



**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

JUNE 5, 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; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer and Landscape Architect; Marie Downie, Planner I; 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; and Matt Booms, State Bank (Case 2).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the May 29, 2014, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATION

- 1. Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine – Signs
6775 and 6785 Bobcat Way
14-025WID-DP/SP West Innovation District-Development Plan/Site Plan**

Claudia Husak said this is a request for two wall signs to exceed the permitted size and height for existing buildings for a college campus at the southwest corner of the intersection of Post and Eiterman Roads. She said this is a request for review and recommendation regarding a Development Plan/Site Plan in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.042(D) and 153.042(7).

Ms. Husak said the signs are for two existing buildings, now addressed as 6775 and 6785 Bobcat Way and the two signs are identical. She pointed out that one of the previously proposed "Ohio Health" signs was now eliminated from this application as it has been moved to the interior of the site and is no longer visible from the adjacent properties or rights-of-way. She stated that both signs are 60-square-foot wall signs to be installed at a height of 28 feet above grade, which exceeds the Code requirement of 15 feet. She stated the size of the signs exceeds Code by 30 square feet. She reiterated that the Code does not include specific sign regulations for college campuses, and that the 30-square-foot requirement is for signs for schools. She explained the signs will read *Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine* in channel letters that are internally illuminated, as well as the green and white Ohio University College of Osteopathic Medicine logo.

Barb Cox said there is no other suitable place for the signs due to the glass façade of the building.

Ms. Husak said Planning recognizes the unique needs for identification as applicable to a college campus and effective methods of wayfinding that include a variety of sign types. She indicated the proposed wall signs are appropriately designed given the architecture and location for the existing buildings.

Colleen Gilger noted that Code permits 30 square feet for schools and asked how the college campus was classified. Ms. Husak said that offices in this district are permitted 50-square-foot signs, but the college use is classified as a school since no other categories are available in this Zoning District. Ms. Gilger asked if this site could be treated as an office. Ms. Husak specified that if it was deemed office space, the proposed signs would exceed Code by 10 square feet.

Jeff Tyler pointed out that for the purposes of the Building Code, the use is deemed "business".

Steve Langworthy asked if any of the ART members had an issue with the proposed height and the response was no. He concluded that the ART would approve sign heights of 28-foot wall for 6775 Bobcat Way and 6785 Bobcat Way and would forward that to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Langworthy asked if any of the ART members had concerns with the square footage of the signs given they would be twice the size as permitted by Code for schools. He concluded that the ART recommended approval to PZC of two signs at 60 square feet each.

CASE REVIEW

2. BSC Office District - State Bank 14-047BSC-SP/PP/FP

West Dublin-Granville Road Site Plan Review/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat

Gary Gunderman 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 associated site improvements. He said this proposal includes the subdivision of one 2.8-acre lot into two lots. He 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. He said this is also a request for review and recommendation of approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission to City Council for a preliminary and final plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Gunderman said minor comments were received from Engineering and the proposal is in pretty good shape overall. He commented on a few specific items on the plans: 1) the Code requires that the ATM lanes need to be striped, and the drive-through stacking spaces should measure 20 feet long; 2) the exterior lighting does not comply with Code in terms of the locations of the light fixtures; and 3) the sign on the south side of the building does not comply with Code as it is situated too far from the wall on the canopy over the main entrance to be considered a wall sign. He said a Master Sign Plan would be needed for approval of that wall sign.

Gayle Zimmerman, Ford & Associates Architects, noted the illustrations of the signs on Banker Drive are needed and almost ready. She said the sign on SR 161 is on the plans. Mr. Gunderman questioned the exact distance the sign is set off of the wall as it was not indicated. Ms. Zimmerman said she would send the dimensions via email and will also provide the total area or square footage of the sign as well as the dimensions of the setback.

Steve Langworthy said the Master Sign Plan only needs to include any signs that are not compliant with Code.

Mr. Gunderman said three Waivers will be requested:

1. Structural soils on Banker Drive;
2. Structural soils on the parking lot islands; and
3. Building sited outside of the Required Building Zone.

Mr. Langworthy suggested that the third Waiver noted could potentially be an Administrative Departure, since the setback distance is within the Departure requirements, and the siting of the building was due to the presence of the gas easement that is beyond the control of the applicant.

Mr. Gunderman said with respect to the structural soils, he had received a report from Todd Faris, Faris Design & Planning, which indicated that there was no advantage to structural soils for this site, but it also made the assumption that the soil is in good shape. He said that history shows that these areas do not necessarily include good planting soil. Mr. Gunderman said it was recommended that the applicant dig down three feet in all the planting areas in the parking lot to mix in good top soil. Mr. Faris stated in the report that this would be a more useful product than structural soil would have been.

Mr. Langworthy asked how this justification might help going forward.

Mr. Gunderman explained that really urban settings with lots of pavement and buildings located very close to the planting zones require structural soils, and Banker Drive does not fit that description. Rachel Ray suggested that structural soils would be needed for areas that are already compacted or for smaller tree lawns.

Mr. Gunderman stated two Administrative Departures are required: 1) building facades exceed the 40-foot vertical façade division requirement - one exceeds Code only by eight inches and other is arguably over; and 2) breaks are supposed to be 18" in depth, which is not met. Mr. Langworthy suggested this might need to be a Waiver.

Ms. Zimmerman noted the 8-inch return on the west elevation and referred to plan exhibit CA11. Ms. Ray noted the south elevation is technically at 49 feet, 8 inches before a vertical façade division appears.

Mr. Gunderman said additional analysis on the elevations would be necessary, and the recommendations would be summarized in the report for next week's ART meeting.

Mr. Gunderman said driveway width at 24 feet was recommended as Code limits driveways to 22 feet. He said the 24-foot driveway curb cuts are existing.

Mr. Langworthy asked how the applicant would justify the urban nature of the proposed site plan, given the Planning and Zoning Commission's previous concerns that the plan seemed too suburban.

Ross Sanford said it is going to be an increasingly urban area, and the site is designed to coordinate with the adjacent properties when they redevelop.

Claudia Husak said this site is being constructed during a transitional period. Mr. Gunderman said a bigger impact would be to have buildings on either side of this property as the same size with the buildings right up to the street with the parking behind. Mr. Stanford said SR 161 is still not an urban street at 45 mph; it is going to take a while before this area feels urban, with a grid and many buildings and sites developed in an urban manner, but this is a step in the right direction.

Ms. Zimmerman asked what was involved for a Master Sign Plan. Mr. Gunderman confirmed staff has the plans in question. Mr. Langworthy said a description of what is required by Code vs. what the applicant is requesting is part of the Master Sign Plan. Mr. Langworthy indicated it a similar process as a Waiver, just evaluated under different review criteria.

Mr. Sanford said he was not comfortable giving the easement on the lower access now.

Ms. Cox said access and how the sites are developed had not been discussed. Mr. Langworthy suggested care be taken with the condition for an access easement. Ms. Cox said the easement goes from property line to property line and if it is on the plat already, they might be okay. Mr. Gunderman asked what language Mr. Sanford was uncomfortable with. Mr. Sanford explained they own the other property to the west and that was appropriate for the northern connection but they do not own the property to the east and should not be asked simply give the access away immediately. Mr. Gunderman said that the City needs something that can be counted on but understood the applicant's concerns. Mr. Gunderman suggested that the central parking lot easement be conditioned upon the provision of a similar cross access easement to the State Bank property in order to make this access effective. Mr. Gunderman said the properties to the east need another access point. Mr. Sanford agreed to the easement from the property line. Mr. Sanford indicated that nothing would be concluded on any access for the properties to the east relative to the access at the north end of the property.

Ms. Ray said the revised plans go out in the packets next Friday and will need the revisions by next Tuesday. She also stipulated that 4 large, 10 small paper copies were needed and an updated electronic set for both ART and PZC.

Mr. Langworthy asked if all the Waivers were clear. Mr. Sanford said he understood. Mr. Langworthy said staff will clarify the Waivers and Administrative Departures.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 pm.