



**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

JULY 17, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Alan Perkins, Washington Township 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/Landscape Architect; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; Logan Stang, Planning Assistant; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests (Case 1); Jim Muckle, Vrable Healthcare; Linda Menerey, EMH&T (Case 2); Brian Quackenbush and James Peltier, EMH&T; Nelson Yoder, Russ Hunter, and Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 4 & 5).

Gary Gunderman called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the July 10, 2014, meeting minutes. He confirmed that the ART members had sent their modifications to Ms. Wright prior to the meeting. The minutes were accepted into the record as amended.

DETERMINATIONS

- 1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center –Partial Demolition
14-064MPR 6700 Village Parkway
Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for demolition and removal of approximately 68,920 square feet of an existing 126,410-square-foot commercial building and associated site improvements at the Dublin Village Center shopping center, west of Sawmill Road and Dublin Center Drive, east of Village Parkway, south of Tuller Road, and north of the existing movie theater. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said this application was introduced two weeks ago, at which time the applicant requested a time extension on the determination to the July 17, 2014 ART meeting. She presented a slide that highlighted the area of the shopping center to be demolished. She explained the applicant will restore the area by seeding a lawn and grading for stormwater management as well as adding a new driveway connection to Tuller Road. She presented photos of the applicant's proposed screening arrangements to install a five-foot mound with eight-foot evergreens (White Fir and Norway Spruce). She said the applicant is proposing to install screening immediately for the adjacent property, which has a separate owner, on which the warehouse building is located.

Ms. Ray said the applicant has requested to be allowed to install the screening for the southern loading dock. She reported that installing the mounding for both areas was recommended at the time of the demolition, although the screening could be delayed until October 1, 2015, following the approval of the demolition permit or when the tenant space becomes occupied, whichever is sooner. She said the

applicant would need to plant evergreens 10 feet on center as stated in the report to achieve the minimum 50 percent opacity requirement.

Ms. Ray said approval with five conditions is recommended for this request for Minor Project Review:

- 1) That the applicant obtain the adjacent property owner's signature and consent on the Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval and demolition permit for the portion of the improvements to the west wall of the warehouse building;
- 2) That the applicant complete the mounding at the time of the demolition and screen the existing southern loading area by October 1, 2015, following the approval of the demotion permit, or when the tenant space is occupied, whichever is sooner, in accordance with the submitted plan;
- 3) That the evergreen plantings be installed at approximately 10 feet on center, subject to Planning approval;
- 4) That the applicant identify a staging and stockpiling area as part of the demolition permit; and
- 5) That the applicant coordinates any changes to the water services with the City of Columbus.

Gary Gunderman asked the applicant if he agreed with the above five conditions.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests, asked if the trees allowed by October needed to be in both mounding areas to which Ms. Ray responded affirmatively. Mr. McCauley said he understood and agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Gunderman 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 five conditions.

2. BSC Office Residential District – Vrable Healthcare

14-065MPR

**4500 John Shields Parkway
Minor Project Review**

Marie Downie said this is a request for review and approval of site modifications for a child daycare center located in the Vrable Healthcare building currently under construction in the BSC Office Residential District at the southwest corner of the intersection of Tuller Road and Tuller Ridge Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Downie said this application was introduced at the July 3, 2014, ART meeting, and not much had changed since that time in terms of site modifications. She reported the modifications to the southwest outdoor area consisted of:

- o A door to provide access to the fenced-in play area;
- o A new play structure;
- o Benches;
- o Revisions to the storm drainage bio-retention basin;
- o A three-foot, eight-inch aluminum fence and gate; and
- o Landscaping

Ms. Downie confirmed the proposed colors for the play structure (green, blue and silver) met the subdued color requirement. She explained that the following modifications at the Northwest Entrance were noted:

- o Designation of 8 parking spaces for 15-minute, short-term pick-up/drop-off;

Ms. Ray began by laying out the concerns and issues with the following as part of the Preliminary Plat:

Right-of-Way

- Private streets should be provided in reserves on the plat, and reserve lines should mirror the sections for public streets.
- Banker Drive (currently noted on the plans as Bond Avenue) should be public between Mooney Street and Dale Drive, and interim and future conditions should be provided given the existing car dealership on the south side of that future roadway. Ms. Ray stated that additional information about how the project would address development on the south side of this roadway, until future development was proposed, would be needed.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, clarified that the public portion would end when Banker Drive extends over the proposed parking structure for the segment between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Mooney Street south of Park Avenue should be public, since it is no longer proposed over a parking structure, and the street section should be consistent as the segments north of Park Avenue, with on-street parking on both sides of the street.
- The applicant should provide an exhibit showing all of the lot lines to be reconfigured or adjusted, including Dale Drive/Park Avenue (and the Dale Drive vacation); John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive; and the greenway parcels south of John Shields Parkway.
- The applicant should provide detailed sections for all streets and street segments, including all of the variations (such as where turn lanes are added).

Barb Cox inquired about Block F where Lot 1 and Lot 2 were noted but the lot lines were not shown. Mr. Langworthy stated that better defined blocks were needed and setbacks should be noted.

Mr. Quackenbush asked if, for the private streets, the lot lines should be drawn at the curb or walkway and not at the edge of the building as there is no tree lawn. Ms. Ray responded staff prefers a sidewalk in the area and suggested mirroring the sections for the public streets.

Ms. Cox pointed out several areas where the proposed lot lines did not join that would need to be corrected.

Ms. Ray continued:

Parcels/Lots

- Lot sizes are dependent on the proposed building types, and the applicant should indicate the conceptually proposed building types and uses anticipated for each block and lot. She suggested a table reference.
- She asked the applicant if they ever planned to subdivide the blocks into smaller parcels for future financing purposes, and suggested that they consider a game plan for how the parcels could be configured, and if there would be an impact on the plat.
- She stated that known open spaces should be shown in public access easements.

Other Improvements

- She stated the applicant still needed to provide a master utility plan with the Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Cox said utility provisions were needed or there could be issues with the utility easements and future building placement.

Mr. Quackenbush said the private streets were over the parking garages, and he did not anticipate the need for utility easements to run through the private streets.

Ms. Cox pointed out a few areas where the reserve areas meet the rights-of-way and where the transformers sit. Mr. Quackenbush agreed with Ms. Cox's assessment. She said there may just be three or four instances.

Ms. Cox asked the applicant to make sure the plans included "environmental" aspects of the site, including existing wetlands, buried structures, etc.

Jeff Tyler said there may be more issues and comments to come on the electrical plans, and he is continuing to meet with the applicant to discuss and coordinate Building Code related issues.

Ms. Ray stated that to conclude the discussion on the Preliminary Plat, a few additional design details were noted on the comment sheet she had provided the applicant, including the need for updated proposed street names, fixing the plan scale, providing a table showing all block dimensions, and providing a tree survey for the portion of the site north of Tuller Ridge Drive.

Ms. Ray referred everyone to the comments she had prepared on the Basic Development Plan which included the following key issues:

Required Waivers

- Blocks "D" and "H" exceed block length and perimeter, and other block waivers may be identified once the applicant provides the correct block measurements. Ms. Ray said the Waiver could be reviewed either as part of the Basic Plan or Development Plan applications.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said he preferred to submit the Waiver request with the Basic Development Plan. Ms. Ray agreed that since the Preliminary Plat would be affected the Waivers should be discussed as early as possible.

Street Sections

- Ms. Ray stated that the ART and the Planning and Zoning Commission will require a much clearer understanding of the vision for each street, including detailed sections at a minimum 20-scale. She agreed that final details will be determined with the Development Plan Review (refer to comments on case 14-071DP-BSC, below).

Neighborhood District Standards

- Ms. Ray reiterated the applicant's need to think through the vision for the shopping corridor(s) along Park Avenue and Riverside Drive (since the required shopping corridors had not yet been identified), the gateways, and other urban design elements of the streetscape.

Ms. Ray noted technical issues:

1. Block Measurements - Blocks need to be measured along rights-of-way where they exist, and along the section edges of the private streets, and/or property lines. Provide a table showing calculations (total length of each side and total perimeter).
2. Vehicular Access Configuration – Engineering is still reviewing.
3. Mid-block Pedestrianway - Required for Block G on shopping corridor
4. Plans/Additional Information Needed
 - a. Scale should be no larger than one inch = 100 feet
 - b. Gray out the building footprints (the property/right-of-way lines should be more prominent)
 - c. Identify existing/future Principal Frontage Streets
 - d. Identify front/corner side/side property lines (based on building orientation)
 - e. Show lot configuration (refer to Preliminary Plat comments)
 - f. Show all typical sections (refer to Preliminary Plat comments)
 - g. Show location and dimensions of planned shopping corridor

Ms. Ray summarized the main issues with the Basic Development Plan and that a clearer vision was needed for the character of the streets throughout this project before the application moves forward. She said this, to some extent, also applies to the open space plans because while all the final details do not need to be solidified at this stage, the applicant needs to demonstrate how they are starting to think through the details of their placement, dimensions, character, purpose, function, etc. for open space.

Mr. Langworthy suggested that the applicant show the required build zones (RBZ) on the plans and not the building footprints, since the purpose of the Development Plan application is to focus on the street network and block framework. He said the applicant should understand that the buildings will then have to be sited within the RBZ range.

Ms. Ray suggested that the applicant show the building footprints on the plans for the Development Plan. Mr. Quackenbush said that taking buildings off of the Development Plan would be quite a challenge because then there would not be much left.

Joanne Shelly suggested just providing the building envelope. Ms. Ray agreed, because the building footprint outlines would help illustrate the locations of parking structures and vehicular access.

Ms. Cox referred back to the Preliminary Plat and noted that there were a few requirements such as rights-of-way with chamfered corners that would require variances by City Council since they are technically required by the Subdivision Regulations, but are not necessarily appropriate for urban streets. Mr. Langworthy said those items would be noted in the report.

Mr. Langworthy asked about the process for vacating right-of-way for existing Dale Drive. Ms. Cox said it can be done with the Final Plat. Ms. Ray asked for an exhibit to clarify each of the lot line adjustments, right-of-way vacations, etc.

Ms. Ray reiterated that the plans for the street sections needed to be at a larger scale with a much greater level of detail. She indicated that when this goes to the Commission, they will want an understanding of the vision for Park Avenue that will include the look/feel, where the private patio spaces will be accommodated, how the open spaces will be integrated into the streetscape, and how the other less prominent streets will feel as well. She stated that Park Avenue will terminate at the pedestrian

bridge landing point, and the ART, Commission, and City Council will all want wide sidewalks and an exceptional public realm along Park Avenue leading up to the park and the bridge. She indicated that at this stage, the Commission will be looking for "vision" and not necessarily all of the details – just an understanding that the project's public improvements and public realm are headed down the right path.

Mr. Yoder asked what would be considered enough walkway area. Mr. Langworthy asked if each street will have a section drawing.

Ms. Ray stated each street needed to have its own section, including where street segments had different sections. She recommended that the applicant carefully review the preliminary analysis she had provided, and provide the information highlighted in yellow that is still missing since that information would be needed before the project moves forward.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked about the mid-block pedestrianway requirements along the shopping corridor. Ms. Ray noted the blocks exceeding 400 feet on a shopping corridor would require a mid-block pedestrianway. She also referred to item #4 of the Development Plan.

Mr. Yoder inquired if they could stop the shopping corridor to avoid the need for a mid-block pedestrianway. He suggested that portions of the Riverside Drive frontage and the first two blocks of Park Avenue could serve as the shopping corridor.

Ms. Ray said the Code had a minimum required length for the shopping corridor, and the applicant would need to show how the minimum length was provided on the plans since that information had not been provided.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or comments regarding this application at this time. [There were none.] He stated that the ART's recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Basic Plan Review and to City Council for Preliminary Plat Review were scheduled for July, 31, 2014.

5. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project, Phase 1
Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
14-071DP-BSC Development Plan Review

Rachel Ray said this is a request for review and approval for four new blocks for development on approximately 17.28 acres, including new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Bridge Street District Development Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Ray said after conducting a preliminary review of the plans since they had been submitted last week, she had identified a significant amount of detail on the public improvements that have not yet been provided. She said she had met with the Director of Strategic Initiatives/Special Projects to discuss the level of information that the City is comfortable making a recommendation on at this stage of the project, and he agreed that a comfort level on the details for project elements including the disposition of each of the public/private streets, the cycle track configuration on Park Avenue, and the streetscape character of Park Avenue and Riverside Drive needed to be reached before the Development Plan moves forward.

Ms. Ray stated that with a bit more information, the Basic Development Plan application could move forward, since it is more conceptual in nature, but she strongly recommended that the applicant consider

a Time Extension on the Development Plan to allow adequate time to sort through these issues. She stated that staff was sensitive to the applicant's timeframes and committed to work with them to expedite the reviews to the extent possible, but more information would be needed as a starting point. She reiterated that a comfort level with all of the public improvements and private improvements that overlap the public realm needed to be achieved with the ART and the City before this application moves forward for consideration by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Ray referred to the key issues outlined on the comment sheet she had prepared for the Development Plan application.

Right-of-Way Encroachment

She stated it appears there are buildings shown encroaching into the Park Avenue and Mooney Street rights-of-way.

Mr. Quackenbush stated he believed those encroachments to be an error with the way the plans were drawn, but he would verify.

Ms. Ray continued:

Park Avenue Street Character and Streetscape

She pointed to the proposed BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District Code amendment requiring a minimum 12-foot clear sidewalk area along shopping corridors. She said as shown, the plans do not appear to indicate enough space for all outdoor spaces such as patios and seating areas and still meet that requirement. She reiterated the need for detailed plans.

Mr. Quackenbush referred to Plan labeled DP-5 and indicated that buildings G1 and C3 were really close to the street and providing the minimum 12-foot walkway was going to be a challenge.

Claudia Husak said, as an example, when State Bank went to the Planning and Zoning Commission recently, the Commission made a point of making sure there would be plenty of room out front for patios and activity should the building's use change over time. She said if 10 restaurants are proposed, the applicant would need to be able to demonstrate where all of the patio areas would be located and how there would be enough room for all of the pedestrian activity.

Mr. Quackenbush questioned how the 12-foot minimum clear area was measured. Ms. Ray stated that the 12-foot area needed to be clear and void of benches, cycle tracks, street trees, dining areas, etc.

Ms. Shelly said 12 feet is not too significant to accommodate. She stated that in Washington, DC for example, the requirement is 20 feet.

Mr. Quackenbush said this would be a huge change in the plans and a big deal for the applicant, and said their plans were based on the proposed rights-of-way planned months ago.

Mr. Yoder asked about the cycle track along Park Avenue. Ms. Cox agreed that staff needed to make sure they reached a decision on how the cycle track would be implemented in this part of the loop. She stated that the one-way pair had been shown on the north and south sides of the street to City Council as part of their streetscape work session in June.

Fred Hahn agreed that regardless of the proposed dimension of the clear walkway, the applicant needed to provide details and a vision for the streetscape as a starting point for the discussion.

Ms. Ray continued:

Neighborhood District Standards

She noted that a gateway is required at the intersection of Park Avenue and Riverside Drive. She reiterated that this should not be a sign; the intersection should feel prominent in terms of the building's architecture, plaza spaces, streetscape, etc. She said this is related to the next point:

Open Space

She said according to the preliminary use area calculations, approximately 3.2 acres of open space is required, and so the applicant should:

- a. Identify specific areas that meet the specific open space type requirements (and show on Preliminary Plat). She offered to schedule a meeting to discuss this further;
- b. Be prepared to explain conceptual vision for each space, including relationship to adjacent building/streetscape; and
- c. Add up the actual acreage provided.

Mr. Hahn said Code requires a total amount of open space based on use, and the applicant needs to illustrate some distribution of quality open spaces throughout the site. He clarified that even reviewing the proposal as is, there are opportunities for indentations in the buildings, for plazas, etc. He said at this time, he would expect the Code to be met in terms of the provision of required open space.

Mr. Yoder stated that 3.2 acres is equivalent to 'C' block, which is an enormous amount of space. Mr. Hahn explained the Commission will not want to see 3 acres of one block provided as a single empty open space; and they and the City will want varieties of open spaces of different sizes and uses, complimentary to the nearby building uses.

Ms. Ray offered to schedule a meeting with staff to help the applicant work through the provision of open space and brainstorm together. She said this is one of the more significant reasons why we want to hold off on the Development Plan, because this issue needs to be sorted out.

Mr. Tyler said *quality* needed to be there as well as *quantity*.

Ms. Ray continued:

Vehicular Access & Utilities

She said Engineering is still reviewing the plans, but they would need to show all existing and proposed utilities in and adjacent to the site.

Fire Access

She stated that Fire is still reviewing as well, although at a minimum, fire hydrants should be shown on the utility plans.

Alan Perkins said he needed to see the street layout, building footprints, locations of water mains and hydrants. Mr. Quackenbush said this will be driven by the locations of fire connections for the buildings.

Mr. Perkins said he was not seeing anything major right now but was concerned about the ability to maneuver a big fire truck on Oxford Street. He explained his crews could not identify public/private streets and they need to be able to navigate streets wherever fire access needed to be achieved. Mr. Quackenbush said he would check and understands fire hydrant locations will be critical.

Ms. Cox said she has not seen a public water management plan, just sewers.

Ms. Ray noted that there were a number of other smaller details to be clarified or addressed, also noted on the comment sheet. She asked about dumpsters and service areas, and pointed out where the corner occupancy requirements did not appear to be met for Block F. She said a demolition and interim conditions plan would be necessary for Block A since that wasn't included as part of the Development Plan.

For demolition/interim conditions plan, Mr. Quackenbush referred to the plan labeled DP-4 and asked for guidance. Ms. Ray said what was missing was an idea of what would happen on the building pad once the building is demolished. Ms. Cox asked if there would be mounding provided for screening or if walls would be exposed. Ms. Ray indicated that staff needs an elevation for exposed walls, and asked what the "temporary barricades" would entail, and how that would affect vehicular circulation.

Mr. Quackenbush said it was the applicant's intent that the phases would follow so quickly upon the heels of one another, that the interim conditions and timing of the start of the improvements would not be an issue. Ms. Cox said a written plan will be needed on hand and that it could be a narrative on the plans.

Ms. Ray asked if there were further questions or comments. [There were none.]

Ms. Ray concluded her recommendation that after the issues identified for the Preliminary Plat and Basic Development Plan had been resolved, that those applications could be forwarded on to PZC for Preliminary Plat and Basic Development Plan but to hold off on the Development Plan. She said a Time Extension would need to be filed for that. She asked the applicant to have revised plans to her by next Wednesday for review, prior to submitting the plans early to the Commission by next Friday. She anticipates the ART will make a recommendation on July 31, 2014.

Mr. Quackenbush asked if it made sense for all three parts to go to the Commission all at once and *not* delay the Development Plan. Ms. Husak said because so many issues were still outstanding, she believed it was in the applicant's best interest to separate the applications. She thought it was a better strategy to get the momentum started on a project of this size and leave the Development Plan for later.

Ms. Ray explained it would be more manageable for the PZC on August 7, 2014. She asked the ART members to provide her with comments by next Friday for her final report to the ART and the Commission.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if they were clear on everything. The applicant responded they needed to review all the comments.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or comments regarding this application at this time. [There were none.]

ADMINISTRATIVE

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 pm.