



**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 29, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; and Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Planner II; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; Logan Stang, Planning Assistant; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; Jonathan Staker, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction; Gayle Zimmerman, Ford & Associates Architects; Todd Faris, Faris Design & Planning; Tom Warner, Advanced Civil Design; and Matt Booms, State Bank (Case 3).

Rachel Ray called the meeting to order. She asked if there were any amendments to the May 22, 2014, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. 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 the Planning Report highlights the differences between the Riverside Neighborhood District and other neighborhood districts for 1) Block Length; 2) Permitted Building Types; 3) Building Type Layout and Relationships; 4) Vehicular Canopies and Ground Story Use & Occupancy Requirements; 5) John Shields Parkway Frontage; and 6) Pedestrian-Oriented Streetscape.

Ms. Ray said a graphic was prepared to match the graphics for the other neighborhood districts that show the planned street network and street connections in this area; the potential shopping corridor along the new mixed-use street and Riverside Drive; open space nodes and corridors; and potential gateways announcing arrivals to this area.

Ray Harpham asked if the regulations were prepared in response to what is anticipated from Crawford Hoying and Ms. Ray said yes, to some extent, since the City has been working with the major land owner in this area. She explained that the majority of the Code regulations are very consistent among the other neighborhood districts, but there are a few unique elements, which she highlighted earlier. She explained that a neighborhood district would have been applied to this site when the Code was originally drafted, but there were different property owners at that time that had less interest in the significant mixed-use

development envisioned for each of the neighborhood districts. She stated that since the circumstances have changed, the neighborhood district is now being prepared.

Ms. Ray asked if the Administrative Review Team members had any further comments regarding this proposal [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval of this application to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**2. 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 overall area covers approximately 57.75 acres of land along the east side of the proposed relocation of Riverside Drive, including the existing Bridge Pointe shopping center, the former Wendy's restaurant site at the southeast corner of Riverside Drive/SR 161 intersection, properties along Dale Drive, the former driving range and "Digger and Finch" restaurant site, and land along the north side of John Shields Parkway. She explained the existing Acura car dealership at the northwest corner of Dale Drive/SR 161 will remain BSC Commercial District until the property owner chooses to redevelop the land, at which time it would be eligible for be rezoned to the BSD Riverside Neighborhood District.

Ms. Ray stated the future riverfront park land is recommended to be zoned BSC Public District, which is an existing zoning district that applies to other public areas throughout the BSC, including the Dublin Schools property, the cemetery, Sycamore Ridge Park, and the AEP substation on Banker Drive.

Ms. Ray said a *Proposed* BSD Zoning Map and *Existing* BSD Zoning Map are found in the Planning Report for comparison.

Ms. Ray asked if the Administrative Review Team members had any further comments regarding this proposal [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval of this application to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

CASE REVIEWS

**3. BSC Office District - State Bank West Dublin-Granville Road
14-047BSC-SP/PP/FP Site Plan Review/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for an 11,500-square-foot Loft building for State Bank with a retail banking facility, a drive-through kiosk and all associated site improvements. She said this proposal also includes the subdivision of one 2.8-acre lot into two lots. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Bridge Street District Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She said this is also a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a preliminary and final plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray stated that Gary Gunderman introduced this case last week. She said Gary was out of town but had provided a preliminary analysis of the proposal. Ms. Ray said a recommendation of approval to forward the case on to the PZC is anticipated at the June 5th ART meeting.

Ms. Ray inquired about the height dimensions of the parapet from the roof deck.

Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction, said they would provide the actual distance from the top of the roof deck this week. Ray Harpham noted the two-foot minimum requirement. Ms. Ray said the parapet had been modified to provide screening of the HVAC units that had been moved to the rooftop since the Basic Plan Review. Mr. Sanford said a mechanical screen wall was added in the center of building, approximately 3 feet, 5 inches tall.

Ms. Ray asked if the trim and downspouts would be painted, and if so, what color. Gayle Zimmerman, Ford & Associates Architects answered the downspouts are a prefinished metal. Ms. Ray requested that she provide a confirmed color, to which Ms. Zimmerman agreed.

Ms. Ray stated that Code requires masonry windows to have appropriate sills and lintels, and asked the applicant if they believed their windows were designed to be architecturally appropriate. Ms. Zimmerman stated that a stone sill was proposed originally but they have since eliminated the detail. Ms. Ray said they still need to show the detail or explain the architectural appropriateness so a determination can be made.

Ms. Ray inquired about the degree of reflectivity from the windows. Ms. Zimmerman said the glazing is clear with a light tint but would provide the detail.

Ms. Ray said the location of the building on the site will require a waiver. She explained that due to the location of a 15-foot gas easement along the front of the property, which coincides with the 0-15-foot Required Building Zone, prevents the building from being sited in the RBZ. She noted that PZC had already had concerns with the building being positioned so close to State Route 161, leaving little space for future patio areas or other activity along the front of the building.

Mr. Sanford said the building was originally about six feet behind the front property line, but is now 16 feet back, due to the easement. Ms. Ray said there is a fairly wide tree lawn too, so staff is comfortable with the revised building placement due to the circumstances.

Ms. Ray said the vertical façade division requirement was off just a little bit from Code, which requires a vertical façade division to help break up the building's façade. She said the requirement was a division not more than every 40 feet, however on the east elevation, the plans show a 40-foot, 8-inch span. Ms. Ray suggested an Administrative Departure for the eight inches.

Ms. Ray inquired about gas meters, or other elements on the building façade. Ms. Zimmerman stated they did not have a gas meter shown on the plans at this time but anticipated that one would likely be installed on the east elevation.

Ms. Ray asked if the ground sign was intended to be part of this submission. She said the ART could review it for approval as part of the Site Plan Review, or it could be filed separately as a Minor Project Review. Mr. Sanford said he would check on the ground sign.

Ms. Ray said Brian Martin, Zoning Inspector, reviewed the landscape plan and provided some comments. He noted the extensive use of liriope and suggested more variety and diversity of plant materials. Mr. Sanford said they could provide different plant materials.

Ms. Ray said Mr. Martin noted that other banks in the city have had security concerns when shrubs were planted next to entrances, making good hiding places.

Todd Faris, Faris Design & Planning, said the junipers adjacent to the doorway on the west entrance were to add some height next to the door on a somewhat blank wall space. Mr. Sanford said that door

was an emergency exit and did not believe the plantings would be an issue for security. Ms. Ray said the recommendation was made so the applicant could be made aware of possible security issues but they were not obligated to change the plant material.

Ms. Ray asked if Catmint or another similar ground cover could be added by the dumpster. The applicant replied yes.

Ms. Ray noted that there were a few conflicts between the trees and parking lot light fixtures. She reported that Mr. Martin had recommended that the trees be centered in some of the islands, since not all of them were necessary to meet the interior landscape requirement.

Ms. Ray referred to the evergreen hedge along the east property line, and explained that Mr. Martin had suggested the addition of several different types of junipers to provide more diversity.

Laura Ball said she would respectfully disagree with that recommendation. She said one type of plant material spaced that close together acts more like one unit and provides a clean line, rather than one with multiple interruptions. Ms. Ray confirmed with the applicant and the other ART members that the landscape screen could remain as shown on the plans.

Mr. Faris asked about Code requirements for the area currently shown as concrete under the drive-through canopy. He asked if the City preferred gravel or some other material, since landscaping was not likely to survive in that location. He asked if river rock would be appropriate.

Ms. Ball agreed that river rock could work, although placing landscape fabric down under the rocks to prevent weeds would last approximately two years.

Ms. Ball questioned the perennials on the plant list for the basins. She said if the basin is wet, several of the perennials will be lost, like the day lily, and recommended more water tolerant plants. Mr. Faris was agreeable. Ms. Ball said the Karl Forrester and the lirioppe, were now considered evasive and suggested using an alternative.

Ms. Ray referenced the proposed plat and stated that Planning had agreed that the "flag" portion of the lot should remain part of Lot One. She said that Mr. Gunderman planned to meet with Engineering to determine if there were other comments specific to the plat.

Fire Marshal Alan Perkins commented that the plans were very similar to the first submittal and confirmed no sprinklers were needed under the canopy, which had been discussed at the previous ART meeting that he had not been able to attend.

Ms. Ray inquired about the sanitary sewer easement and manhole shown in the pocket plaza area, and asked if Engineering was okay with the encroachment.

Barb Cox requested information from the applicant that she could review, but said she believed it to be acceptable.

Mr. Harpham asked if the layout of the stacking lanes associated with the drive-through had been addressed following the Commission's comments. Mr. Sanford said they have relocated the dumpster, giving them enough room so there is enough space for a bypass lane.

Ms. Ball referred to the pocket plaza easement on the plat and noted that there was no reference to maintenance responsibilities. She stated that the City would not want to be responsible for the plaza's

maintenance. Mr. Sanford and Mr. Warner agreed to look at the language shown on the preliminary and final plat documents.

Ms. Ray asked if there were any other questions or comments from the applicant.

Mr. Sanford asked if the two requested Waivers specific to the use of structural soil were understood. He explained the first is intended to eliminate the need to trench beneath the sidewalk to install structural soils up to the bank site for the street trees, since the material below the existing sidewalk is not highly compacted so the proposed tree roots will grow freely under the existing pavement, and because it would be cost prohibitive to remove and replace the existing sidewalk in order to install the trench, in addition to the fact that there is no need for structural soils since the tree lawn is turf and not paved. He explained the second request is to eliminate the structural soils in the parking islands as actual soil and organic media would be better to promote tree growth using the native mixture currently on the site. He said the structural soils required by Code are typically used in urban planting areas and tree wells in very narrow areas between streets, sidewalks, and buildings.

Ms. Ball said she understood the request and would review the material submitted by the applicant. She agreed that the tree lawn would be sufficient without requiring the need for trenching.

Mr. Faris asked about the tree plantings at 40-feet on center. Ms. Ray said staff will review. Mr. Sanford asked if trees needed to be added to the flag portion of the property. Ms. Ray said they were necessary for the length of Banker Drive.

Ms. Ray confirmed that there were no further items for discussion, and noted that a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application is planned for next week's ART meeting.

INTRODUCTIONS

4. BSC-C – Red Roof Inn – Wall Signs 14-050MPR

5125 Post Road Minor Project Review

Rachel Ray said this is a request to modify two existing 68.25-square-foot wall signs for an existing hotel building on the south side of Post Road, approximately 1,100 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. 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).

Andrew Crozier presented the case. He said one wall sign faces Post Road and the other faces US 33/Bridge Street. He explained that the applicant is proposing to leave the majority of the sign as it currently exists, but that the "Inn" would be replaced with the new channel letters: "Plus+".

Mr. Crozier said the current signs are consistent with the approved variance from 1985 allowing the height of the signs to be 19 feet from grade, and the overall size permitted to be up to 70 square feet. He said the signs will have two colors each, instead of one, which is permitted by Code. He said the signs are internally illuminated.

Mr. Crozier said the current size is just over 68 square feet and the applicant is proposing 73 square feet, which exceeds the size allowed by the variance.

Barb Cox asked if the text "Plus+" could be decreased in size to fit the 70-square-foot size requirement.

Ms. Ray said there were some concerns with the aesthetics, in addition to the size. She said the Red Roof Inn downtown has this same "Plus+" logo.

Dave Marshall asked if this was the first franchise location with the new signs, as the Red Roof Inn downtown is a corporate store, not a franchise that has this sign with the new logo.

Jeff Tyler asked if the font size could be decreased and all the members agreed that would help.

Colleen Gilger suggested that all the text be in red as it is currently rather than the bright yellow proposed for the "Plus+".

Claudia Husak noted that the logo on the website is more of a toned down gold color than the bright yellow shown on the drawing.

Mr. Marshall recommended the actual color specifications be provided to ensure the corporate palette is used. He said the PMS numbers could be requested so we could see the color chips. He said if this is a registered trademark, there may be concerns with reducing the size of the "Plus+" if it is required to be proportional. Ms. Gilger said if that was the case, the ART could request that the whole sign be smaller.

Ms. Ray agreed and stated that in any event, they signs cannot exceed the maximum area permitted by the variance. She confirmed that there were no further comments on this application and stated that the ART would plan to make a determination on this request at next week's ART meeting, pending the modifications discussed at this meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Ms. Ray asked if there were any administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 pm.