



**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**

**JULY 31, 2014**

**ART Members and Designees:** Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Alan Perkins, Washington Township Fire Marshal; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; Sergeant Rodney Barnes, Police; and Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner.

**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; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; Jonathan Staker, Planning Assistant; and Flora Rogers, Administrative Assistant.

**Applicants:** Bruce Sommerfelt, Signcom, Inc (Cases 1 and 3); Jim Dooley, Morrison Sign Company (Case 2); Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T (Cases 4 and 5).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the July 24, 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.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

- 1. BSC Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge - Haring Dental - Sign**  
**4393 W. Dublin-Granville Road**  
**14-078MPR**  
**Minor Project Review**

Katie Ashbaugh said this is a request to install a 28.17-square-foot wall sign for a pediatric dental office in the Shoppes at River Ridge shopping center, at the southeast corner of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dale 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. Ashbaugh said this is a recently relocated office located in the tenant space formerly occupied by Coldwater Creek. She said this space has been converted to a dentist's office and a maximum 30.5-square-foot sign is permitted based on the dimensions of the tenant space. She said the maximum permitted height is 15 feet. She said the proposed sign meets Code requirements for sign height at 14.6-feet above grade, and the sign is centered above the door and placed in the previous Coldwater Creek sign location. She said the proposed sign is only two colors and uses the existing light fixtures.

Claudia Husak said the applicant has decided not to use the toothbrush logo in the sign's design.

Bruce Somerfelt said unfortunately they were not able to incorporate the toothbrush logo due to the size limitations.

Ms. Ashbaugh said a determination is scheduled for August 7, 2014.

Steve Langworthy asked if the sign consultant would be reviewing this sign.

Ms. Ashbaugh said that the application was sent to the consultant and will have a review for the planning report.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed there were no additional comments or questions on this application and concluded a determination is scheduled for next Thursday, August 7, 2014.

**2. BSC Commercial District – Red Roof Inn – Wall Signs  
14-080MPR**

**5125 Post Road  
Minor Project Review**

Andrew Crozier said this is a request to modify two existing 68.25-square-foot wall signs for an existing hotel building located on the south side of Post Road, approximately 1,100 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Mr. Crozier said the Red Roof Inn is located in the Bridge Street District with frontage on two roadways (US 33 and Post Road) and has two existing wall signs. He said they are proposing to replace only the "Inn" text with "Plus +". He said the site has an existing variance to allow 2 signs, to allow the 70-square-foot signs, and to allow a height up to 19 feet instead of 15 feet. He said the sign design is consistent with the architectural character of the building, consistent with the Bridge Street District Code requirements for signs. He said the applicant originally submitted a sign proposal for two colors, with the "Plus +" being in yellow lettering. He stated that Planning had recommended that they change the "Plus +" text to match the red used for the rest of the sign text.

Claudia Husak confirmed with the applicant that all of the letters would be the same shade of red.

Jim Dooley, Morrison Signs, said the customer has invested a lot of money changing the operation of this hotel to the new "Red Roof 'Plus +' brand. He said they would be happier with the "Plus +" text in a gold color but they will accept the red lettering because it will set their business apart from the other Red Roofs Inns.

Steve Langworthy confirmed there were no additional comments or questions on this application and concluded a determination is scheduled for next Thursday, August 7, 2014.

**3. BSC Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – Coldwell Banker – Sign**

**14-081MPR**

**4535 W. Dublin-Granville Road  
Minor Project Review**

Nicole Martin said this is a request to construct a new 43.5-square-foot wall sign and to modify the existing awning for a new tenant in Shoppes at River Ridge, at the southeast corner of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dale 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. Martin said this is a new application for a sign with illuminated channel letters in blue with a white accent logo with lettering at 14 feet, 9-inches above grade. She said the sign does not project more than the allowed 14 inches from the wall. She said there is a concern with the overall square footage of the sign, which is determined by the length of the tenant space. She said based on the measurement of the

front tenant space, they are allowed a 35.5-square-foot sign, and as proposed, the sign exceeds that by 10 square feet.

Bruce Somerfelt, Signcom, Inc., said this proposal meets the height requirement. He stated that the size of the sign is reduced to 28 square feet with a beige background panel that will match the EIFS on the building archway. He said they measured the sign size by measuring around the perimeter of the letters of the sign.

Rachel Ray asked Mr. Somerfelt to describe the purpose and design of the aluminum background panel.

Mr. Somerfelt said it is 2.5-inches deep and painted beige for consistency with the rest of the façade. He said the panel is intended to hide the hardware and mounting details for the illuminated lettering.

Claudia Husak stated that Code requires sign area measurements to include the background panel, unless the channel letters are mounted directly to the wall of the building.

Mr. Somerfelt said they are attaching the aluminum panel to the building and not using a sign panel and thought that would allow them to measure around the perimeter of the lettering.

Ms. Husak stated that not permitted by Code.

Fred Hahn asked what is currently within the archway detail.

Ms. Martin said the archway is stucco under the proposed panel being used to place the lettering.

Steve Langworthy asked about the two different operations going on within this one building.

Mr. Somerfelt said Coldwell Banker is only using part of the building, with an interior wall between the other tenant space which is the title agency that works with the applicant. He said the title agency will not need a sign for their operation to the right side of the Coldwell Banker tenant space.

Mr. Somerfelt said they would have to stay within the lettering size because they would not be able build smaller letters.

Ms. Gilger said the background piece would look too small and would not fit the architecture of the building.

Jeff Tyler suggested making the sign lettering part of the building façade above the entrance.

Ms. Ray asked if the cabinet has to be so large and suggested that the cabinet mirror the shape of the archway.

Mr. Somerfelt said there is some margin around the sign, but would be much more attractive for the building to install the sign as proposed.

Mr. Tyler confirmed the ART does not have the authority to approve a different way of measuring the sign area, but the applicant can apply for a Master Sign Plan with the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Langworthy summarized the applicant's three options: reduce the size of the cabinet, put lettering directly on the building, or request a Master Sign Plan from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ray Harpham said if they request a Master Sign Plan, the ART could be in a position to recommend approval because they meet the height requirement and are working to integrate the sign with the building's architecture.

Ms. Husak said it is a matter of timing for the applicant, with the potential for a determination next week by the ART. She said a review by the Planning Commission would push back the approval another month.

Mr. Somerfelt asked if the overall aesthetics of the sign met ART approval. [The ART members concurred.]

Steve Langworthy confirmed there were no additional comments or questions on this application and concluded a determination is scheduled for next Thursday, August 7, 2014, unless directed otherwise by the applicant.

## **DETERMINATION**

### **4. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road 14-070BPR/PP Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for preliminary review for seven new blocks for future development on approximately 30.9 acres, in addition to new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive (relocated), 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 Basic Development Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D). She said this is also a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat Review under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the site and then provided an overview of where this application for Basic Development Review is in the context of the current applications on file, and the upcoming applications that will be filed. She explained that the purpose of the Basic Development Plan Review is to make sure the framework that will enable the future mixed-use development at this site is cohesive and will ensure that a strong public realm is established. She explained that this application is not intended to serve as a determination for all project details associated with the public or private realm. She stated that further details will be determined at the Development Plan Review, Basic Site Plan/Site Plan and Final Plat stages. She said there are some questions still to be worked through, and pointed out that the applicant is meeting with the City on a weekly and almost daily basis to coordinate these items.

Ms. Ray said the applicant has also filed an application for Development Plan Review for Phase One of this project, although the applicant has requested a time extension to allow time to address the issues and obtain feedback from the Commission on the Basic Development Plan. She said that by the time the Development Plan Review for Phase One is ready to move forward, all of the detailed items that have not been determined at this stage will need to be for that review. She said following the Development Plan Review, the next step is the Basic Site Plan Review, which is a review of the conceptual buildings, uses, and site details, and finally, the last step is the Site Plan Review, which is likely to proceed in phases by block and will serve as the most detailed review out of all of the applications since all of the architectural details, open space details, parking, landscaping, signs, and other site details will be reviewed at that time.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the proposed Basic Development Plan. She said that the proposed plan includes a grid street network forming seven blocks for development. She stated that the Basic Development Plan involves the public realm elements, including seven development blocks (Blocks A, B, C, D, F, G, H) subdivided by private access drives and mid-block pedestrianways (Block 'E' is the designation currently applied to land north of John Shields Parkway, east of Riverside Drive, and is not included with this application), three new public streets (Broadstone Avenue, Tuller Ridge Drive, Mooney Street), and a future mixed-use shopping corridor designated along portions of Broadstone Avenue and Riverside Drive. She said this application also includes a Preliminary Plat for the project site that includes the reconfiguration of rights-of-way for John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive and the necessary vacation and reconfiguration of the right-of-way for the east/west portion of Dale Drive.

Ms. Ray said the Code analysis for the project includes the Lots and Blocks requirements. She explained that Waivers are required for Blocks 'D' and 'H' because the east and west faces of both blocks each exceed the 500-foot maximum block length, and when combined with the other block lengths, the total block perimeter also exceeds the maximum of 1,750 feet. She said approval is recommended for the Waivers. She explained that the intent of the maximum block length provisions is to prohibit "superblocks" from being established, which limit pedestrian connectivity and do not appropriately distribute traffic. She stated that the plan meets the intent of this requirement by providing mid-block pedestrianways through private drives, which serves to break up the blocks and allow for connectivity through the site. She added that the greenway along the south side of John Shields Parkway adds an additional 80 feet to the block length measurement, which is a condition unique to these two blocks.

Ms. Ray said the Street Types section of the Code addresses the designation of street families and street elements such as bicycle facilities. She explained that five-foot one-way cycletracks are proposed along both sides of "Broadstone Avenue," which is the main shopping corridor that is part of the regional cycletrack system through the Bridge Street District. She said that the cycletrack transitions into an eight-foot, two-way cycletrack along Riverside Drive. She said that a condition was recommended to begin to identify accommodations for transit stops, as well as on-street parking details. She said at Mr. Hahn's suggestion at a previous meeting, the applicant should consider providing on-street parking spaces for motorcycles and scooters where full-length vehicular parking spaces will not fit. She said they will also need to continue to work through fire access throughout the site as the details come together. She said one of the recommendations is a condition that, in addition to Mooney Street being public south of "Broadstone Avenue," Banker Drive (shown as Reserve I) will also need to be a public street between Dale Drive and Mooney Street to allow for fire access. She said no on-street parking would be required on this portion of Banker Drive.

Steve Langworthy asked if that was because of the steepness of the road grade.

Ms. Ray said yes, the slope is about 10 percent in that area, which makes on-street parking challenging.

Ms. Ray said the Neighborhood Standards are also part of the Basic Development Plan Review. She explained that the consideration include placemaking elements such as the designation of the shopping corridor, providing a pedestrian-oriented streetscape, identifying street terminations, locations for gateways and open spaces, and later in the process, sign plans. She explained that along the shopping corridor, which is shown along portions of "Broadstone Avenue" and Riverside Drive, the Neighborhood Standards require a minimum 12 feet of clear sidewalk area. She said within the right-of-way, between the six-foot sidewalk and five-foot cycletrack area, a minimum of 11 feet is provided; the applicant will be required to provide a minimum of one additional foot to be provided within the Required Building Zone along the shopping corridor.

Ms. Ray stated that in terms of open spaces, staff met with the applicant yesterday to work through the placement of open spaces to meet the intent of the Code requirements for the provision of a high quality open space network. She said the applicant was also thinking through the private spaces, including restaurant patios, and how they will interact with the streetscape. She said those details would be finalized through the next phases of Development Plan and Site Plan Review.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing the proposed Preliminary Plat. She said the Preliminary Plat can be viewed as the "technical" side of the Basic Development Plan Review. She referenced the plat content including the site conditions, lots, right-of-way dedication/vacation, lot line adjustments, street sections, reserves for private drives, grading and utilities, open space, and a tree survey.

Ms. Ray explained that the applicant had provided street sections for all of the roadways throughout the project area. She presented graphics depicting the sections for "Broadstone Avenue" and Riverside Drive. She stated that although the applicant is not constructing Riverside Drive, it is included on the plans given its integral relationship to the project. She provided overviews of the sections for Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge Drive, as well as section views on how the private drives will be installed over parking structures in some areas of the site.

Ms. Ray presented a slide showing a summary of the comments received from the ART on this application to date. She reiterated that this is the first of a multi-step process in the review of this project, with details increasing with each review. She commented that the applicant is in the process of working to establish a development agreement with the City Administration, although the agreement has not been finalized at this time. She noted the comments and conditions related to the shopping corridor and provision of a highly pedestrian-oriented streetscape, in addition to the attention that will be paid to ensuring that the applicant appropriately integrates open space into the development, including distribution, suitability, and design. She noted that stormwater information should be advancing, and the applicant should be prepared to make any corrections on the Preliminary Plat before it advances to City Council.

Ms. Ray referenced the comments from Fire, which at this time relate mainly to fire hydrant locations, the need for public streets in certain areas of the site to provide fire access, and private drive construction above garages. She noted that Mr. Perkins' comments indicated that surfaces must be capable of supporting a 75,000-lb. fire apparatus. She said Building Standards commented that the applicant should start thinking about a loading/trash/building services plan and utility services.

Ms. Ray said there are three ART actions required: 1) Development Plan Waiver Review for two waivers; 2) Basic Development Plan Review, based on the review criteria of Section 153.066(E)(3) for Development Plan Review; and 3) Preliminary Plat Review. She said the Planning and Zoning Commission will also make a determination on the required reviewing body for the Development Plan reviews.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the two waivers, which are for:

1. Maximum Block Size (Block D) – to increase the maximum permitted block dimensions from 500 feet to +594 feet on the west and 607 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 to +1,868 feet; and
2. Maximum Block Size (Block H) – to increase the maximum permitted block dimensions from 500 feet to 630 feet on the west and 686 feet on the east, and maximum block perimeter from 1,750 to +1,945 feet.

She said the Waiver review criteria have been met for both blocks.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the Basic Development Plan, with 10 conditions:

- 1) City Council approval of the area rezoning to the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District;
- 2) That the applicant select building types that are permitted in the BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District, or seek a Waiver;
- 3) That the applicant work with the City to establish a development agreement for this project;
- 4) That the applicant dedicate the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
- 5) That the applicant address any remaining Engineering details as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant coordinate with the City and Washington Township Fire Department to ensure fire accessibility throughout the site as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 7) That the applicant work with the City to plan for future transit stop locations for appropriate areas of this development;
- 8) That the applicant provide the remaining one-foot (for a total of 12 feet) clear sidewalk area as part of the public streetscape along appropriate portions of the Shopping Corridor;
- 9) That the applicant describe the intent for the required BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District gateways at the Development Plan Review, with details to be determined as part of the Site Plan Review; and
- 10) That the applicant provide an outline of the details for each open space type, including the intended users, exact acreages required and provided, and general program, at the Development Plan Review, with determinations as part of the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Langworthy said nearly all of the conditions are administrative in nature.

Ms. Ray said a lot of the conditions refer to the types of elements that are expected to be addressed with the Development Plan Reviews, and are noted here to make sure the applicant is aware.

Ms. Ray said approval is recommended for the Preliminary Plat with 5 conditions:

- 1) The modifications to the street sections described in this report are incorporated in the plan as part of the Development Plan Review;
- 2) That the proposed utility easements be provided on the preliminary plat prior to review by City Council;
- 3) That the applicant dedicate the roadway shown as "Reserve I" on the south side of Block 'F' as public right-of-way;
- 4) City Council approval of the Plat modification of the requirement that rights-of-way lines at street intersections must be connected with a straight line tangent;
- 5) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to City Council submittal.

Mr. Langworthy asked for clarification if the reconfiguration of the John Shields Parkway right-of-way was covered under condition five.

Ms. Ray said the reconfiguration is shown on the plat, and will be addressed in that manner.

Aaron Stanford said the applicant has already shown the necessary changes on the plat.

Mr. Langworthy asked for any additional comments.

Police Sergeant Rodney Barnes said Police is supportive of the proposal. He said they appreciate the amount of access provided through the area. He said Police has talked about increasing the officers in

this area, and making greater use of the substation within the Hard Road Fire Station, with a possible use for bike patrol.

Mr. Stanford noted that the applicant indicated that the street names may be changed further, and asked at what point will they be finalized.

Claudia Husak said the street names should be determined with the Preliminary Plat.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said they are more concerned with the timing of the Final Plat than the Preliminary Plat and have focused on the end of the process. He said the Preliminary Plat could be delayed from advancing to City Council if needed to have time to work out the final street names.

Joanne Shelly said Barb Cox has been working with the applicant to coordinate the naming of the streets, and they could be finished as soon as next week.

Mr. Yoder said addresses will be assigned to the blocks and buildings after the street names have been determined.

Alan Perkins, Washington Township Fire Marshal, said based on the changes to Mooney Street to make it a public street, and the condition requiring Banker Drive to be public between Mooney Street and Dale Drive, Fire is comfortable with the streets. He said for the private drives, the Fire Department will need to make sure they have comfortable truck access, and if there are areas that will not accommodate a fire apparatus, they will need to make sure there are posted weight limits. He said he is waiting on locations for fire hydrant and set-up zones, and said he would have more comments as those elements are known in the next steps. He said the building types for the most part will be okay at six story buildings since they are likely to have sprinklers.

Ray Harpham commented that Building Standards' only comments at this time relate to waste management, and making sure that attention is paid to how this will function throughout the site.

Mr. Yoder said there is a meeting to discuss this very topic occurring right now, with other team members.

Fred Hahn said he had no further comments at this time beyond what had been included in the report.

Mr. Langworthy stated that this is a determination this week, with the recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission provided in the ART Report and presented at this meeting. He asked the applicant if he agreed to the conditions of each recommendation.

Mr. Yoder agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Langworthy said recognizing the applicant agrees to all the conditions as discussed the recommendation of approval stands and will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for two Waivers, Basic Development Plan, and Preliminary Plat Review. He said the application was scheduled for the Commission's meeting agenda for August 7, 2014.

## **CASE REVIEW**

### **5. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project, Phase 1**

**14-071DP-BSC**

### **Riverside Drive and Dale Drive 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 there is nothing new to report on this application, since the applicant had requested a time extension to the August 21, 2014 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She said anything not addressed with the previous case for Basic Development Plan Review will need to be addressed as part of this Development Plan Review. She reiterated that the agenda for the August 21<sup>st</sup> Planning and Zoning Commission meeting will be published next Friday, August 8<sup>th</sup>, and there were a lot of items to be addressed in a very short amount of time, not to mention the Commission's feedback on the Basic Development Plan.

Nelson Yoder said they understand what information is still needed.

Ms. Ray said they will discuss the details further at the weekly coordination meeting next Wednesday.

Mr. Yoder said they will work on the details and be in touch.

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 pm.