



**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**

**DECEMBER 18, 2014**

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

**Other Staff:** Rachel Ray, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; Logan Stang, Planning Assistant; Nicole Martin, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

**Applicants:** Nelson Yoder, Matt Starr, and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Greg Briya, Moody Nolan; and James Peltier, EMH&T.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 4, 2014, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

**PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW**

**1. Pre-Application Review (Bridge Street District) – BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development  
Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for non-binding review of a future application for a new mixed-use development on a 30.9-acre site at the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road. She said the proposal includes new public streets and nine blocks for development for the overall site, with eight mixed-use buildings containing 372 housing units and 260,000 square feet of commercial (office, retail, restaurant). She said this is a request for pre-application review prior to submission of an application for Basic Plan Review (Basic Development Plan Review and Basic Site Plan Review) and a Preliminary Plat in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(C). She said the purpose of the pre-application review meeting is to provide the applicant with a non-binding and informal review of the development proposal, and information on the procedures and policies of the City including application review procedures that may be used.

Ms. Ray said the Basic Development Plan includes the street network, block framework, and building arrangements. She said this encompasses the blocks east of Riverside Drive, north of the roundabout, in addition to the Tuller Ridge Drive extension, Mooney Street, Banker Drive, Longshore Street, and Bridge Park Avenue. She explained the Basic Site Plan is for the first four blocks adjacent to Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, which includes eight buildings. She said the complete project area covers nine blocks extending east to Dale Drive and north to John Shields Parkway. She indicated some Waivers are being considered and are currently under review. She reported the applicant had completed an analysis of all the buildings against the building type requirements of the Code, and had also provided information about utilities, open space and other plan aspects.

Ms. Ray said the applicant had reached the Basic Plan submittal stage in September when the applicant decided to rescind the previous plans to modify the parking structure arrangement. She explained as a result, entirely new Basic Plan Reviews are necessary.

Steve Langworthy confirmed that the Basic Development Plan and the Preliminary Plat are for the entire site, while the Basic Site Plan encompasses four blocks.

Ms. Ray explained January 7, 2015, is the effective date of the Ordinance for the amended zoning regulations. She advised the applicant that it was possible for the ART to make a determination by January 8, 2014, or January 15, 2014, and still be forwarded to City Council for a potential meeting in January.

Mr. Langworthy recommended making the determination by the January 8<sup>th</sup> ART meeting, which would allow as much time as possible for Council to review the materials before their meeting.

Claudia Husak said the Preliminary Plat cannot be forwarded to Council until it is reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Langworthy agreed. He asked if everyone understood the change in the Ordinance with respect to the review processes in the Bridge Street District.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, verified the process.

Mr. Langworthy explained that PZC meetings in January will only occur if a quorum of four is met. He said it is possible City Council would appoint someone so Commission meetings could occur in January but they may not have a full Commission with all seven members until a later date.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the applicant could provide an overview of the project materials and walk the ART members through the plans.

Ms. Ray noted that a complete set of material sample boards are available for viewing in one of Planning's conference rooms.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, began the presentation by showing before and after illustrations of the buildings to compare the evolution of the elevations.

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, began with the B1 Building, describing the architectural detail changes. He said they broke down the scale with more vertical and horizontal elements of this corridor type building. He said the central area is brick and includes the introduction to the porch, lower entry, and balcony. He said this change seemed to make it appear more inviting. He said with the addition of signs, canopies, and trees, it appears to have more life than originally presented. He added that shading and shadowing effects were also applied to provide more depth to the illustrations. He said the architectural vocabulary is consistent with the other three sides of the building. He indicated the same brick color is being presented as before. He stated that the B1 building is the farthest south on the Riverside Drive elevation.

Jeff Tyler asked if the percentage of materials was accounted for in the plans. Mr. Briya said that the percentages were reported in the plans.

Joanne Shelly confirmed that the patio was at grade, and the terrace on an upper floor, and suggested they be marked appropriately on the plans.

Mr. Briya explained that the center section at the lowest level was pushed back approximately 10 feet while bringing the whole building forward. He said the residential area stayed the same but the patio is

now a little smaller in size. He said the transformer locations were adjusted; the façade was pushed back to tuck the equipment in the back corner and landscape was placed in front to screen it.

Mr. Hunter added that there is a patio at level 1, a terrace on level 2, as well as a terrace on level 3.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, noted the bridge locations. He said there is a pedestrian bridge that connects Building B1 to Building B4 and lands at Level 4 of B4, which leads through to a parking garage. Mr. Briya indicated the final location of the sky bridge is in question, although the two alternatives are within a few feet of one another.

Mr. Tyler noted there were Code implications with the final location of the bridge.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant how close they were to deciding the final location of the bridge. Mr. Briya answered they are considering options A or B and the decision will depend upon the impact it will have on the unit layout.

Ms. Ray inquired about Waivers. She asked if a preliminary analysis had been completed, and if Mr. Briya was aware of any that would be needed with Building B1.

Mr. Briya said he could not remember all of the requested Waivers for all of the buildings, but he thought one might be necessary for the maximum amount of blank space without a break.

Ms. Ray said based on her preliminary review of the Code, another potential Waiver would be a request to place the required horizontal façade division at the top of the second floor instead of the top of the first floor, as required by Code.

Mr. Hunter said there was retail and office above on the first two levels, with the upper three or four stories containing residential.

Mr. Yoder stated that distinguishing the first two floors gave the building a more balanced appearance, rather than calling out only the first floor on a six-story building.

Ray Harpham mentioned a noticeable difference in the buildings, from the previous version to the current versions. He commended the applicants for the improvements.

Mr. Briya described Building B2 as he presented illustrations of the Riverside Drive elevation. He said the materials were the same, all brick in both red or ivory sections as well as composite metal panels in gray to break down the horizontal and vertical elements. He explained the niches were set back further and the corner on the second floor terrace was carved out for open space. He said they were providing more recesses and projections with the latest designs. He indicated the roof garden was in the original design and is a residential amenity.

Mr. Yoder said residents of these buildings likely would have access to any of the amenity decks on any of the buildings. Mr. Hunter added the different amenity decks provide varied experiences and views.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were square footages of each building marked on the plans and requested a table be inserted to record square footage. He suggested the patios as an amenity be pointed out as well. He noted the parking calculations.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the pedestrian bridge connection that was just penciled in where it goes from level 4 in B2 to B3 and then another bridge connects from B3 to the parking garage in B4. He indicated that there is some concern that bridges keep people off the streets and suggested that these

bridges are emphasized as amenities for the residents and not to remove pedestrians and visitors from shopping, dining, or walking along the sidewalks throughout the area.

Mr. Hunter said they decided on open air pedestrian bridges rather than closed, climate controlled bridges. He said the residents using these bridges would be appropriately dressed as they were traversing back and forth to the parking garages anyway, and the intent was to design the bridges so that the residents could engage with the street activity better, since they will be open.

Mr. Yoder said this eliminates the need for two separate four floor elevator rides.

Ms. Shelly pointed out that she had read a recent article that describes the use of sky bridges of this type, and that they really have no impact at all on either adding to or eliminating street activity. She commented the façade was really nice, distinctive, and interesting. Unfortunately, she said the Revit models were not showing the details as well.

Ms. Ray inquired about the dots on the illustration of the elevations. Mr. Briya confirmed that they are dryer vents.

Mr. Hahn inquired about the sky bridge elevations, and asked if they were final designs or still more conceptual and works in progress. Mr. Briya explained that they were pretty final, and described the bridge's arch designs.

Mr. Briya described the changes made to the B3 Building since October. He said they stayed true to form but added canopies and awnings. He noted the length of the building had been extended. He said it is mainly a red brick with gray composite metal panels at the top. He indicated this was their "warehouse" building. He said the balconies on this corridor building type have metal mesh guardrails. He pointed out that the balconies for each of the buildings have different railing types.

Mr. Briya said there is a roof amenity deck on level 6. Ms. Shelly asked if it is not seen from the front façade. Mr. Briya showed the roof level looking out to the park and open space.

Ms. Ray asked if the windows could be opened. Mr. Briya answered the windows would be operable - opera style.

Mr. Langworthy noted that the elevation change is dramatic. Mr. Briya agreed. He explained the grade was flattened out to create three levels moving from Longshore Street to Mooney Street and would require three different entry points.

Mr. Tyler recommended the applicant provide all examples they are considering for screening mechanicals so there are no surprises at building permitting.

Mr. Briya said the units on the C2 building will be visible but their goal is to group them together over non-residential areas.

Ms. Shelly inquired about the elevator core of B3.

Mr. Briya reported that Building B4 took on a completely new life. He said it is a combination corridor building and parking structure and the footprint has been increased. He said two sides will be open to a parking garage and the other two sides will have residential units wrapping the outside. He showed the illustration of level 1, which shows residential units on one side, the lobby on the corner, utilities, maintenance, electric, bike storage, and bike racks line another side and the garage then is open on the last two sides. He said the illustration of level 2 shows residential units on the two sides and the open parking garage on the remaining two sides. He said the proposed material that makes this building so

unique is the random patterning of the green metal mesh panels. He explained the mesh panels are pulled out and slope to produce shadowing. He said there is also brick, perforated metal guardrails and composite gray flat metal panels used on this building. Mr. Briya said B4 connects to B1.

Mr. Hahn asked how the mesh panels are colored green.

Mr. Briya answered there is a stainless option with a baked-on finish.

Ms. Ray asked if the screen color could it be changed over time. Mr. Yoder said they are considering a brushed stainless for a more timeless look.

Mr. Hunter said with a brushed stainless, more could be done with lighting to produce colors for effect that could be altered more easily than actually changing the color of the panels.

Mr. Hahn asked if the baked-on aluminum color came with a long-term warranty.

Mr. Yoder asked Mr. Briya if it would be a fast process to change the rendering to a silver look option. Mr. Briya said it could be accomplished quickly.

Mr. Tyler asked if a large scale wall section of the screen attached to the building was available. Mr. Briya said they have produced a three sided view layout that tells the whole story. He said it expressed the B4 residential wrapper with the garage and planters placed at street level.

Ms. Ray noted B4 is proposed to be reviewed as two building types: a parking structure and a corridor building. She asked if the parking structure was set up to allow for 'pay to park' in the future. Mr. Hunter said that would be possibility in the future, although they certainly were not planning to charge for parking in the short term.

Mr. Yoder pointed out the 42 public bike racks located next to the bike storage area that will hold 96 bikes. He said there are also benches inserted into the hill.

Ms. Ray asked if the sky bridges were high enough to allow fire equipment to pass under. Alan Perkins confirmed there was enough space for the fire department's equipment.

Mr. Briya pointed out the glass stair tower on the corner of B4 on the Longshore Street elevation with curtainwall glazing combined with composite metal panels. He said the main lobby space and trash hub are in the lowest level of this tower. He said the overhead garage door was panelized under a metal canopy.

Ms. Ray asked if the calcium silicate masonry units were proposed to be considered a primary material. Mr. Briya said yes, and that product is the primary material at the base with brick at the top.

Mr. Briya said Building C1 took on a significant transformation. He said it is on the northwest corner along Riverside Drive. He said the floor plate is similar to B1 in its shape. He described the building having brick, composite metal panels, stucco, calcium silicate masonry units, metal guardrails in a horizontal picketing style for the balconies, and metal canopies along with some awnings. He said the first level is all retail and the rest of the floors are residential. He said a terrace was created as an amenity to look over into the park.

Mr. Yoder said the brick was extended all the way to the ground to break up the vertical plane.

Mr. Briya said the detail for the balconies and the added awnings brought so much more character to the style of the building.

Mr. Yoder remarked that the recessed center space made the building more dramatic and the patio/terrace can be covered.

Mr. Yoder said the private drives were eliminated, which changed the character of the open spaces. He said there are many areas that provide views of the park and the river. He said the ground floor was an amenity open to everyone.

Mr. Langworthy asked about the position of the mid-block pedestrianways. Ms. Ray said the locations need to be reviewed and confirmed that they fall within the middle-third of the blocks. Mr. Briya noted the patio roof gardens distributed throughout the site as well.

Mr. Briya said the height of the building decreased by three feet. He said it is the same floor to floor height as B. Mr. Yoder confirmed the ceiling heights were all nine feet with the exception of the top floor with 10-foot ceilings.

Mr. Briya called attention to the material boards that show window sills and headers along with the brick work. Ms. Ray inquired about the masonry against windows and if the windows are recessed. Mr. Briya said the masonry was not flush with the windows.

Mr. Briya said the curtainwall was broken down on the C2 Building. He described rectangular shapes that were used for floors two, three, and four. He said they accented the tower with glazing along the sides.

Mr. Hunter explained more verticality was presented and the terrace was pushed back for the all the upper floors and the one on the fifth floor was extended out to the north end of the building and a second terrace was added at the south end. He said this will show so much better in real life as it is not showing well in the illustration.

Mr. Briya said the brick colors stayed the same as before and a metal panel screen wall is provided on the roof to hide mechanicals.

Mr. Yoder said just condensing units would be on the rooftop and the rest of the mechanicals will be hidden within the tenant spaces. He said this entire building is for office use on all stories except the ground floor.

Ms. Shelly indicated she liked how the brick wrapped the corner of the façade but as a signature building on the corner of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive, the corner looks like all the other buildings.

Mr. Langworthy agreed with Ms. Shelly and said he was hoping for more dramatic detail or an architectural element at that corner as that will also be where people will be coming off the pedestrian bridge and approaching Bridge Park Avenue. He said he did like the verticality of the style but it calls for more attention at that corner.

Mr. Tyler asked if the tower could pop out more from the façade.

Ms. Ray inquired about symmetry with the building on the south side of Bridge Park Avenue or using lighting to emphasize the tower. Mr. Hunter said lighting was planned for both internal and external effects.

Mr. Tyler emphasized that this is the building people will focus on when coming across the bridge. He noted that this was Crawford Hoying's building and asked if they felt it was special enough. Mr. Yoder replied they thought it was very special and attractive, but they can always push for a better building. He said they will study the tower section.

Ms. Shelly said she understands the wrapping of the brick and thought that aspect was very nice but thought the design could be just a bit better. Mr. Hunter suggested one more level of detail could be added.

Mr. Yoder inquired about adding punctuation to the top. Mr. Briya said the details were not represented well in the rendering.

Mr. Harpham said it was important that this group thoroughly review the plans going sheet by sheet.

Mr. Briya presented the Bridge Park Avenue elevation for Building C3. He said the grading changed an additional seven feet accounting for step plates at the street level. He said they broke down the façade vertically once again with this building. He described the brick as going all the way to the top and different colored brick would be used to signify the various sections. He said these balconies have perforated metal screens. He showed where retail was on the first level, office spaces on the second level, and floors three through five were residential.

Mr. Hunter noted the significant differences between the before and after illustrations. He said with parking out from underneath the building it was a lot easier to combine the commercial with the residential. He said varying the color of brick further broke down the length of the building.

Ms. Shelly recommended not using real company names in the illustrations of the conceptual signs and sign locations.

Both Ms. Shelly and Mr. Harpham agreed this was a significantly better building.

Mr. Briya pointed out the roof amenity deck placed on the northwest corner will overlook the park and river.

Mr. Briya said Building C4 was similar to B4 because the garage is also exposed to Longshore Street and includes residential units wrapped on two sides on the upper levels but looks completely different. He presented an illustration that showed two shades of ivory brick used primarily on the building. He said metal mesh panels were used as well but only random panels had an accent of color. He indicated these perforated panels hide the crash wall and could be painted in a variety of colors. A view into the two sky bridges was also represented; one bridge connects C4 with C1 across Longshore Street and the other connects C4 with C3 across the mid-block pedestrianway. He said it is hard to represent the openness.

Ms. Ray inquired about the pedestrian experience on Longshore Street.

Mr. Yoder said it adds great variety and responds to single-family condominiums. He said it had a nice rhythm with Mooney Street and the street level planters bring more life. He indicated the main lobby is public/private similar to B4.

Mr. Hunter said the rhythm is mimicked in the panels, ties the building together, and is playful in nature.

Ms. Ray said she really liked this building, with the color and uneven screen treatment. She said it is ok for 2014, but she wondered if it would feel timeless or dated in a few years. She asked if the panels could be changed or modified in the future to evolve the architectural character.

Mr. Briya said they are still working through the colors for the decorative panels and how they adhere to the building. He said it is illustrated in both a red/blue pattern of accent color and a color variety for accents but maybe a brushed aluminum versus a high gloss may be the direction to take. Ms. Ray said the overall skeleton is timeless and she likes the accents.

Mr. Yoder indicated treatments organically change over time. He thought that as people come and go, the look will be changed.

Ms. Ray said to that point, how much freedom would each tenant have to modify their individual tenant spaces. Mr. Yoder answered that extensive leeway could be given. He said the developer will have their own criteria but anticipates coming back to the City often to gain approvals for different tenants.

Mr. Langworthy asked if all the bridges would be built to look the same. Mr. Hunter replied that was their intention. Mr. Hunter added that bridges are important logistically but should not take over the streetscape by standing out too much. Mr. Langworthy said he prefers that the bridges not differ from each other.

Mr. Yoder stated that letters might be added to the bridges to help enhance the experience and provide wayfinding and identification, but would be very subtle.

Ms. Shelly referred back to the "warehouse" building where the side elevation shows a bridge. She cautioned the applicant about the use of overhead street lighting. She added festoon lighting over Bridge Park Avenue is not necessary but could be used where the bridges span the green spaces. She again cautioned this can be overdone and where the applicant chooses to place lighting should be significant and create special places.

Ms. Shelly remarked the open space plans were beautiful. She said as a city dweller for 20 years, too much vegetation within small urban open spaces can lead to a lot of maintenance. She recommended the use of planters on multiple levels in varied containers. For an example, she said a tenant such as a florist might use topiary in the planters positioned in their area to individualize and draw attention to their space.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. He thanked the applicant for taking the time to walk through the plans and provide an overview for the ART members to consider as they review the plans.

Ms. Ray stated she would follow up with the applicant in terms of schedule over the next few weeks.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.