



**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

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

MAY 15, 2014

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

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: James Brooks, Custom Sign Center and Michael Sharp, Red Roof (Case 1); Larra Thomas, U Crew Holdings, LLC (Case 2); Nelson Yoder, Brent Crawford, Vern Hoying, Bob Hoying, Russ Hunter, and Matt Starr of Crawford Hoying Development Partners; and Gerry Bird, OHM Advisors (Case 6).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the May 8, 2014, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. BSC-C – Red Roof Inn – Entry Modification
14-037MPR**

**5125 Post Road
Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request to add a canopy near the front entrance to an existing hotel building on the south side of Post Road, approximately 1,100 feet west of the intersection with Bridge Street. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said the applicant had requested a time extension. She said John Gavin, from Custom Sign Center was not able to meet today but James Brooks, also with Custom Sign, and Michael Sharp with Red Roof Inn, are in attendance. She presented photos of the site showing the general location of the proposed canopy that is not proposed to be connected to the building.

Ms. Ray said the applicant has modified the design of the posts, angled the canopy to mimic the roof, and matched the side panel to the roof and trim. She said there are still some outstanding issues: the lighting; and the canopy is not well integrated into the design of the building, it appears to be designed as an afterthought. She said Mr. Gavin had provided details to show how the lighting will be diffused. She said the recommended determination on this proposal is approval with three conditions:

- 1) That a stone wall matching the existing stone wall be used in lieu of the aluminum panel;
- 2) That the design should be resubmitted to provide a connection to the principal building, subject to Planning approval; and
- 3) That the change in imperviousness (if any) is noted on the site plans submitted for building permits.

Ms. Ray said condition #2 was based on a conversation with Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director, who said the canopy roof could be extended to the building and did not necessarily have to be angled.

Mr. Langworthy invited the applicant to comment.

James Brooks shared a rendering showing the canopy moved back to be in contact with the building (in response to condition #2). He said Red Roof Inn would prefer to maintain the siding wall, which they believe to have a more contemporary character, rather than using stone (condition #1). He said removing the wall altogether would also be acceptable.

Michael Sharp, a representative for Red Roof Inn, asked if there needed to be a side wall.

Colleen Gilger inquired about the intent of the wall.

Mr. Sharp explained the Red Roof Inn logo would be eliminated when this site becomes a "Red Roof *Plus*" to distinguish it from the other Red Roof facilities. He said the side wall was designed to diffuse the canopy so it would not look like a bus stop. He said it has been redesigned so no electrical equipment will need to be housed in the sidewall portion, since all of the electrical would be contained in the cabinet above.

Mr. Langworthy said that instead of eliminating the sidewall, he would like to see the wall constructed with stone to better integrate with the building. He said this would also ensure that the structure becomes more substantial, rather than appearing as an afterthought.

Ms. Gilger agreed that removing the wall would make it appear more like a bus stop.

Jeff Tyler suggested that the wall needs to meet the sidewalk with a foundation, and should not "float" over the concrete pad. He agreed with the other ART members by restating that the canopy needs to be better integrated with the design of the building to make it look more like a permanent structure.

Mr. Brooks said that structurally, creating a rock wall creates problems for mounting and asked if the rock wall would be acceptable outside of the canopy structure and installed just next to it, or if it had to be attached.

Mr. Tyler said the wall needs to be anchored as part of the foundation, and the canopy needs to be attached to the wall and not the wall attached to the canopy. He asked the applicant to explain how the wall would be connected to the canopy.

Mr. Sharp answered by steel post and a pylon and further explained the actual structure.

Mr. Langworthy concluded that before the ART would be able to make a determination on this proposal, they really need to see details associated with a revised design consistent with the comments made by the ART. He asked that the applicant consider returning after they had revised the design.

Mr. Sharp asked for clarification of next steps. Ms. Ray explained the options: request a time extension, or receive disapproval from the ART at today's meeting and resubmit the application.

Mr. Langworthy said the ART meets every Thursday at 2:00 pm and they could return as soon as they were ready. Ms. Ray said a few days lead time was needed. She said she would resend the time extension agreement form.

Mr. Sharp stated the applicant's intent would be to return with the stone sidewall that was part of the structure, not ancillary, connected to the building, and connected to the concrete foundation.

Mr. Sharp confirmed that the light fixtures would not be visible. Mr. Brooks showed a sample of the light fixture diffuser material and explained that the intent is to use ½ inch thick material in addition to a double layer of milky white carbonate that is not transparent. He said they can put in a diffuser to reduce light output and they have reduced the number of lamps from four to three per cabinet.

Ms. Ray asked that the light be downward-oriented, as much as possible.

Mr. Langworthy thanked applicant and stated that a determination would be postponed until they have prepared a revised design.

2. BSC Historic Core District – Architectural and Sign Modifications

14-043ARB-MPR

**113 South High Street
Minor Project Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for modifications to building trim and roof colors and the installation of a new eight-square-foot sign for an existing commercial building on the west side of South High Street, between Pinney Hill and John Wright Lane. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch said this application was introduced at last week's ART meeting. She explained that there are two parts to this application: 1) paint colors, and 2) a sign. She said after reviewing the guidelines, it was suggested that the proposed color scheme should be modified and potentially reversed.

Larra Thomas questioned the color schemes typical of the era during which the building was constructed.

Jeff Tyler asked if Ms. Thomas had read far enough through the text where it states that the lighter colors would typically be used on the body of the structure and darker colors would be used for trim. Ms. Rauch read the text out loud to the group. She said that Mr. Tyler had researched the historic guidelines and they were similar.

Ms. Thomas asked if the ART could propose colors that she could show her clients for their consideration. Ms. Thomas said the blue they selected was from the Sherman Williams history collection, which she thought was appropriate for a Craftsman-style home.

Mr. Tyler said a Victorian theme was more appropriate, and the blue was more Craftsman-style.

Ms. Thomas said the applicant had selected a dark gray for the roof and asked if it was appropriate, and Mr. Tyler agreed that the proposed roof color was appropriate.

Mr. Tyler suggested that the applicant select a darker color than white for the body of the structure, but not this dark of a shade of blue. He said reds were appropriate for trim, but with a lighter color for the body for this style of home.

Ms. Rauch read the proposed conditions for a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board:

- 1) That a revised sign detail be submitted clarifying the specific sign dimensions to meet the 8-square foot area requirement;
- 2) That the proposed sign colors be modified to better coordinate with the proposed building color scheme; and

- 3) That the proposed body and trim colors be modified to incorporate a lighter color for the main structure with a darker, compatible color for the trim to meet the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch suggested options for next steps.

Ms. Thomas inquired about the proposed sign colors and asked if the blue could be used for the right side and the reddish brown used for the left side. She also asked if a rich brown color would be appropriate for the shutters.

Ms. Rauch said the colors all need to coordinate. She said they met the Code requirements for the location of the sign but requested a revised detailed design for the sign showing all dimensions.

Ms. Rauch asked if the ART could recommend this application to the ARB with conditions or if this should be resolved next week.

Steve Langworthy said the applicant needs to determine their proposed color scheme before the ART could make a recommendation to the ARB. Mr. Tyler said he did not want to decide the colors for the clients and suggested Ms. Thomas discuss the options with her clients to see what they would prefer.

Ms. Rauch said this application could be postponed and reviewed by the ARB at their next meeting in June. Ms. Thomas said her clients want a sign as soon as possible and they are unavailable currently. She said she was not comfortable with making a selection without consulting with her clients first. She requested a time extension for this application.

CASE REVIEWS

3. Zoning Code Amendment – Bridge Street District – Riverside Neighborhood District 14-039ADMC Zoning Code Amendment

Rachel Ray said this is a request for an amendment to the Zoning Code to establish a new Bridge Street District zoning district and related Code amendments for the Riverside Neighborhood District. She said this is a request for review and recommendation regarding proposed Zoning Code amendments under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232 and 153.234.

Ms. Ray said Dan Phillabaum is in the process of creating the draft Neighborhood District graphic for this district, consistent with the other neighborhood district graphics. She said at this stage, the Zoning Code amendment and Zoning Map amendment are expected to move forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their meeting on June 5.

Barb Cox reported she had read through the Code and had some questions like how the lots and blocks would be measured.

Ms. Ray explained that one of the associated Code amendments is a modification to the Lots and Blocks section clarifying that alleys cannot be used to measure block size, although private streets that are designed to look like public streets could be, given the special circumstances expected for the Neighborhood District. She added that a specific requirement of a minimum of 12 feet of clear sidewalk area will be added to the Code to ensure adequate space for pedestrian activity.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further questions or comments on the proposed Zoning Code amendment at this time. [There were none.]

**4. Area Rezoning – Bridge Street District – Riverside Neighborhood District
14-040Z Zoning Map Amendment**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for an area rezoning of 20 parcels for the Riverside Neighborhood District in the Bridge Street District. She said this is a request for review and recommendation regarding proposed land use map amendments under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232 and 153.234.

Ms. Ray said the conversation for the Zoning Amendment application above applies here as well.

OTHER

**5. Informal Presentation – Bridge Park West – Crawford Hoying
94 & 100 North High Street**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for informal review and feedback for a mixed-use redevelopment project in the Historic District in preparation for upcoming application submissions.

Steve Langworthy explained that the ART can make a recommendation of approval to be forwarded to the ARB and the ARB would be the final deciding body. Mr. Langworthy invited the applicant to present an introduction to the proposal.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said they are concentrating on the west side for development as part of this proposal, although they are also working on the project on the east side of the river. Mr. Yoder asked his architect, Gerry Bird, OHM Advisors, to present the project overview.

Mr. Bird presented slides that had been previously shared with City Council at their work session on May 12th. He explained that the project will be two or two and a half stories along High Street, but given the change in grade, several levels of parking will be below grade. He said that the parking structure would be wrapped by condominium units overlooking the river. He stated that the architectural character along High Street would be more traditional, but the character of the portion of the building overlooking the river would be more contemporary.

Mr. Bird said the applicant's intent today was to confirm their direction and the submission materials with the ART so they can begin making arrangements to move forward with a formal submission. He focused on the building section showing the west side in relationship to the river. He noted on the west edge, the building is a two-story building with retail and office above that is notched through the hillside for parking for the condominiums. He said the part of the building that faces the river is approximately six to seven stories high but matches the height of surrounding buildings where it meets High Street. He pointed out the four parking levels and relative heights. He said with respect to the proposed parking structure, the building's design would downplay the garage entries to appear more like carriage doors. He said the buildings would be constructed with stone and there would be "slots" between the buildings with lots of windows to break down the scale.

Mr. Bird explained that the slides were meant to emphasize scale more than the proposed materials. He emphasized the use of four-stories with lots of glass used on the upper stories to reflect the sky.

Fred Hahn asked if parking would be located behind the residential units. Mr. Bird said the parking is entirely internal, wrapped by residential units so the garage is not visible. He said there would be private garages for the condominiums and public open space for retail.

Steve Langworthy said he struggles with the unknown of what the rest of the High Street roadway is going to look like. He noted that the library site will also be undergoing a significant change. He said he is reacting to the proposed architectural character, which appears to be more of a "creation of history," as opposed to a character that preserves history by reflecting the character and scale but not replicating historic architecture. He said the tendency is to lose the historic character when transitioning into a modern look. Mr. Bird noted some examples where the change was well done including the Brazenhead building.

Jeff Tyler said he likes the design. He said he thought the architecture proposed was well done and was not held to a historic character per se. He said both sides of the river do not have to share the same reference point. He said the only caveat being, there needs to be some reference so the concepts are not completely different.

Mr. Bird presented another rendering that showed a townhouse type of scale using different colors of brick. Mr. Tyler said if the detail was done correctly on quality structures, both sides could coordinate.

Mr. Langworthy noted there are broader issues than just the project's architectural design.

Mr. Bird said the building height, size, width, and parking, is what he is proceeding with. He said he would reconcile the building to the street, following existing setbacks to stay out of the sewer line and the ODOT easements. He asked if this is consistent with ART's vision.

Mr. Hahn asked for clarification. Mr. Bird said he plans on a streetscape area of approximately 25 feet of sidewalk and patio area.

Mr. Langworthy asked if Mr. Bird had completed a Zoning Code analysis and if any waivers would be needed. Mr. Bird replied that it depends on where the property lines fall.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the building type and if it met Code. Mr. Bird thought it would have retail space with underground parking making it a podium building.

Mr. Yoder asked if they were proposing two different building types as there are two separate structures with a fire wall between the two, but both building types were permitted under the Bridge Street District Code.

Mr. Langworthy restated that any major waivers would need to be identified at this point for ARB's consideration early in the process. Ms. Ray said the applicant should begin to consider their open space provisions and stormwater management before they get too far into the design.

Mr. Tyler recommended that the applicant consider plans for trash, mechanicals, and sustainability elements.

Mr. Hahn asked if the parking count was just based on their own needs, or if additional public parking was planned. Mr. Yoder said the parking structures are currently oversized.

Barb Cox confirmed that valet service would be provided.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they had any additional comments. Mr. Bird said they would like to proceed with the application but were concerned with the streetscape and how far back to set the building with no specific setback.

Ms. Rauch said the setback requirements depend on the building types, which would need to be identified before the application submittal. She said additional analysis identifying how the Code requirements are met should also be completed.

Ms. Cox recommended the coordination with EMH&T as they have the plans where signature and historic streets were designated.

Mr. Hahn said there is not likely to be much of a departure from the existing streetscape character in Historic Dublin.

Mr. Bird said their options were to meet with MKSK, the City, EMH&T, and the ART to fold this together to meet the goals or take their best shot and have everyone weigh in, after. He said he would prefer to sit down and figure this out together. Ms. Ray said outstanding questions could be addressed at the Pre-Application Review before making a complete submittal. She instructed the applicant to complete a Code analysis and then the Pre-Application Review would be a good next step to identify questions and discuss waivers. Mr. Bird asked about a tree survey. Ms. Ray said a detailed tree survey was not necessary for the Basic Plan Review, and to skip the tree survey for now, although it would be required for the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Hahn asked if the FEMA issues had been figured out with the floodplain. Ms. Cox said it was on the list to be addressed. Mr. Yoder said FEMA is doing testing.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any other major items to be discussed.

Colleen Gilger said the biggest complaint from small retail is the window panes in the front windows. She asked the applicant to keep that in mind while designing the retail space so it is leasable to retailers.

Alan Perkins said that the plans for fire protection would need to be discussed at a later date when the building types had been established, given the limited access to the site.

Mr. Tyler said it was way too early to comment on Building Code issues, although the applicant should consider the types of Code issues that might impact architecture. He strongly recommended that the applicant consider using sustainable building materials and techniques.

Mr. Yoder mentioned that they were considering the use of geothermal heating.

Mr. Hahn said to consider open space requirements, mechanical units, trash, etc. early rather than late. He stated he liked the general design of the building.

Ms. Rauch encouraged the applicant to meet with the neighbors and Historic District businesses, such as the Historic Dublin Business Association to obtain their feedback. Mr. Yoder said he would reach out to the HDBA.

Ms. Ray said if there were no other comments the next step is the Pre-Application Review followed by the Basic Plan submittal.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm.