applicant has since changed the proposal to a wall sign. He said the proposed wall sign meets Code for location, height, and colors and fits in with the character of the surrounding buildings. He said the proposed sign does not meet Code for size and will need to be reduced from 9.58 square feet to 8 square feet.

Mr. Crozier presented a photo of the proposed sign. He said the application has since been revised, the condition of approval has been met, and so the revised sign will be forwarded to the ARB.

Mr. Crozier said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board with one condition is recommended:

- 1) That the sign area be reduced to eight square feet to meet Code and a revised plan and sign details be submitted with the sign permit.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application for a Minor Project Review.

Fred Hahn commented that the sign appears to be appropriately located on the building wall. He said the rendering makes the sign look large, and reducing the sign to 8 square feet would help.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval with one condition to the Architectural Review Board.

**3. BSC Historic Transition District - Bridge Park West Development**

**14-106ARB/DP**

**94-100 N. High Street  
Development Plan Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for a Development Plan for a 2½ story mixed-use commercial development and 42 condominium units in a seven-story building with associated parking and site improvements along 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 for a Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.057-153.066.

Ms. Rauch said that while the Development Plan is different from the Basic Site Plan, there will be some overlapping elements.

Ms. Rauch said two Waivers were granted with the Basic Development Plan.

Ms. Rauch stated that, with respect to the ODOT easement, the City is waiting on final details but ODOT has indicated they are supportive of allowing the easement to be vacated.

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

- 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.

After discussion clarifying the conditions, Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they agreed to the six conditions. Mr. Burmeister agreed.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application for a Development Plan Review. [There were none.] Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval of this application for a Development Plan Review with six conditions to be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board.

**4. BSC Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park East – Mass Excavation  
Riverside Drive and Dale Drive  
14-107MPR Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for site modifications including grading and excavation to prepare for future development. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G)(2)(f).

Ms. Ray said this is a request to begin preparing the site for future development, including cut, fill, and establishing dirt pads for a portion of the Bridge Park East development site. She explained the purpose of this project is for compaction during the winter months in preparation for the spring construction season. She said the proposal creates plateaus along the hillside for the approximate locations of the new roads and development blocks as the site slopes down east to west toward the Scioto River. She explained the temporary stockpile for the dirt cut from the slope will be placed in the northwest portion of the work area at the bottom of the slope (behind the existing stockpile for the John Shields Parkway/Dale Drive road work). She said the City's dirt will be used when Riverside Drive is realigned. She said the City's existing dirt stockpile from the Dale Drive extension will screen the dirt stockpiled as a result of this project. She said a temporary sediment basin at the bottom of the slope is also proposed. She said two construction drives from the two existing parking lots are proposed to provide access to the activity area.

Ms. Ray said the next steps require the City Engineer's review and approval of the sediment and erosion control plan.

Ms. Ray stated approval is recommended for a Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the Right of Entry agreement is signed by both the City and the applicant prior to the start of construction;
- 2) That the applicant install signs on existing Riverside Drive at the construction points, subject to approval by the City Engineer; and
- 3) That the sediment and erosion control plans demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Ohio EPA and Section 53.300 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances regarding erosion and sediment control.

The possibilities of signs were discussed as requested in condition #2 above. Aaron Stanford said he would check with Ms. Cox and Jeannie Willis, Transportation Engineering Manager, to confirm the appropriate size and type of signs.

Brian Quackenbush inquired about condition #3. Mr. Stanford said he believed Ms. Cox had reviewed and found the plan acceptable, but he would confirm.

Ms. Ray said there is a description of the scope of work for this site that will be put on the website to help address any concerns the local residents may have, in case there are questions about what type of work, exactly, is starting to happen on this site.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this application with three conditions.

**5. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center  
14-108MPR Minor Project Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for site modifications regarding hardscape materials, landscaping and lighting for the existing AMC Theater at the Dublin Village Center. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G)(2)(f).

Ms. Rauch said this application was introduced at last week's ART meeting. She said the applicant has already made modifications to the existing plaza area and is seeking approval of this Minor Project Review. She presented the proposed site (as already modified) that is intended to provide a more direct route from the parking lot to the theater entrance. She presented slides of the previous site conditions and after the final site conditions, where the area was originally in a diamond shape and is now shifted to a square. She said the applicant is proposing to remove paving and concrete; and adding planters, a green lawn area, and trees. She said the applicant proposes bollards on the eastern edge and different light fixtures within the new plaza. She said the concrete has been colored and scored in places to create design. She said benches are also proposed.

Ms. Rauch said AEP controls the overhead power line easement that passes over the plaza. She said the applicant was instructed to check with AEP regarding the proposed tree selections and site modifications to ensure compliance with AEP's requirements for planting under overhead electrical lines.

Ms. Rauch stated approval is recommended for this Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) Any landscape substitutions required as a result of AEP's actions would be subject to approval by Planning as a Minor Modification;
- 2) Landscape replacements sought in the future be subject to approval by Planning as a Minor Modification; and
- 3) Specifications for site furnishings be submitted to Planning for review and approval prior to installation.

Steve Langworthy asked the applicant if they agreed to the three conditions.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests Ltd. said AEP would not approve specific landscape materials as it was left to the applicant. He reported that AEP said if the top of the trees get in the way, they have the right to trim them to not encroach on the electrical lines. Mr. McCauley asked how to best solve this issue as AEP would not provide the confirmation requested by Staff. He said anything planted in this area can be removed by AEP at their discretion.

Mr. Langworthy suggested he provide copies of documentation showing that AEP reviewed the site modifications.

Fred Hahn asked how often these sites are inspected by Brian Martin. Ms. Rauch answered approximately every four years. Mr. Hahn suggested a condition whereby approval coincides with the City's inspections.

Mr. McCauley indicated there are trees 20 years old in this area and do not appear to have been trimmed.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this application with three conditions.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 pm.