

# Basic Site Plan Review

**14-099BPR-ARB– Bridge Park West**

**Mixed-Use Development Project**

**Historic Transition District - High Street**

This is a request for a development of a two-story mixed-use building, 42 condominium units in a seven-story building with associated parking and site improvements along the east side of High Street approximately 280 feet north of the intersection of North Street. This is a request for review and recommendation of approval by the Architectural Review Board of a Basic Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

**Date of Application Acceptance**

Tuesday, October 14, 2014

**Date of ART Recommendation to the Architectural Review Board**

Thursday, November 13, 2014

**Date of Architectural Review Board**

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

**Case Managers**

Joanne Shelly, RLA, AICP, LEEDBP+C, Urban Designer, (614) 410- 4677 | [jshelly@dublin.oh.us](mailto:jshelly@dublin.oh.us)  
Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner, (614) 410-4690 | [jrauch@dublin.oh.us](mailto:jrauch@dublin.oh.us)

## **PART I: Application Overview**

<i>Zoning District</i>	BSC Historic Transition
<i>Review Type</i>	Basic Site Plan Review
<i>Development Proposal</i>	42 units of multiple-family residential, 16,650 sq. ft. office, 11,800 sq. ft. restaurant and 4,200 sq. ft. retail; 280 parking spaces (garage, private and public), 0.21 acres of open space and associated site improvements on a ±10.495 acre site.
<i>Use</i>	Multiple-family dwellings, mixed use retail, restaurant, office and associated accessory uses.
<i>Building Types</i>	Apartment Building w/ internal garage (1); Historic Mixed Use (3)
<i>Site Plan Waivers</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Loading Facility Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Apartment Building.</li><li>2) Entry for Parking within Building Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Apartment Building.</li><li>3) Maximum Building Height Permitted at 4.5 Stories (7 requested) – Apartment Building.</li><li>4) Parking within Building Permitted in Rear on 3 floors (5 requested) – Apartment Building.</li><li>5) Ground Story Height – 10 to 12 foot (14.16 requested) – Historic Mixed-Use Building</li><li>6) Loading Facility Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Historic Mixed Use Buildings.</li><li>7) Entry for Parking within Building Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Historic Mixed Use Buildings (1 and 2).</li><li>8) Entry for Parking within Building Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Historic Mixed Use Buildings (2 and 3).</li></ol>
<i>Property Owner</i>	Crawford Hoying Development
<i>Applicant</i>	Michael Burmeister, OHM Advisors
<i>Representative</i>	Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development
<i>Case Managers</i>	Joanne Shelly, RLA, AICP, LEEDBP+C, Urban Designer Jennifer Rauch, AICP, Senior Planner

### **Application Review Procedure: Basic Plan Review**

The purpose of the Basic Plan Review is to outline the scope, character, and nature of the proposed development and to determine the applicable review process. The process is intended to allow the required reviewing body to evaluate the proposal for its consistency with the principles of walkable urbanism as described in §153.057, the Bridge Street District Plan in the

Dublin Community Plan, and other related policy documents adopted by the City. The Basic Plan Review also provides an opportunity for public input at the earliest stages of the development process. Basic Plan Review is required prior to submission for applications for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews.

Following acceptance of a complete application for Basic Plan Review, the Administrative Review Team shall make a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board to approve, deny, or approve with conditions the application based on the criteria of §153.066(E) applicable to Development Plan Reviews, §153.066(F) applicable to Site Plan Reviews and §153.066(I) for Waivers (if necessary).

#### *Basic Site Plan Review*

The project elements reviewed as part of the Basic Site Plan include the proposed use, building types, open space arrangement and site development details.

#### *Waiver Review*

Although in its preliminary stages, the applicant and the ART have identified several project elements that require Waivers for review and determination by the Architectural Review Board; additional waivers may be required at the final Site Plan review.

#### *Next Steps*

The next step following this application is (final) Site Plan Review.

### **Architectural Review Board Determinations**

The Basic Plan Review is intended to provide a higher level overview of significant development projects. While the Basic Plan Review is based on an analysis of the review criteria for the Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews (as applicable), it is not expected that all project elements will be finalized since the purpose of the Basic Plan Review is to obtain public input at the earliest stages of the development process.

The Administrative Review Team has conducted its analysis of the project based on the information submitted. The ART has also reviewed the proposal in light of the detailed review standards and the applicant is aware of the additional information that will be needed as this proposal advances to (Final) Development Plan and Site Plan Review.

Multiple actions will be required by the Architectural Review Board:

- 1) Basic Site Plan Review, based on the review criteria of §153.066(F)(3) for Site Plan Review;
- 2) Basic Site Plan Waiver Review

### **Application History**

#### *Informal Review*

The ARB has conducted three previous informal reviews regarding the proposed site design and the architecture.

May 21, 2014

The Board general supported redevelopment of the area, but expressed significant concerns about the character, mass and scale of the proposed buildings within the context of the Historic District, particularly along the Scioto River side.

The Board expressed concerns about the reduced building setback with the scale and height of the proposed 7-story buildings along the Scioto River and the future park area. There was significant discussion regarding the proposed building heights and the Code permitted maximums for the specific building types permitted in Historic Transition. Additional site section studies were requested showing the height of the proposed buildings in relation to the buildings and elevations along North High Street to the Bridge Street intersection, as they exist today or could be approved in the future.

The Board requested additional information regarding the view from the future pedestrian bridge, the Bridge Street vehicular bridge, and adjacent development. They also asked for additional information regarding the proximity to the floodplain along the eastern portion of the proposal. The Board supported the proposed architectural design along the North High Street elevation, but had concerns about the smaller, more modern elements connecting the buildings, proposed architectural design concept and use of materials along the Scioto River elevation, and the lack of historic design cues incorporated to ensure it fits within the District. The Board also supported the parking garage concept, understanding the continue parking concerns within the District and the desire to ensure adequate parking for users of this building and others within the District.

August 27, 2014

The Board held a special meeting held on August 13<sup>th</sup> for a site visit for the proposed development. The members supported the direction the applicant was taking, including breaking up the massing of the buildings along North High Street and the modifications to the site access. The Board was receptive to the incorporation of more contemporary architectural details along the High Street elevation; however, the Board was sensitive the site's location within the Historic District and the desire to ensure the overall design fits within the context of the District. The members encouraged the applicant to be thoughtful in how the contemporary design of the Scioto River elevation meets the High Street elevation, particularly along the southern elevation because it will be a viewed from High Street and from the future pedestrian bridge.

October 29, 2014

The Board expressed concern regarding the revised architectural concept and found the proposed design more contemporary along North High Street than seemed fit Historic Dublin. The Board asked the applicant to further refine the drawings to ensure the North High Street elevations are compatible with the character of the District. They also provided additional feedback regarding the details of the multiple-family building.

### *Basic Plan Review*

The Architectural Review Board approved a Basic Development Plan and three Development Plan Waivers on October 22, 2014.

## **Application Contents and Overview**

### *Project Overview*

The proposed plan includes the redevelopment of an existing commercial property on approximately 10.495 acres. The property is located west of the Scioto River, between High Street and a proposed extension of Riverview Street and South of the Indian Run Creek. The project includes commercial (office, restaurant & retail) and residential uses including new public open space.

The proposed plan includes two buildings on a ±10.495 acre site:

- A seven story apartment buildings;
  - 42 condominium units
  - five story integrated parking structure; 280 parking spaces (public & private)
- Historic Mixed Use buildings (3)
  - 16,650 sq. ft. office
  - 1,800 sq. ft. restaurant
  - 4,200 sq. ft. retail
- 0.21 acres of open space and associated site improvements.

## **PART II: Administrative Review Team Comments**

### **Planning and Building Standards**

*Block Layout – Building Orientation.* The property is located in the Historic Transition district, south of the Indian Run Creek, west of the Scioto River along High Street, between High Street and a proposed extension of Riverview Street. The mixed use buildings face High Street, the Apartment building faces the proposed Riverview Street extension with the north and south sides wrapping around to meet the Mixed Use Building at a two towers, one at the north and one at the south end of the High Street façade. A public/private parking structure is integrated into the rear of the apartment building and at the rear of the mixed use building. The orientation of the buildings is generally consistent with the Bridge Street District Area Plan.

*Open Space Type, Distribution, Suitability and Design.* The proposed open spaces meets Code requirements for minimum dedication (±.21 acres). Other residual green space areas do not meet open space size, dimension and location standards. Open space is to be provided along the southeastern corner of the property in a location which respects and takes visual advantage of the unique geological cliff formation and future vistas east towards the proposed pedestrian bridge. Not all of the entrances to the buildings meet the walkable distance requirements to publicly accessible open space. Adding additional open space locations and site plan

adjustments and details will be required at final site plan approval to satisfy this requirement. A tree survey will be required with the Site Plan Review application along with additional details of the open space design. In addition, Parks and Open Space is continuing to develop a conceptual plan to establish the intended character and function for parkland connections to the Indian Run Creek and future pedestrian bridge.

*Vehicular Circulation.* The proposed site layout includes three mixed use buildings and one residential building on a single block. Two public access points (North High Street and proposed North Riverview Street extension) and one private access (North High Street) are provided.

*Parking.* The parking structure integrated into the apartment building has entries on the front of both building types (two on North High Street and one on North Riverview Street) as recommended by staff to avoid undesirable traffic circulation issues and destruction of geological features. Front entries are not allowed by Bridge Street Code without the approval of the City Engineer, which has been granted. Proposed parking counts exceed minimum requirements but may be within the max allowable range. Consideration is being given to this excess as it may serve the future public need with its proximity to the proposed pedestrian bridge and associated park.

*Architecture.* The plan proposes one Apartment Building Type and three Historic Mixed Use Building Types per the Bridge Street District zoning regulations. Conceptual architectural sections and elevations have been revised based on the Architectural Review Board's review on October 29, 2014. The proposed modifications include revised elevations along North High Street that appear to be constructed over time. The historically compatible architecture located adjacent to the Historic Core employs pitched roofs with overhangs and stone façade; as one moves north through the site towards the gateway to the District, the architecture takes on a progressively more contemporary style with visual cues from the 1900's, 1950's to modern and current styling details. The overall design theme provides consistent use of materials, colors and window details which ties the various architectural pieces together and intend to comply with Historic color and material palette requirements. The tower elements have been scaled down and the north tower has been relocated adjacent to the northern vehicular entrance along North High Street to create a clear indication of the public entry.

The condominium building has a contemporary architectural style with geometric forms and an Italianate roofline. The façades continues to be highly transparent to take advantage of the views. Breaks occur horizontally and vertically through the use of projections, balconies and recessed elements. A more significant visual break is created mid-block along the Riverview Street façade to break the building massing and address the Board's review comments.

*Development Agreement.* At this time, City Council has not approved a development agreement, although the City Administration is actively working with the developer to establish agreeable terms. The development agreement is expected to address the following, at a minimum:

- Public improvement design and construction responsibilities including North Riverview Street extension;
- Park and open space issues;
- Parking facility and policy issues;

- Other public and private development investment responsibilities;
- Project phasing; and
- Function, design, and maintenance responsibilities for publically accessible facilities.

## Engineering

*Grading & Utilities.* There is a public sanitary sewer structure at the southwest corner of the property and a 36-inch sewer which runs along the south side of the property parallel to the south property line. The building footprints have been designed to avoid the sanitary structure and a connection to this sewer will serve all four buildings. Additional details regarding sanitary service will be required as part of the final Site Plan. Water service has been preliminarily identified and final details will be required as part of the final Site Plan.

Preliminary stormwater management calculations have not been provided. The City of Dublin's Stormwater Management Design Manual does not require this project to provide quantity control as it is directly connected to the Scioto River. The site will have to provide the required quality control measures required by the OEPA in the General Construction Permit. The plans show that the public parallel parking spaces may be used to provide the quality control needs; however, the City's Stormwater Design Manual does not allow this because the permeable pavers in parallel parking areas are for public roadway stormwater compliance. An additional area has been identified as a bioswale in the proposed open space, this will need to be integrated appropriately and at a minimum comply with the open space requirements as describe by the Zoning Code section 153.064 G (7).

In addition, the drainage from the parking garage needs careful consideration especially in terms of flood routing. Additional details as to how the building and garage drains connect to the public system along the roadways will also be needed with the final Site Plan.

Refer to attached Engineering Memo for additional details.

## Parks and Open Space

Parks Department has reviewed and will continue to provide guidance to the applicant for design details to be incorporated as part of the (final) Site Plan Review. Parks will identify additional amenities to be provided for areas that have been included in the open space requirements calculation.

## Fire

The Washington Township Fire Department has reviewed the proposed plans and provided the following comments, which were raised as part of the Development Plan Review. The City of Dublin staff is reviewing options for an extension of North Riverview Street north of the intersection with North Street and connecting through to North High Street to create additional connectivity and accommodate the future needs of the pedestrian bridge and associated amenities for construction and for future park access. These plans have not been finalized. Because the North Riverview Street extension is not an existing road and the timing of its design and construction may not fully coincide with the development of the Bridge Park West project, the Fire Marshall has provided additional comments which would need to be address if

North Riverview Street extension is not built concurrently.

1. The length of a dead-end North Riverview Street without the future extension is more than 300 feet to the southeast corner of the building from North Street. This distance exceeds the Ohio Fire Code Section 503.2.5 requirement that dead-end fire apparatus access roads in excess of 150 feet in length be provided with an approved area for turning around fire apparatus.
2. Based on the topography of the site and height of building exceeding three stories, the rear access (North Riverview Street) would be a required aerial apparatus access road designed to meet the requirements of Dublin Fire Code (DFC) Sections D104.1 and D105. The DFC Section D104.1 establishes the requirements to have at least two means of fire apparatus access (front/rear) for the structure and DFC D105 identifies the minimum requirements for width (26 feet) and proximity (15-30 feet) from the building.
3. The turning radius for North Street at North Riverview would be required to meet the requirements of DFC Section D103.3. The minimum turning radius shall be 45 foot outside radius and 25 foot inside radius for fire apparatus access roads.

If the North Riverview Street extension was constructed the above conditions could be removed. And the drive aisle width could be reduced to 22 feet and allow fire aerial apparatus to approach from two different directions to the corners of the seven-story structure.

### Economic Development and Police

No comments.

## PART III: APPLICABLE REVIEW STANDARDS

### 1. Basic Plan Review Criteria – Basic Site Plan

The Administrative Review Team reviewed this application based on the review criteria for applications for Basic Site Plan Review, and provided the following evaluation:

- (a) Consistency with Approved Development Plan  
N/A
- (b) Meets Applicable Requirements of Sections 153.059 and 153.062 through 153.065  
*Met with conditions or Site Plan Waivers.* As reviewed in this report, all appropriate sections of the Code are either met, met with conditions, met following approval of a Site Plan Waiver or are details that would be anticipated as the development progresses to Site Plan Review.
- (c) Safe and Efficient Circulation  
*Met with conditions.* The proposed street network will provide for safe and efficient circulation within and around this site, with ART comments outlined within the report.

(d) Coordination and Integration of Buildings and Structures

*Met.*

(f) Desirable Open Space Type, Distribution, Suitability, and Design

*Met with conditions.* This proposal meets the requirements for open space. Locations and quality of design and details will be determined at the final Site Plan Review.

(g) Provision of Public Services

*Met with condition.* This proposal minimal public utility information, details of providing the services in a desirable manner will need to be coordinated and finalized to the City Engineer' satisfaction prior to (final) Site Plan Review.

(h) Stormwater Management

*Met with condition.* The final plans providing stormwater details and design shall be coordinated and finalized to the City Engineer's satisfaction prior to final Site Plan Review.

(i) Phasing

*Met with condition.* This proposal will be completed in one phase. Construction should be coordinated with the proposed Riverview Street extension.

(j) Consistency with Bridge Street District Vision Principles, Community Plan and other Policy Documents

*Met with condition.* The proposal is consistent the goal of creating a mixed use walkable development within the Historic Transition District of the Bridge Street District Plan and is consistent with the principles of walkable urbanism described in Code Section 153.057.

## 2. Waiver Review Criteria

### *Section 153.062(O) Building Types – Apartment Building*

1. Loading Facility Permitted (rear) – front entry (requested)

a. Request is caused by unique site and circulation issues.

*Criterion met.* Proposed entry along south side façade created traffic circulation issues, created the potential to damage a significant geological formation, and was proposed along a road that is not currently part of the Bridge Street Plan.

b. Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience

*Criterion met.*

c. Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District

*Criterion met.*

d. Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality

*Criterion met.*

2. Entry for Parking within Building (rear entry) – front entry (requested)
  - a. Request is caused by unique site and circulation issues.  
*Criterion met.* Proposed entry along south side façade created traffic circulation issues, created the potential to damage a significant geological formation, and was proposed along a road that is not currently part of the Bridge Street Plan.
  - b. Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience  
*Criterion met.*
  - c. Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District  
*Criterion met.*
  - d. Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality  
*Criterion met.*
3. Maximum building height permitted (4.5 stories) – 7 stories (requested)
  - a. Request is caused by unique site and circulation issues.  
*Criterion met.* There is a +/- 40 ft. change in elevation grade between High Street and Riverview Street for the Mixed Use Building to interface with the Apartment building additional stories are necessary.
  - b. Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience  
*Criterion met.*
  - c. Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District  
*Criterion met.*
  - d. Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality  
*Criterion met.*
4. Parking with in building (3 floors) - 5 floors (requested)
  - a. Request is caused by unique site and circulation issues.  
*Criterion met.* There is a +/- 40 ft. change in elevation grade between High Street and Riverview Street for the Mixed Use Building to interface with the Apartment building additional stories are necessary; additional parking is to be provided as public parking for the proposed Pedestrian Bridge Park.
  - b. Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience  
*Criterion met.*
  - c. Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District  
*Criterion met.*

- d. Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality  
*Criterion met.*

*Section 153.062(O) Building Types – Historic Mixed Use*

- 5. Ground Story Height (10'-12') – 14.16 ft. (requested)
  - a. Request is caused by unique site and circulation issues.  
*Criterion met.* There is a +/- 40 ft. change in elevation grade between High Street and Riverview Street for the Mixed Use Building to interface with the Apartment building additional height on the ground floor stories is necessary.
  - b. Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience  
*Criterion met.*
  - c. Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District  
*Criterion met.*
  - d. Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality  
*Criterion met.*
- 6. Loading Facility Permitted (rear) – front entry (requested)
  - a. Request is caused by unique site and circulation issues.  
*Criterion met.* Proposed entry along south side façade created traffic circulation issues, created the potential to damage a significant geological formation, and was proposed along a road that is not currently part of the Bridge Street Plan.
  - b. Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience  
*Criterion met.*
  - c. Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District  
*Criterion met.*
  - d. Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality  
*Criterion met.*
- 7. Entry for Parking within Building (rear entry) – front entry (requested) – Buildings 1 and 2
  - a. Request is caused by unique site and circulation issues.  
*Criterion met.* Proposed entry along south side façade created traffic circulation issues, created the potential to damage a significant geological formation, and was proposed along a road that is not currently part of the Bridge Street Plan.

- b. Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience  
*Criterion met.*
  - c. Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District  
*Criterion met.*
  - d. Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality  
*Criterion met.*
8. Entry for Parking within Building (rear entry) – front entry (requested) Buildings 2 and 3
- a. Request is caused by unique site and circulation issues.  
*Criterion met.* Proposed entry along south side façade created traffic circulation issues, created the potential to damage a significant geological formation, and was proposed along a road that is not currently part of the Bridge Street Plan.
  - b. Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience  
*Criterion met.*
  - c. Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District  
*Criterion met.*
  - d. Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality  
*Criterion met.*

## **PART IV: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Basic Site Plan**

The Administrative Review Team recommends **approval** to the Architectural Review Board for the request for Basic Site Plan Review with the following **6 conditions**:

- 1) The following details be presented with the Site Plan Review:
  - a. Architecture, landscaping, fencing, lighting, signs and other site development details or Building Type requirements noted as TBD or SPR in this report and attached analysis.
  - b. Detailed installation specifications for façade materials and material transitions, including material samples and section panels, be provided to ensure high-quality and durable construction, and addressing specific items as described in this report.
  - c. Color palettes for façade materials be incorporated.
- 2) Terminal vista elements be provided and detailed to meet the intent of the Code;

- 3) The applicant address Engineering's comments outlined in the report and as attached to this report, including traffic, access, stormwater and utility details.
- 4) 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;
- 5) Parking calculation shall be included, identifying retail, restaurant, office area and residential unit counts as well as counts and labels for standard, ADA, compact and non-standard spaces, along with justification for the additional spaces provided;
- 6) The applicant will demonstrate the feasibility of a public path adjacent to the Indian Run Creek. The final location will be coordinated through and approved by the Director of Parks.

### **Site Plan Waivers**

The Administrative Review Team recommends that the Architectural Review Board consider the following Basic Site Plan Waivers:

- 1) Loading Facility Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Apartment Building.
- 2) Entry for Parking within Building Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Apartment Building.
- 3) Maximum Building Height Permitted at 4.5 Stories (7 requested) – Apartment Building.
- 4) Parking within Building Permitted in Rear on 3 floors (5 requested) – Apartment Building.
- 5) Ground Story Height – 10 to 12 foot (14.16 requested) – Historic Mixed-Use Building
- 6) Loading Facility Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Historic Mixed Use Buildings.
- 7) Entry for Parking within Building Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Historic Mixed Use Buildings (1 and 2).
- 8) Entry for Parking within Building Permitted to Rear (front requested) – Historic Mixed Use Buildings (2 and 3).



**14-099BSP-BDP-ARB– BSC Historic Transition**  
 Bridge Park West

**ART ANALYSIS AND DETERMINATIONS – BASIC SITE PLAN**

*Applicable Site Plan Review Criteria*

Includes 153.059 - Uses, 153.062 – Building Types, 153.064 – Open Space Types, and 153.065 – Site Development Standards (Parking, Stormwater Management, Landscaping and Tree Preservation, Fencing Walls and Screening, Exterior Lighting, Utility Undergrounding, and Signs).

**153.059 – Uses**

Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
Table 153.059-A	Permitted and Conditional Uses	<b>Met.</b> All proposed Principal and Accessory Uses are permitted. The proposed Principal Uses are: Dwelling, Multiple-Family; Parks and Open Space; Eating and Drinking; Office, General; and Retail, General.
	Accessory Uses	<b>Met.</b> All proposed Accessory Uses are permitted. Parking, Structures are proposed as Accessory Uses to the proposed Principal Uses.

**153.062 – Building Types**

Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
(B)(3)	General Requirements	<b>Met. Zoning Districts:</b> Historic Mixed-Use building & Apartment building types are permitted in the BSC Historic Transition Neighborhood.
		<b>Met. Uses:</b> Proposed uses are permitted in the District and in the building types without further use restrictions or use specific standards.
		<b>Met. No Other Building Types:</b> Proposed buildings are generally consistent with the Historic Mixed-Use building & Apartment building types, based on the information submitted.
		<b>Met. Permanent Structures:</b> The proposed buildings are permanent structures.
		<b>N/A. Accessory Structures:</b> None proposed at this time.
(C)	General Building Type Layout and Relationships	<b>Met. Incompatible Building Types:</b> No building type incompatibilities are present.
		<b>N/A. Shopping Corridors:</b>
(D)(1)	Parapet Roof Type Requirements	<b>SPR. Parapet Height:</b> TBD
		<b>SPR. Parapet Wraps all Facades:</b> Except on pitch roof
		<b>SPR. Horizontal Shadow Lines:</b> Encouraged
		<b>SPR. Occupied Space:</b> None of the buildings with a parapet roof type incorporate occupied space or a half story within the roof.
(D)(2)	Pitched Roof Type	<b>SPR.</b> Southwest building

# 14-099BSP-BDP-ARB– BSC Historic Transition

## Bridge Park West

153.062 – Building Types		
Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
(D)(3)	Flat Roof Type Requirements	<b>SPR.</b> <i>Eaves:</i> Encouraged
		<b>SPR</b> <i>Interrupting Vertical Walls:</i>
(D)(4)	Towers	<b>Met with Waiver.</b> Quantity; only one tower allowed per building unless approved by the required reviewing body. – ART requested a gateway feature & a vista feature
		<b>Met.</b> Tower Height; Tower may exceed max bldg. height, tower shall not be greater than the height of one addition upper floor of the building to which the tower is applied.
(E)(1)	Façade Materials	<b>SPR.</b> TBD
(E)(2)	Façade Material Transitions	<b>SPR.</b> – Heavier material shall be incorporated below lighter material
(E)(3)	Roof Materials	<b>SPR.</b> – Standing seam will be utilized on pitched roofs.
(E)(4)	Color	<b>SPR.</b> TBD
(F)(1)	Entrances & Pedestrianways – Quantities and Locations	<b>See Building Type Requirements Tables for each Building</b>
(F)(2)	Recessed Entrances	<b>Met.</b> Minimum 3 feet from the property line
(F)(3)	Entrance Design	<b>Met.</b> Quantity and Location – 153.062(O)
(G)	Articulation of Stories on Street Façades	<b>Met.</b>
(H)	Windows, Shutters, Awnings, and Canopies	<b>SPR.</b> Materials, colors and details to be shown at final Site Plan.
(I)	Balconies, Porches, Stoops, and Chimneys	<b>SPR.</b> Materials, colors and details to be shown at final Site Plan.
(J)	Treatments at Terminal Vistas	<b>Met/SPR.</b> The intersection of the southern end of the Historic Mixed Use building and the western return of the Apartment building join at a Terminal Vista location. The proposed plans show a tower. The details of tower and open space treatment (trees, sculpture, fountain, etc.) will need to be provided with the final Site Plan.  Also note: The northern end of the Historic Mixed Use building fronting High Street is designated as a Gateway location.
(K)	Building Variety	<b>Met.</b> Building designs must vary from adjacent buildings by the type of dominant material (or color, scale or orientation of that material). Building designs must also vary through at least two of the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The proportion of recesses and projections</li> <li>(2) A change in the location of the entrance and window placement</li> <li>(3) Changes to the roof design, including roof type, plane, or material</li> </ul>

**14-099BSP-BDP-ARB– BSC Historic Transition**  
 Bridge Park West

153.062 – Building Types						
Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes				
		<b>SPR</b>				
		Adjacent Buildings	Dominant Material	Recesses and Projections	Entrance and Window Placement	Roof Design
			Required	2 of 3 Required		
		HMU	Brick/stone/glass	Yes	Yes	Pitched/Flat
		Apartment	Brick/glass	yes	yes	Parapet - flat
(M)	Signs	<b>SPR.</b> Sign details will need to be identified on the elevations for the final Site Plan.				
(N) & (O)	Individual Building Type Requirements	<b>SPR.</b> Street Frontage – occupation of RBZ by building, landscape, patio or streetscape treatment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Building areas</li> <li>– Height</li> <li>– Façade Requirements / Transparency</li> <li>– Façade Divisions</li> </ul>				

153.062(O) (3) – Apartment Building (Riverview Street)			
Building Type Requirements	Code Requirement	Provided	Met, N/A, Adm. Dep., Waiver, Other
Number of Principal Buildings Permitted (per Lot)	Multiple Permitted	one	<b>Met</b>
Front Property Line Coverage (%)	Min. 75%	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Occupation of Corner Required (Yes/No)	Yes	Building and Open Space	<b>Met</b>
Front Required Building Zone Required (range, ft.)	5-20 ft.	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Corner Side RBZ Required (range, ft.)	5-20 ft.	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Side Yard Setback Required (ft.)	5 ft.	Met	<b>Met</b>

**14-099BSP-BDP-ARB– BSC Historic Transition**  
**Bridge Park West**

<b>153.062(O) (3) – Apartment Building (Riverview Street)</b>			
Building Type Requirements	Code Requirement	Provided	Met, N/A, Adm. Dep., Waiver, Other
Rear Yard Setback Required (ft.)	5 ft.	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Minimum Lot Width Required (ft.)	50 ft.	522 ft.	<b>Met</b>
Maximum Lot Width Required (ft.)	None	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage (%)	70%	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Semi-Pervious Lot Coverage (%)	20%	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Parking Location	Rear Yard	Parking structure	<b>Met</b>
Loading Facility Permitted (location relative to principal structure)	Rear	Front	<b>Not Met - Waiver</b>
Entry for Parking within Building (relative to principal structure)	Rear & Side Façade;	Front (neighborhood street)	<b>Not Met - Waiver</b>
Minimum Building Height Permitted (ft.)	2 stories	7 stories	<b>Met</b>
Maximum Building Height Permitted (ft.)	4.5 stories	7 stories	<b>Not Met - Waiver</b>
Story Height	10 ft. Minimum 14 ft. Maximum	11.25 ft.	<b>Met</b>
Minimum Finished Floor Elevation Permitted (ft.)	2.5 above adjacent sidewalk	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Parking within Building	Permitted in rear of first 3 floors and fully in basement	Parking on 5 floors	<b>Not Met - Waiver</b>
Occupied Space	20ft. depth	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Ground Story Street Facing Transparency Required (%)	Minimum 20% transparency	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Transparency	Minimum 20% transparency	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Blank Wall Limitations (Yes/No)	Yes	No blank walls	<b>Met</b>
Non-Street Façade Transparency	Minimum 15% transparency	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Blank Wall Limitations (Yes/No)	Yes	No blank walls	<b>Met</b>
Principal Entrance Location Required (relative to principal structure)	Primary Street Façade of Building	Yes	<b>Met</b>
Number of Street Façade Entrances Required (per ft. of façade)	1 per 75 ft. of façade, minimum	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Number of Parking Lot Façade Entrances Required	Not required	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Mid-Building Pedestrianways Required (# per ft. of façade)	1 required for buildings over 250 ft.	Administrative Departure - Approved	<b>AD</b>

**14-099BSP-BDP-ARB– BSC Historic Transition**  
**Bridge Park West**

<b>153.062(O) (3) – Apartment Building (Riverview Street)</b>			
<b>Building Type Requirements</b>	<b>Code Requirement</b>	<b>Provided</b>	<b>Met, N/A, Adm. Dep., Waiver, Other</b>
Vertical Increments Required (location on principal structure)	No greater than every 40 ft.	Provided	<b>Met</b>
Horizontal Facade Divisions Required (per ft. of facade)	On buildings 3 stories or taller; within 3 ft. of the top of the ground story. Required at horizontal divisions of each floor	Provided	<b>Met</b>
Required Change in Roof Plane or Type	No greater than every 80 ft.	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Permitted Primary Materials (types)	Stone, brick, glass	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Roof Type(s) Permitted (types)	Parapet, Pitched, Flat	Parapet / Flat	<b>SPR</b>
Tower(s) Permitted (Yes/No)	Yes	One proposed	<b>Met</b>

<b>153.062(O)(9) – Historic Mixed Use (High Street Building)</b>			
<b>Building Type Requirements</b>	<b>Code Requirement</b>	<b>Provided</b>	<b>Met, N/A, Adm. Dep., Waiver, Other</b>
Number of Principal Buildings Permitted (per Lot)	Multiple Permitted	Three	<b>Met</b>
Front Property Line Coverage (%)	Min. 80%	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Occupation of Corner Required (Yes/No)	Yes	Patio	<b>Met</b>
Front Required Building Zone Required (range, ft.)	0-20 ft.	Met	<b>Met</b>
Corner Side RBZ Required (range, ft.)	0-10 ft.	TBD - varies	<b>SPR</b>
Side Yard Setback Required (ft.)	0 ft.	TBD - varies	<b>SPR</b>
Rear Yard Setback Required (ft.)	0 ft.	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Minimum Lot Width Required (ft.)	30 ft.	378 ft.	<b>Met</b>
Maximum Lot Width Required (ft.)	None	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage (%)	85%	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Semi-Pervious Lot Coverage (%)	5%	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Loading Facility Permitted (location relative to principal structure)	Rear	Front	<b>Not Met - Waiver</b>

**14-099BSP-BDP-ARB– BSC Historic Transition**  
**Bridge Park West**

<b>153.062(O)(9) – Historic Mixed Use (High Street Building)</b>			
Entry for Parking within Building (relative to principal structure)	Rear	Front	<b>Not Met - Waiver</b>
Minimum Building Height Permitted (ft.)	1.5 stories	2 stories	<b>Met</b>
Maximum Building Height Permitted (ft.)	2.5 stories	2.5 stories	<b>Met</b>
Ground Story Height	10 ft. Minimum 12 ft. Maximum	14.16 ft.	<b>Not Met - Waiver</b>
Upper Story Height	9 ft. Minimum 12 ft. Maximum	11.25 ft.	<b>Met</b>
Ground story – residential prohibited	Prohibited	None	<b>Met</b>
Upper story	No requirements	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Minimum Occupied Space Required (ft.)	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Parking within Building	Not permitted	None	<b>Met</b>
Ground Story Street Facing Transparency Required (%)	Minimum 40% transparency	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Upper Story Street Facing Transparency Required (%)	Minimum 20% transparency	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Non-Street Façade Transparency	Minimum 15% Transparency	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Blank Wall Limitations (Yes/No)	No	None Shown	<b>N/A</b>
Principal Entrance Location Required (relative to principal structure)	Primary Street Façade of Building	High Street	<b>Met</b>
Number of Street Façade Entrances Required (per ft. of façade)	1 per 40 ft. of façade, minimum	7 shown – not all within 40 ft. min. – Administrative Departure	<b>SPR</b>
Number of Parking Lot Façade Entrances Required	1 per 100 ft. of façade, minimum	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Mid-Building Pedestrianways Exempt 153.063 (3) (d)	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Vertical Increments Required (location on principal structure)	No greater than every 30 ft.	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Horizontal Façade Divisions Required (per ft of façade)	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Permitted Primary Materials (types)	Stone, brick, glass	TBD	<b>SPR</b>
Changes in Roof Plane/Type Required (per ft of façade)	At vertical divisions	Provided	<b>Met</b>
Roof Type(s) Permitted (types)	Parapet, Pitched, Flat	Pitched - Parapet & Flat with approval	<b>Met</b>
Tower(s) Permitted (Yes/No)	Yes	One – note height requirements a waiver may be required.	<b>Met</b>
Additional Requirements/Notes			

**14-099BSP-BDP-ARB– BSC Historic Transition**  
 Bridge Park West

153.064 – Open Space Types		
Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
(C)	Provision of Open Space	<p><b>SPR—Additional Information Needed.</b> 200 sq. ft. of publicly accessible open space is required for each dwelling unit, and 1 sq. ft. of publicly accessible open space per 50 sq. ft. of commercial space located within 660 feet of the main entrances of dwelling unit or commercial space. With 42 dwelling units and 32,650 sq. ft. of commercial space, .21 acres of open space is required.</p> <p>Need a waiver for the distance exceeding 660 feet from the main entrance, as proposed. However, additional open space types may be incorporated within a closer proximity to meet the requirements.</p>
(D)	Suitability of Open Spaces	<b>SPR—Additional Information Needed.</b>
€	Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space	<b>SPR – Additional Information Needed.</b>
(F), (G)	Open Space Types & General Requirements	<b>SPR—Additional Information Needed.</b>

153.065(B) – Site Development Standards – Parking and Loading		
Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
(1)(b)	Parking Location	<b>Met.</b> Provided on-site in structures of the buildings.
(2)	Required Vehicle Parking	<p><b>Not Met. SPR—Additional Information Needed.</b> Based on a total of 42 dwelling units (2 one bedroom units, 23 two bedroom units, 16 three bedroom units, and 1 four bedroom unit), 11,800 square feet of Eating &amp; Drinking use, 16,650 square feet of Office and 4,200 square feet of Retail use, a minimum of 244 and a maximum of 305 parking spaces are permitted.</p> <p>The proposal includes 280 parking spaces, which exceeds the permitted parking maximum, which will require a parking plan be submitted and reviewed.</p>
(3)	Required Bicycle Parking	<b>Met.</b> 21 bicycle parking spaces are required (one space for every 2 dwelling units), and based on 375 commercial parking spaces provided, 38 bicycle parking spaces are required (one space for every 10 required vehicular spaces for commercial uses), for a total bicycle parking space requirement of 39 spaces.
(4)	Off-Street Parking Space	<b>N/A.</b> None provided.

**14-099BSP-BDP-ARB– BSC Historic Transition**  
 Bridge Park West

**153.065(B) – Site Development Standards – Parking and Loading**

Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
	and Aisle Dimensions	
(5)	Parking Structure Design	<b>N/A.</b> Integrated
(6)	Surface Parking Lot and Loading Area Design and Construction	<b>N/A.</b>
(7)	Required Loading Spaces	<b>SPR.</b>

**153.065(C) – Site Development Standards – Stormwater Management**

Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
153.065 (C)	Stormwater Management	<b>SPR.</b> Insufficient details have been provided for Stormwater Management.

**153.065(D) – Site Development Standards – Landscaping & Tree Preservation**

Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
(2)	General Landscaping and Tree Preservation Req.	<b>SPR. <i>Tree Protection:</i></b> The applicant will need to submit a tree preservation plan as part of the Development Plan Review.
		<b>SPR. <i>Landscape Beds:</i></b> Landscape design details to be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review.
		<b>SPR. <i>Irrigation systems, Site Visibility Triangles, Use of a Landscape Architect to Prepare Plans:</i></b> Details to be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review.
(3)	Street Trees	<b>SPR. <i>Spacing and Location:</i></b> Details to be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review.
		<b>SPR. <i>Planting Details:</i></b> Details to be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review.
(6)	Required Building Zone (RBZ) Treatment	<b>SPR.</b> Landscape and Patio RBZ Treatment types shown, which appear to meet Code; however, additional landscaping will be required around the base of the podium parking garage. Additional landscape details will be required at Site Plan Review.
(7)	Foundation Planting	<b>SPR.</b> Additional landscape details will be required at Site Plan Review.

**14-099BSP-BDP-ARB– BSC Historic Transition**  
 Bridge Park West

**153.065(D) – Site Development Standards – Landscaping & Tree Preservation**

Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
(8)-(11)	Tree Preservation and Replacement	<b>SPR.</b> The applicant will be required to submit a tree survey, tree protection, and tree replacement plan demonstrating compliance with the applicable provisions of the Code. Details to be reviewed at the Site Plan Review.
<b>SPR :</b> Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.		

**153.065(E) – Site Development Standards – Fencing, Walls, and Screening**

Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
(1)	Fence and Wall Standards	<b>SPR</b> —Additional Detail Needed.
(3)	Screening	<b>SPR.</b> —Additional Detail Needed.
<b>SPR :</b> Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.		

**153.065(F) – Site Development Standards – Exterior Lighting**

Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
(3)	Exemptions	<b>SPR.</b> Details and lighting plan to be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review.
(4)	Fixture Power and Efficiency	<b>SPR.</b> Fixtures to be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review.
(5)-(8)	Shielding, Lighting Uniformity/Trespass, Light Poles	<b>SPR.</b> Lighting plan to be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review.
(9)-(10)	Wall & Canopy Lighting	<b>SPR.</b> To be reviewed as part of the Site Plan Review.
<b>SPR :</b> Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.		

**153.065(G) – Site Development Standards – Utility Underground**

Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
(G)	Utility Undergrounding	<b>SPR.</b>

**153.065(H) – Site Development Standards – Signs**

**14-099BSP-BDP-ARB– BSC Historic Transition**

Bridge Park West

Code Section	Requirement	Met/Notes
(H)	Signs	<b>SPR.</b> No sign information has been provided at this time. Proposed locations should be shown on the elevations.

***SPR:** Not enough information provided to determine if requirement is met. Details of this nature would be expected as part of the Site Plan Review. The proposal is required to meet Code, or request a Site Plan Waiver.*



**To:** Jenny Rauch, Senior Planner  
**From:** Barbara Cox, PE, Engineering Manager - Development  
**Date:** October 7, 2014  
**Re:** ART Case 14-099BSP/BDP/ARB - Bridge Park West, Building Z

Engineering has reviewed the drawings that were submitted on September 30, 2014, for the Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan review for the above-referenced project. At this time, we have the following comments and notes on this project (in no particular order).

### **General concerns**

1. Addressing for this project needs to be determined before building permits applications can be made.
2. The landscaping drawing LS1 included with the architectural drawings does not reflect the most current site plan for this project. I would use caution in forwarding with the rest of the documents – it will cause confusion since it is not reflective of information that is acceptable.
3. The division of responsibilities within the Development Agreement will have an effect on this plan.
4. The principal frontage street is not identified on a plan.
5. No signs are identified or proposed.
6. Trash services, mail delivery, fire department connections, meter locations and electric service components are all detailed items that will need to be continually addressed as the application moves forward.

### **Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan**

I have combined comments for these as most will apply to both packages of information.

Civil Site Drawings: Sheet 1 – No comments.

Civil Site Drawings: Sheet 2

1. What will the interim conditions be? Notes are needed to indicate what will be done to the site between demolition of the existing buildings and appurtenances and the construction of the new structure.
2. What will be done to eliminate erosion control issues for the areas where the buildings are removed?
3. Are the building foundations to be removed?
4. Please add clarification to the demolition of the lights and pavement of existing drive to the east and the limits of the removal of the existing water line
5. Please add a note that the existing sanitary sewer is to not be disturbed.
6. Update the adjacent property owners.
7. Please show and label the existing and proposed lines of the limits of the FEMA floodway and floodplain.

Civil Site Drawings: Sheets 3 & 4

1. Engineering's understanding of the street designations are:
  - a. North High Street is a corridor connector street and a principal frontage street (76-foot ROW). The street section will need to reflect the current MKSK design guidelines for this roadway.
  - b. North Riverview will be a neighborhood streets (65-foot ROW or 60-foot ROW with no carriage walk).
2. Turn lanes on North High Street for future 'Rock Cress' per the adopted Phasing Study are shown on the site plan.
3. Additional information is needed regarding the amount of turning traffic for the northern access point into the garage. This will aid in determining the left hand turn lane storage need on North High Street at this location. A turn lane is shown but the details will need to be verified.
4. We need to discuss with MKSK if the driveways into the garages are to be flared or curbed approaches.
5. Additional details regarding the structure of the building may be required by ODOT in order to vacate the existing highway easement.
6. Street lighting is to be provided on all public streets.
7. A determination should be made if transit/bus facilities are needed in this area along North High Street.
8. Sight distance triangles at the public street intersections need to be shown on the Site Plan in order to review the elements within those areas for compliance with visibility standards.
9. Please show and label the existing and proposed lines of the limits of the FEMA floodway and floodplain.
10. Update the adjacent property owners.
11. The locations of the parallel parking spaces near the intersections need to meet the AASHTO requirements (Section 4.20, Figure 4-26). This requires the parking to end 20 feet in advance of an intersection and a tapered (in a straight line) curb line over 8 feet (a 45° angle). A few spaces may be lost due to this.
12. Handicap accessible spaces are required for the parallel parking. None are shown in the current plan. A discussion with Building is needed to determine if the spaces within a garage are acceptable.
13. No allowance for any bicycle parking has been shown along the public streets.
14. A loading/valet area is shown along North High Street. The location of this seems appropriate and useful for the operation of the site. Additional details in future submissions will be needed on this regarding pavement markings and signage.
15. No fire access zones are identified.
16. Sidewalks are shown on both sides on all roadways that are proposed to be public. All hardscape elements included in the public right of way are to be constructed with materials that match the MKSK typology report.
17. Additional work will be needed to detail how the cross walks are designed. A special pavement treatment may be required.

## Civil Site Drawings: Sheet 5

### Sanitary

1. There is a public 36-inch sanitary sewer trunk which runs along the east side of the North High Street.
2. The plan indicates only one sanitary sewer service for this building and does not note a size. We will need additional information to determine if this service can accommodate the entire building. Also, a discussion will be needed to determine if interior lift stations will be needed.

### Water

1. This proposal includes the removal of an existing 6-inch water line. The limits need to be determined. The existing Approval for this must be gained from both Dublin and Columbus.
2. A 24-inch water line exists along the west edge of North High Street along the entire frontage of this project. A 16-inch water line also exists on the east side of North High Street at the southern corner of the project.
3. No new public water lines are proposed with this project.
4. The size of the proposed water service is not provided. We will need verification that use of the 6-inch line along the existing eastern driveway is adequate.
5. WTFD will need to verify that the placement of the Fire Department Connection is appropriate. They may also require an additional fire hydrant.

### Stormwater Management

1. No preliminary calculations have been submitted. There is an indication of the use of a bioretention swale in the dedicated open space area. This project has to provide water quality control if necessary based on the OEPA General Construction Permit requirements.
2. The drainage from the parking garage needs careful consideration especially in terms of where water will go if the interior drainage system is plugged (flood routing).
3. Storm sewers are proposed along the existing eastern driveway. If this roadway is going to be public, these should be coordinate with the drainage needs of the street.

### Floodplain

1. The current limits of the floodplain do not allow the construction of the proposed building in accordance with Chapter 151 of Dublin Code. All approvals through the zoning process will be conditional on the floodplain and floodway revisions proposed. Building permits cannot be issued until the final floodplain revisions are issued by FEMA.
2. Please show and label the existing and proposed lines of the limits of the FEMA floodway and floodplain.

### Grading

1. The proposed grading seems appropriate per the existing grades of the site. Since the surrounding public roadway system is not designed, these elevations may require additional measures to make the grading work.

Please let us know if you have any questions on the content of this memo.