



**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

DECEMBER 30, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Rodney Barnes, Police Sergeant; and Laura Ball, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; Logan Stang, Planning Assistant; Nicole Martin, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Greg Briya, Moody Nolan; John Woods, MKSK; and Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T.

Others Present: Dan Phillabaum, dp planning & design, llc; consultant to the ART.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 18, 2014, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

**1. Pre-Application Review (Bridge Street District) – BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development
Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for non-binding review of a future application for a new mixed-use development on a 30.9-acre site at the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and West Dublin-Granville Road. She said the proposal includes new public streets and nine blocks for development for the overall site, with eight mixed-use buildings containing 372 housing units and 260,000 square feet of commercial (office, retail, restaurant). She said this is a request for pre-application review prior to submission of an application for Basic Plan Review (Basic Development Plan Review and Basic Site Plan Review) and a Preliminary Plat in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(C). She said the purpose of the pre-application review meeting is to provide the applicant with a non-binding and informal review of the development proposal, and information on the procedures and policies of the City including application review procedures that may be used.

Ms. Ray said Dan Phillabaum, dp planning & design, did a preliminary review of the building type plans, and was present to provide comments. She reiterated the anticipated project schedule, with the ART making their recommendation to City Council by the January 8th ART meeting, which would allow as much time as possible for Council to review the materials before their meeting. She requested that the ART members submit their comments by Monday, January 5, 2015.

Ms. Ray said General Staff reviewed this application December 23rd with a focus on general architecture comments. She said that following the General Staff meeting, she compiled the comments along with her preliminary Code analysis into a set of notes to discuss at this ART meeting.

Ms. Ray began reviewing the Pre-Application Review Note sheets provided. She pointed out that everything noted with a "DPR" or "SPR" on the tables MUST be addressed at the Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews as well as for the next ART meeting, but were noted at this point to make sure the applicant was aware of the additional information that would be expected. She said the following **clarifications** need to be made prior to review by City Council:

- Proposed uses and square footage need to match between the architectural plans and the data included on Illustrative Elevation cover sheets/civil drawing sets;
- Signs shown on the renderings should be removed or reconfigured to eliminate signs for actual businesses;
- Block size calculations for Lots 6 and 9 should include the greenway and justifications for the block adjustment Waiver should be added;
- Line work on the plans adjacent to the greenway in Lots 6 and 9 need to be cleaned up; and
- Locations of building entrances need to match between the plans and elevations.

Ms. Ray highlighted changes needed for the **Basic Development Plan/Preliminary Plat**:

- Crosswalks should be shown at Bridge Park Avenue and Longshore Street, since pedestrians are likely to cross at that location anyway;

Brian Quackenbush explained how the grading increases at varying degrees in this area, but agreed that the plans could be modified to include the crosswalks if desired by the City.

Barb Cox agreed the crosswalks were appropriate.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Verify that turning radii will be acceptable for truck access to trash compactors;
- Consider adding motorcycle parking in the odd areas/parking spaces across from vehicular access drives to parking structures;
- Add parking to the south side of Banker Drive between Riverside Drive and Mooney Street, but no on-street parking on Banker Drive in areas due to the steep grade is acceptable; and
- Future right-of-way will need to be dedicated for Banker Drive with the development of Lot 1 and/or Lot 7 along with an access easement in the short-term providing turf instead of tree grates.

Ms. Ray added that even though on-street parking may not be practical due to the grades, street trees should be provided on the north side for the section between Mooney Street and Dale Drive.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Show all crosswalks (particularly around the edges of the Development Plan site area) and details will be needed at the Development Plan Review for Lots as they are developed.

Steve Langworthy asked whether overhead pedestrian crossing signs were needed within the Bridge Park Avenue right-of-way, or if that was something that would be installed later. Ms. Cox suggested this be discussed with Jeanne Willis as this is not a requirement. She said these are typically only installed later if a problem is identified.

Ms. Ray highlighted changes needed for the **Basic Site Plan**:

- **Uses**

- The number of dwelling units should match between the required parking table and site data block;
- Square footage needs to be noted as they vary within a building as well as across the different buildings as this affects the parking space requirement; and

- Uses such as Personal Services and Leasing Offices need to be identified with on the spreadsheet listing the proposed uses, as it affects the parking requirements.

Ms. Ray asked about the range of unit sizes across the project. She noted that although this was not a Code requirement, she was interested if all of the one-bedroom units, for example, were the same size among the different buildings. She thought there was interest in the community about the range of dwelling units, and a desire that the units with the same number of bedrooms should not be identical across the site.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, stated that there was a great variety in unit types and sizes, as well as price points. He said for example, a one bedroom unit facing Riverside Drive and the Scioto River is going to be more expensive and could be larger overall than a one bedroom unit elsewhere on the site, and the same goes for units with two and three bedrooms.

- **Architecture**

- Corners of Buildings B2 and C2 need more attention;

Ms. Ray stated that a lot of discussion on these two buildings, and particularly the southwest corner of building C2, had already occurred, but she wanted to reiterate that with the Site Plan application for these buildings, the corner would need to be even more special and detailed since they function as a terminal vista from the pedestrian bridge. She noted that although there is a protruding tower element on the upper stories, she pointed out that at ground level, the space is recessed, which seems to detract from the prominence of the corner. She said she understood the desire to create patio space in that area, but she was concerned with what was happening at ground level.

Ray Harpham suggested that the two corners have a relationship to one another in terms of design. Mr. Yoder suggested a "twin towers look" but not identical towers.

Joanne Shelly suggested concentrating on the street level.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Pay particular attention to the articulation of the first floor(s)/below the expression lines of each building to show details and activity of storefront character, pedestrian entrances, signs, and placemaking;

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, said the storefront details are usually determined when the tenant moves in. Mr. Yoder added that some will come over time. He said the desire is that the basic storefront will not be bland but will evolve over time.

Jeff Tyler recommended focusing on framing the storefront areas to achieve consistency, while allowing for each space to be individualized. Ms. Shelly said a "story" needs to be created for current and future tenants. Ms. Ray suggested the applicant be prepared to define a "basic package" of what a vacant tenant space would look like, and to what extent an individualized tenant space could be modified.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Add more pedestrian entrances on all of the buildings, especially the south elevation of building C2 facing Bridge Park Avenue, and the parking structures. She said this will provide an opportunity to eliminate some of the preliminarily identified Waivers and achieve greater pedestrian connectivity through the site;
- Consider applying color through the use of lighting for parking garages to maintain flexibility over time rather than coloring the actual materials;

Mr. Yoder agreed and said they would revise the renderings to show the colored lighting effects rather than colored mesh.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Provide more information about the "open" sky bridges and proposed materials;

Mr. Yoder explained the current elevations. He said there is an arch with a railing that is higher than normal as the railing reaches 48 inches to prevent a pedestrian from falling. Mr. Briya showed a detailed rendering of the proposed sky bridges.

Mr. Harpham was concerned about debris being dropped off the sky bridges, and did not believe 48 inches would be nearly high enough. Mr. Briya said the bridges are private and not open to the general public. Mr. Harpham said there is still a problem of casual debris such as a coffee cup being dropped and rolls off to land on the pedestrians below. Mr. Briya said there would be a four-inch kick plate at the floor.

Ms. Cox said this was an important issue because the sky bridges are proposed to span public rights-of-way. She said if they are going to be approved, they need to be designed to deter climbing, jumping, and items from being thrown or dropped.

Colleen Gilger inquired about building code or ODOT requirements for sky bridges.

Fred Hahn asked if requirements for sky bridges need to reach the ODOT level, as those are quite extensive and not usually very attractive.

Different examples of designs for alternative sky bridges were shown and discussed. Ms. Cox said a roof would prevent people from climbing over a high railing. Mr. Yoder said they were not considering a roof.

Sergeant Rod Barnes said from a security perspective, the City of Dublin has not had a history of problems with the roadway overpasses, so he predicted it would not be too big of an issue here.

Dan Phillabaum noted plexiglass was used in some examples.

Mr. Yoder stated they would be prepared to show several images to Council to help them understand what is being proposed. Mr. Tyler recommended the applicant show in the narrative their intent for preventing jumping, climbing, and throwing debris.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Provide highly detailed elevations for the facades framing the mid-block open spaces;
- Provide elevations with coded notes and window schedules to confirm transparency and material requirements;
- Provide impervious/semi-pervious material coverage;
- Confirm occupant load for roof terraces for the Fire Department;
- Demonstrate quality and installation of the EIFS cladding material as it is not permitted as a primary or secondary material;

Ms. Ray said a Waiver would need to be requested for EIFS to even be considered as a material, and would need to be justified in terms of providing proof of quality, durability, appearance and installation details.

Mr. Yoder said it is to some degree an issue of budget. He requested consideration of their attempt to spend more on materials at ground level and the lower stories and using materials like EIFS on the upper stories where they will only ever be visible from a distance.

Mr. Harpham said a narrative and specifications for how the materials are used and how they will age over time would be needed. He suggested pictures of local successful projects that show aging of 10 – 20 years.

Mr. Yoder confirmed no stucco would be used but rather the EIFS product only.

Ms. Ray continued:

- Provide information that will speak to the quality of the proposed vinyl windows; and
- Provide additional information about Arriscraft units – cut sheets and installation details that include depth of panels, salt tolerance, and dirt/stain resistance.

Mr. Yoder said Arriscraft is used like brick and is better than limestone for durability. Mr. Briya clarified it is a veneer product, a cultured stone and said he would provide manufacturer literature.

Ms. Ray continued:

- ***Buildings***

- Seek Waiver at Basic Site Plan Review for **Lot 1** as a Commercial Center building type is not permitted;
- **B1** - Provide elevations facing rooftop gardens; show a circulation area or unit on the northeast corner of Level 4
- **B2** - Provide elevations facing rooftop gardens;
- **B3** – See Waivers;
- **B4** – Provide pedestrian entrances; residential parking speed ramp controls for upper levels; identify elevators;
- **C1** - Provide elevations facing rooftop gardens; identify the building as a Mixed-Use building and not a Corridor Building; add missing sky bridge to elevation;
- **C2** – Administrative Departure needed as uppermost story exceeds maximum permitted story height; provide pedestrian entrances on Bridge Park Avenue – show structure where doors could go even though tenants will change; revise key plan on all elevations;
- **C3** - See Waivers;
- **C4** – Provide dwelling unit doors from the circulation corridors;
- **All** - Provide better pedestrian access to the garages;
- **All** - Indicate sizes of elevators to show regular size vs the freight elevator size at 4,500 pounds – big enough to accommodate furniture being moved; and
- **B3** and **C3** - Clean up the discrepancies on the Waivers.

- ***Open space***

- Describe the look and feel from a 3-dimensional perspective, especially the screening of transformers and provide utility screen dimensions;
- Demonstrate how live plants will receive sunlight;
- Illustrate how quality open spaces will evolve over time in a plain/simple manner to allow for opportunities showing design flexibility for the future and include paving materials;
- Provide plans for stormwater, including roof gardens, which all should be different building to building to encourage residents to visit the various rooftops for different vistas, lighting opportunities, fun and interest;
- Consider Wi-Fi in pedestrian open spaces, not just in the streets;
- Consider a fee-in-lieu mechanism built into the Development Agreement to allow the “greenway” to function as a park;
- Seek Waivers for three of the proposed pocket plazas or modify the plans, as they do not meet open space requirements;
- Clarify frontage percentage calculations;
- Consider changing public seating areas on Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive;
- Consider interactive art pieces that can be touched or played on; and

- Look at the open spaces holistically providing framing and suitability.

Sergeant Barnes stated the Police would like to see designs that incorporate principles of CPTED (“Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design”), such as low plantings, good lighting, limited walls and screens, etc.

- ***Parking***

- Verify bike parking and plan to show how additional required bicycle parking will be incorporated into the streetscape; and
- Parking spaces along Dale Drive should not be counted.

- ***Right-of-way encroachments***

- Area wells for garage exhaust; and
- Sky bridges over Longshore Street.

Ms. Cox stated the right-of-way encroachments would need to be noted on the plat and/or addressed through a right-of-way encroachment agreement.

Ms. Gilger inquired about retail space size since they are all shown as full floors without demising walls. She asked if the office space could be divided. Mr. Yoder replied the office and retail spaces could be demised and there are no predefined minimum sizes.

Sergeant Barnes noted that staff had discussed the possibility of locating a police substation in this area, allowing for a better police presence. He stated his other concerns at this point are that there are places to lock up bikes, and the more lighting, the better.

Ms. Ray continued:

- ***Utility Undergrounding***

- Transformers and Fire Department connections will remain above ground; water meters will be applied to the sides of buildings; and electrical lines will be below ground.

Ms. Cox inquired about plans for oil separators for the restaurants.

Ms. Shelly confirmed recycling facilities were also planned.

Ms. Ray continued:

- ***Possible BSP Waivers***

- Prepare a rationale in support of the proposal for each of the 19 Waivers identified:
 - **Pocket Plaza 1:** Exceeds maximum area
 - **Pocket Park 2:** Too small for a Pocket Park; too big for a Pocket Plaza
 - **Pocket Park 3:** Too small for a Pocket Plaza
 - **Lots 3 and 5:** Blocks exceed 400 feet in length, requiring a mid-block pedestrianway in the middle third of the block (pedestrianways have been provided but are not located in the middle third of these blocks)
 - **Building Type:** Stucco and EIFS are both designated as cladding materials on portions of the buildings and are not permitted as primary or secondary cladding materials. EIFS is only permitted for trim.
 - **B1 Façade Requirements:** Missing two entrances on the North Elevation
 - **B1 Façade Requirements:** Exceeds 250 feet in length, requiring mid-building pedestrianway (Could be an Administrative Departure at 268 feet)
 - **B2 Façade Requirements:** Missing one entrance on the South Elevation
 - **B3 Ground Story Height:** West Elevation (22 feet) and East Elevation (14 feet) exceed maximum height of 16 feet.

- **B3 Façade Requirements:** Missing two entrances on East Elevation
- **B4 Building Siting:** East (Mooney) and south (Banker) elevations are forward of the 5-25-foot Required Building Zone for parking structures
- **B4 Façade Requirements:** Missing two entrances on the West Elevation, missing two entrances on the South Elevation, and missing five entrances on the East Elevation
- **C1 Height:** Ground story height exceeds 16-foot Corridor Building maximum
- **C1 Façade Requirements:** Missing one entrance on the North and South Elevations
- **C2 Façade Requirements:** Missing one entrance on the South and North Elevations
- **C3 Ground Story Height:** West Elevation height (21 feet) and East Elevation height (14 feet) exceed maximum height of 16 feet
- **C3 Façade Requirements:** Missing two entrances on the South Elevation, missing two entrances on the East Elevation, and missing one entrance on the North Elevation
- **C4 Building Siting:** West (Longshore Street) and north (Tuller Ridge) elevations are forward or partially forward of the 5-25-foot Required Building Zone for parking structures
- **C4 Façade Requirements:** Missing one entrance on the South Elevation, missing two entrances on the East Elevation, missing three entrances on the West Elevation, and missing one entrance on the North Elevation

Mr. Briya asked if the graphic material boards should be modified. Ms. Ray reiterated that she would like to receive all revised documents and materials from the applicant and all ART staff comments by 5:00 pm on Monday, January 5th so she can finalize the ART report for the January 8th ART meeting.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [Hearing none.] He said with respect to the ART report for the Bridge Park project, he suggested dividing the report, and particularly the proposed Waivers, by block and/or building type. He said given the fact that this project covers eight blocks, not that many Waivers have been requested. He suggested formatting the Waivers block-by-block and also requested that the ART Report be more unified and topic driven rather than delineated by department for the comments.

Mr. Langworthy adjourned the meeting at 3:55 pm.