



**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

SEPTEMBER 18, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Alan Perkins, Washington Township Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; and Rodney Barnes, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer, Landscape Architect; Marie Downie, Planner I; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design (Case 2); and Nelson Yoder and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Teri Umbarger, BHDP Architects; and Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan (Cases 4 & 5).

Gary Gunderman called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the September 11, 2014, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. BSC Historic Core
14-090ARB-MPR**

**48-52 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Andrew Crozier said this is a request for architectural modifications to a building and trim colors for an existing commercial building on the east side of South High Street, between Spring Hill and Eberly Hill. He said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Crozier said the colors proposed for the building and trim are appropriate according to the *Guidelines* and the time in which this building was built. He said the applicant is proposing to replace the existing awnings and locate additional awnings over the remaining storefront. He explained that the awnings over the windows will be recessed and the others will project over the doorways to alleviate the appearance of one continuous awning, which is not permitted by the *Guidelines*.

He said ART recommends approval with one condition:

- 1) The applicant provide additional dimensions to ensure the awnings meet the design intent of the *Guidelines* that each window or door has its own awning, rather than a single full-width awning covering the entire façade.

Mr. Gunderman confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval of this application for Minor Project Review with one condition to be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board.

2. BSC Historic Residential District – Streng Residence – Architectural Modifications
14-092ARB-MPR **75 Franklin Street**
Minor Project Review

Claudia Husak said this is a request to increase the height of an existing attached three-car garage for an existing residence on the west side of Franklin Street approximately 480 feet south of the intersection with Bridge Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G) under the review standards of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Husak said the proposed garage roof will be raised to match the pitch of the existing residence. She said the modifications will match the existing materials. She said the applicant is proposing to remove a second story window where the garage will connect to the residence. Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design confirmed the windows of this attic space do not qualify as an egress window; therefore, removal is allowed and will be replaced with attic doors to provide access to the garage.

Ms. Husak said approval for this Minor Project Review with no conditions is recommended.

Gary Gunderman asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval of this Minor Project Review application with no conditions to be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board.

3. BSC Historic Core District – Shamrock Barber Shop **86 S. High Street**
14-093ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**

Andrew Crozier said this is a request for the installation of a new 6-square-foot projecting sign for an existing commercial building on the west side of South High Street, between Eberly Hill and Pinney Hill Lane. He said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Crozier presented the site, which has an existing four-square-foot sign that is proposed to be replaced with a six-square-foot sign to be hung from the existing metal bracket. He said Code permits a height of 15 feet and its lowest portion shall be eight feet above the sidewalk. He indicated the proposed sign is made of 1/4-inch-deep, poly-metal aluminum panel with rounded edges with a white background and black text. He said Planning is recommending that the border and shamrock be the same shade of green as the existing awnings. He explained the shamrock will need to meet the secondary image requirements. He confirmed that metal signs are permitted in the district and can be shaped, painted, or polished; and that the intent of projecting signs is to provide visibility from a pedestrian scale and the proposed sign meets the intent outlined in the *Guidelines*.

He presented the ART's recommendation of approval for this Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) The proposed green color for the border and shamrock complement the existing awning color, subject to approval by Planning; and
- 2) The applicant provide detailed dimensions at the time of sign permit submission demonstrating that the size of the shamrock meets the secondary image requirements, and the height requirements.

Mr. Gunderman asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommended approval of this application with two conditions to be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board.

CASE REVIEWS

4. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project, Phase 1

14-071DP-BSC

**Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Development Plan Review**

Claudia Husak 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. Husak said she discussed the timing of both projects with the applicant yesterday and it was decided to tentatively include the Preliminary Plat as part of the overall Basic Development Plan to be forwarded to Dublin City Council on Monday for some definitive feedback regarding street sections. She reported that a work session is scheduled with City Council for October 6, 2014, to discuss several agreements and the framework for several larger projects. She indicated that potentially, both the Preliminary Plat and the Basic Development Plan are scheduled for the Planning and Zoning Commission's Special meeting on October 21, 2014. She said this would allow for feedback on the above and provide internal review time for Staff.

Ms. Husak said items need to be clarified and changes made for the Development Plan Review and Basic Site Plan Review. She reported an initial review was provided from an outside consultant, Daniel Phillabaum, AICP, RLA, to assist with these plans being discussed today. She reported the highlighted issues and inconsistencies that are noted under case 14-095BRP, which also involves Bridge Park East.

Ms. Husak said that a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this Development Plan Review request was scheduled for next week's ART meeting and the PZC will need a clean set of plans.

5. BSC Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park East Mixed-Use Development

Blocks B and C

14-095BPR

**Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Basic Site Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this is a request for the first phase of a mixed-use development consisting of approximately 440 residential units, 110,691 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, 127,129 square feet of office, and structured parking (approximately 1,347,261 square feet total) in eight buildings, and associated streets and open spaces on approximately 7.71 acres on the east side of Riverside Drive, west of Dale 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 Site Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D) for a future Site Plan Review.

Ms. Husak and Joanne Shelly identified the following issues:

- Labeling of street names are inconsistent on the civil plans and architectural elevations.
- Street frontages, street facing facades and non-street facing facades need to be identified.
- Scales on the civil and architectural plans are inconsistent; they need to be coordinated. Site drawings need to be all in the same scale and as large as possible.
- Required Building Zones should be included on the civil site plans with the Site Plan Application.

- No Open Space types or locations have been provided. At the Basic Site Plan stage, the design details of these Open Spaces is not necessary, but a plan depicting the locations, areas, and dimensions is necessary to determine if the required provision of Open Space (square footage, dimensions, access, variety of types) is met.
- Square footage of the uses proposed are inconsistent and generalized into an Office/Retail category for parking calculation purposes. The amount of square footage proposed for Eating & Drinking uses appears significantly lower than previously anticipated. As parking requirements are better understood based on refinements to the mix of uses proposed, a Shared Parking Reduction should be explored as part of the overall Parking Plan for the area.

Ms. Husak asked the applicant to verify the numbers that Mr. Phillabaum provided of the breakdown of the building uses. Teri Umbarger, BHDP Architects, said if the numbers were provided to her, they will confirm they are valid.

- Floor to ceiling heights need to be shown.
- Buildings B4 and C4 have been designated as Mixed-Use Buildings by the applicant but each of these buildings are six stories in height, exceeding the five-story maximum permitted for Mixed-Use Buildings. If they are designated Corridor Buildings, six-story maximum is permitted. A Waiver will be required to allow the ground story heights of 10 feet and 10 feet, 9 inches, as the minimum height for ground stories; in Corridor Buildings it is 12 feet.
- Buildings B1, B2, and B3 have also been designated as Mixed-Use Buildings, and also exceed the maximum permitted height of five stories. Each of these buildings are six stories in height and would be more accurately designated as Corridor Buildings.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, asked how to designate the uses and ceiling heights. Ms. Husak explained that story height leads to the rest of the requirements.

- Parking calculations of the number of compact parking spaces proposed exceed the maximum of 10 percent permitted by Code. On the parking structure plans, compact spaces are labeled but it does not include spaces that have dimensions greater than compact, but less than required for standard spaces. The location of 'non-standard spaces' as well as the compact spaces on the plans need to be depicted as they are considered compact spaces by Code and are included on the Parking Schedules. The number of egress and ingress required is not consistent with Code and currently not enough spaces. If a Waiver is requested, this is significant.
- Parking calculations based on use need to be provided, which should be primarily for office/retail and not restaurants. The minimum and maximum numbers need to be included for a more clear evaluation explanation of need. A note of intent of shared parking is also recommended.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying, said he will modify the plans but desires additional egress spaces on each side. He said two egress spaces cannot be next to each other and logistically, this does not work; the spaces need to be side by side and quantity will not be an issue.

- Vehicle parking depth

Mr. Hunter said parking depth was the issue, not width. Ms. Shelly recommended a parking matrix and said a Waiver would be needed for asking for compact spaces that are not truly compact spaces. She said the matrix would identify the spaces that are shorter than full, but not compact. Ms. Husak requested the spaces be counted for better identification either by row or each space has a number to identify per floor plan per row.

Ms. Umbarger said the identified spaces were provided.

- Slope of parked ramps in the parking structures need to be verified. Potentially steep ramps coupled with narrower than standard parking spaces will result in door swinging into adjacent parked vehicles, as well as insufficient accessibility and pedestrian comfort.
- Parking structure circulation needs to be included on the drawings to show entrance/exit locations, all levels, ramps, and circulation pattern.

Ms. Shelly suggested a conceptual isometric diagram.

- Bicycle parking and storage provisions need to be included as it is a significant requirement and may reduce the number of vehicular spaces available.
- Motorcycle parking should also be included.

Ms. Umbarger replied that the applicant has the room for these accommodations.

- Stormwater quality management needs to be provided.

Ms. Umbarger asked if stormwater management should be part of the Basic Plan or part of the Site Plan. Barb Cox requested something be provided at this stage for her to provide feedback. Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying, said the applicant has begun looking at stormwater management. Ms. Umbarger asked if the plan could be submitted as a narrative to which Mr. Yoder interjected that more than a narrative can be provided.

- Several of the above grade transformers on the Site Plan are not depicted on the Landscape Plans and will be required to be screened.
- Refuse container locations need to be diagramed on the plans and refuse management should be considered.

Ms. Umbarger said two buildings have trash compactors, which all four buildings will be using. Ms. Cox emphasized the need for notes and comments on the plans for this application as well as proper labeling.

Mr. Yoder questioned the need for all this paper when both cases will be heard on October 21, 2014. He asked to combine the two into a simple set of drawings. Ms. Shelly explained the idea of the Development Plan is to provide a high-level picture of the project, including simple drawings. She said the detail is needed for the next phase, which is the Site Plan. The best way to present these cases as to not cause confusion was discussed. It was decided that the best way would be to get the Development Plan (simple portion) approved first before moving on to the Site Plan (detail).

Jeff Tyler suggested the Commission receives two packages. Ms. Cox agreed the process should be followed. Ms. Husak suggested that having one Planner present the Development Plan Review and another present the Site Plan Review may help separate the two cases. Ms. Husak said scheduling a general staff meeting next week would be helpful.

- Architecture Facades

Based on initial comments on materials from City Council, Ms. Shelly said they did not approve of fiber cement siding as a primary material and stucco is not permitted as the primary or secondary building façade material by Code.

Mr. Gonzalez presented the material sample boards, which contained the standard size (1 X 2) of stone veneer that is a step up from cultured stone. He explained this was used on the Heartland of Dublin project as masonry units on the bottom of the building.

- More Building Variety should be considered. Many buildings proposed have similar form (number of stories, proportion of recesses/projections, roof design) but do vary material palette considerably.

Ms. Shelly was concerned that even if all the renderings were in all black, white, and gray, removing color, they would still appear to need variation, which Code requires. She said this large project cannot appear as one person designed all the buildings. She said she understood the inside layout reflects the outside but all the buildings are similar in character. She indicated the buildings with a vista and gateway needs to be signature in style and not part of the main palette. She said a vista was important as the bridge was being realigned. She recommended the applicant not miss this huge opportunity to design something extraordinary.

Ms. Umbarger referred her to the C2 building with a tower. She agreed that the black and white renderings make the buildings appear as simple motifs but color and texture will be added and referenced the sample material boards for character.

Ms. Shelly emphasized the first impression was that the buildings were mostly brick and needed variety. Ms. Umbarger asked if showing a perspective would introduce variety.

Ms. Shelly recommended that the applicant convey quality and the types of bricks selected were discussed. She reiterated that stucco was proposed as a trim material but it cannot be used at all in this district. Ms. Umbarger inquired about fiber cement siding to which Ms. Shelly said that was not permitted as a primary building material.

Mr. Tyler inquired about the structural material for the tower that was the focal point. Ms. Umbarger replied that it consists of steel tubes and 3A construction project.

Mr. Tyler said residential units cannot go above 30 feet. Mr. Hunter explained it was a steel building. Mr. Tyler suggested that the applicant highlight that point.

Mr. Hunter asked if they could request a Waiver. He explained they are not using secondary materials where they can be touched by the public. He said the metal panels would be installed within 20 feet of the top of the building, which puts the panels 60 feet in the air and you cannot really tell the difference.

Mr. Tyler thought stucco would be an uphill battle and emphasized the Commission and Council are looking for quality materials that are timeless. He said fiber cement siding was just discussed this past week at a PZC Special Meeting and it was determined that installation is the issue that results in undesirable corners, windows, and chipping.

Mr. Hunter commented that there will be a lot of buildings with brick that will look alike.

Ms. Husak said fiber cement products have only been permitted in residential buildings. She said the applicant must use primarily materials of stone, brick, and glass. She explained Code reads fiber concrete siding, metal panels, etc. as secondary materials.

Mr. Hunter said the applicant needs to be able to afford all those primary materials. Ms. Husak emphasized the need for providing variety and mentioned that the current plan can appear mundane rather quickly.

Ms. Shelly commented that all the brick had the same dimensions and asked the applicant to consider big brick.

Ms. Husak said at this stage, the applicant has the opportunity to receive feedback from the Commission.

Ms. Husak asked if she could expect street sections from the applicant. Mr. Yoder said the applicant could provide street sections.

Alan Perkins inquired about the fire hydrant locations and asked specifically about Mooney Street, south of Bridge Park Avenue. He requested a hydrant on Mooney Street. Mr. Yoder said the applicant could do that.

Mr. Perkins thought the goal of private streets to public streets was to appear seamless. He said the proposed building locations meet minimum fire code requirements for length of hose lines but come close to exceeding. He also said he wanted to see hydrants across Bridge Park Avenue. He explained the FDC location for Block 'B' would require firefighters to stretch a hose line across Bridge Park Avenue to the closest hydrant and potentially block emergency vehicles on the primary street.

Mr. Perkins said now that he has building footprints he can gauge the stretch for ladder trucks. He stated he was concerned with the grade for the drive going up the hill. He indicated he has an understanding of what is public or private and the span on hydrant location is ok.

Ms. Cox reported that Kristin Yorko was working on establishing addresses. She said several different tenants with different uses may share the same main elevator. She said offices sharing the same main building number would be identified by "suites" and residential units would be identified by "apartment numbers". She said Engineering is currently working through the right number system for the grid.

Mr. Tyler asked how garages would be addressed. Mr. Hunter agreed that garages needed separate addresses. Ms. Cox said this could be discussed more thoroughly at next Wednesday's meeting.

Ms. Umbarger asked if everyone should still meet weekly. Ms. Husak thought that it was a good idea to continue the weekly meetings.

Gary Gunderman asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated that a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this request was scheduled for October 2, 2014.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Gary Gunderman asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 pm.