



**Land Use and Long  
Range Planning**

5800 Shier Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236  
phone 614.410.4600  
fax 614.410.4747  
[www.dublinohiousa.gov](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

**ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**MARCH 12, 2015**

**ART Members and Designees:** Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Jeremiah Gracia, Economic Development Administrator.

**Other Staff:**; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jenny Rauch, Senior Planner; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

**Applicants:** Nelson Yoder and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Brian Quackenbush and James Peltier, EMH&T; and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan (Case 3).

Gary Gunderman called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the March 5, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

**DETERMINATION**

**1. BSD Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center**

**Average Joe's Pub & Grill – Sign  
6711 Dublin Center Drive  
Minor Project Review**

**15-020MPR**

Marie Downie said this is a request for installation of a new 20.75-square-foot wall sign for a restaurant tenant in the Dublin Village Center shopping center, east of Village Parkway and south of Tuller Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Downie said the applicant removed the projecting sign from the application since the last time this was reviewed by the ART, and are exploring their options for that sign as part of a future application.

Dave Marshall inquired about the color of the channel returns as the graphic did not clearly illustrate them. Ms. Downie said the color was not specified and would make it a condition of approval that the color is black to match the outline of the lettering.

Gary Gunderman asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns with regard to this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended with one condition:

- 1) That the channel returns are black, consistent with the outline of the proposed sign lettering.

Mr. Gunderman confirmed the ART's approval of this application for Minor Project Review.

## INTRODUCTION

**2. BSD Indian Run Neighborhood District – OCLC – Sign 6565 Kilgour Place  
15-021MPR Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for replacement of an existing corporate office sign facing I-270 with a new 184-square-foot sign. She said this is review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray presented the existing sign as well as the proposed sign. She noted that the letters may appear large but that they comply with the Interstate District sign regulations applicable to all signs facing I-270, not just limited to signs in the Bridge Street District. She asked the ART if there were any questions with regard to this application. [There were none.]

Gary Gunderman said an ART determination is expected at the next ART meeting on March 19, 2015.

## CASE REVIEW

**3. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park – Phase 1 (C Block)  
15-018 DP-BSD/SP-BSD Riverside Drive and Dale Drive  
Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 149 dwelling units, 98,700 square feet of office uses, 48,900 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 864-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Ray provided a handout with the ART's preliminary analysis for the Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews that included Code specific requirement tables to highlight issues still to be resolved.

### Development Plan

Ms. Ray said she expected the detailed comments on the public improvement plans by the end of this week/early next week of March 16<sup>th</sup> since the comments on the public improvements will equally apply to this application.

Ms. Ray identified four **Public Improvement** items to be discussed:

- A minimum of one ADA space per street segment on each side of the street near crossings/mid-block crossings was needed. She said one on Bridge Park Avenue between Longshore Street and Mooney Street would be sufficient. She said ADA ramps were also required.

Aaron Stanford added that the spaces and ramps needed to be appropriately dispersed throughout the development.

- Crosswalks should be specified to match the BSD Streetscape Design Guidelines and mid-block crossings should have brick pavers or an otherwise different material to call attention to them for motorists and pedestrians.
- An additional crosswalk was needed at the fourth leg of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Longshore Street.

- Motorcycle parking spaces needed to be provided where room was available along the streetscape. She said the spaces should be approximately four feet by nine feet and installed with the same brick pavers. She suggested the applicant consider areas where there was not sufficient space for a full motor vehicle but could accommodate motorcycles.

Ms. Ray identified three **Right-of-Way Encroachment** items to be discussed:

- Doors are not permitted to encroach in the right-of-way. Code requires a minimum recess of three feet.
- Canopies may be acceptable if they meet the minimum height clearance of eight feet.
- Balconies and building elements are being reviewed with Legal.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, said there was a case to be made for the doors that were not in the shopping corridor and to the right of intersections.

Ms. Ray said the applicant would have to demonstrate adequate space to accommodate the doors to support a potential Waiver. She said five feet is the acceptable space permitted for the door swing while maintaining adequate sidewalk width.

Joanne Shelly suggested using a sliding door as an option.

#### Site Plan

Ms. Ray provided some **general comments** per the ART's analysis:

- All plans (especially architectural plans) should be numbered.
- Ground floor uses should be labeled on all plans shown.
- Streets should be labeled if a right-of-way is visible on any plan or rendering.
- Scale is off on many of the architectural plans.
- Narratives should be provided on 8.5 by 11 inch paper, not full sized plans for Building Variety, Gateways, Waivers, and Alternative Material Statements, etc.
- The overall use area tables on the cover page for each building do not match the square footages for each floor plan, i.e. should show total circulation, service, amenity, patio, and consistent use of retail and/or food and beverage.

Ms. Ray discussed **Waivers** in general:

- Need to specify which Waivers apply to which elevations and which floor/level for each building.
- All rationales are insufficient that state "maximum transparency is provided adequate to the design and programmatic functions at this level" or similar.

Ms. Ray recommended the elimination of as many Waivers as possible; the ART is not convinced the issues cannot be resolved at this time. She said more information is needed. Ms. Ray emphasized after the applicant takes another look at the buildings and the Code requirements, the final list of Waivers need to meet the four **Waiver criteria**:

- Request is caused by unique site, use or other circumstances
- Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience
- Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District
- Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality

Ms. Ray referred to the highlighted areas in the handout and explained those items need to be addressed by the applicant. She said the applicant should consider what issues can be eliminated and to provide

more information where requested. She emphasized that all details need to be worked out prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Ms. Ray discussed **Site Operations**:

- Valet Service
- Waste Removal

Ms. Ray asked if valet spaces would be provided in the parking garage, the parking spaces would need to be identified (label and counts) for which will be public, which will be private, and which would be designated valet spaces. She asked where valet stops would be located along the streetscape.

Jeff Tyler said the applicant needs to specify the types of parking in parking garages, i.e. compact vehicles, ADA, etc.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the special electric, compact, and ADA spaces have been identified and will show the labels and counts on the plan. He said valet service may be considered if certain tenants request it but to date, no tenants have requested valet service. He said possible valet stops could be provided along Longshore Street in front of Building C2; and north of Building C1 but has not had the opportunity to identify such stops.

Mr. Tyler suggested the applicant provide information on the intent of operations for valet service as this has been a recent issue for other areas of the City.

Ms. Ray said a Parking Plan is needed to address the parking, which is short of meeting the Code requirement since the plans show the parking counts on both sides of the street (only the sides immediately adjacent to this phase count toward meeting this phase's parking requirements). She stated that parking functions need to be described, and valet parking needs to be factored into the total numbers.

Mr. Yoder explained for waste management that a central collection point has been established with a trash compactor and permits were being pursued. He said office and retail trash is collected by the staff of that tenant and brought to this location. He said this would be no different than having dumpsters in the parking lot.

Ms. Ray said the trash strategy needed to be explained in a document from a property management standpoint.

Joanne Shelly inquired about waste removal and transportation between buildings during inclement weather or when there was snow and ice on the ground. She recalled the consideration of wheeling little carts around, which would need to go across the street and down the sidewalk. She asked why trash is not internal to each building.

Mr. Yoder said it was not a Code requirement to have trash next to each building and one compactor was better. He said the applicant considered remote compactors but decided this plan was best when trash trucks were considered going in/out of the site and the noise the trucks would produce.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, added if there was not the central collection point there would be dumpsters and compactors all throughout the site.

Gary Gunderman inquired if buildings were sold off to separate developers, what those buildings were to do for waste management. Mr. Yoder said any and all buildings would still have access to that central location; it would be a matter of easements.

Ms. Ray said the plan would need to be written to address when buildings are sold to other developers.

Ms. Ray discussed **Open Space**:

- This plan requires approval of a fee-in-lieu of open space dedication.
- Pocket Plazas along Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive are needed to be consistent with the approved Basic Site Plan.
- Staff will provide recommended species replacements and other details for landscaping.
- Door swings from the building onto the ramps and adjacent walkways do not meet ADA accessibility requirements.
- Placement and accessibility of the fire department connection (FDC) in the Pavilion and the FDC adjacent to the Mews are too close to the adjacent tree planters.

Ms. Ray said the applicant needs to demonstrate that there is the required clear space for the streetscape and need to determine a “worst case scenario” for patio fencing.

Mr. Yoder asked for an alternative to the current cycle track locations. He said that cycle tracks were not necessary for the main shopping corridor and thought bicyclists could be re-routed around Bridge Park Avenue onto West Dublin-Granville Road and the roundabout. He said he was concerned that there would be adequate space for both cyclists and pedestrians to share and was considering an alternative solution.

Claudia Husak questioned this concern since the topic had already been discussed and determined by City Council with the Basic Development Plan and Preliminary Plat, which Council approved on Monday of this week.

Ms. Ray added that she appreciates what the applicant is saying but it was too late to make those changes and Staff’s position was to be consistent with all plans. She suggested that if the applicant was concerned, buildings could be moved back to accommodate adequate space.

Ms. Ray emphasized the need for a streetscape exhibit that shows cyclists and pedestrians sharing the same spaces. She noted the conflict with doorways for ADA accessibility for the Mews and the Pavilion open spaces.

Mr. Tyler recommended that the applicant explore alternative door options.

Ms. Ray said the FDC was not shown on the plan and proximity to the planter is an issue for the Mews open space.

Alan Perkins explained that the concern for the FDC location was that the trees might be planted far enough away but future tree growth could obstruct visibility and accessibility. He said FDC identification signs were also required and in detail. Mr. Perkins noted the distance of the fire hydrant to Building C1 was okay but there are potential issues for accessing it with the configuration of the Pavilion open space. Again, he said, planting beds obstruct the hydrant.

Ms. Ray discussed **Lot Coverage**:

- Provide semi-pervious coverage percentages and details (either inside of ROW or on Building Terraces).
- Provide more information:
  - **Parcel 2** (Buildings C3 & C4) = 93.27% Impervious Coverage
    - Parking Structure permits maximum 80% impervious coverage with additional 10% semi-pervious coverage

- Corridor Building permits maximum 80% impervious coverage with additional 10% semi-pervious coverage
- **Parcel 3** (Buildings C1 & C2) = 90.13% Impervious Coverage
  - Mixed-Use Building permits maximum 85% impervious coverage with additional 10% semi-pervious coverage
  - Corridor Building permits maximum 80% impervious coverage with additional 10% semi-pervious coverage

Ms. Ray said a **Lighting Plan** needed to be submitted. Mr. Quackenbush said a lighting plan was submitted. Ms. Ray specified that the lumen/power level needed to be identified for building light fixtures and compliant with Code Section 153.065(F).

Ms. Ray discussed **Tree Removal/Replacement**:

- Show what is required, per Code Section 153.065(D) Tree calculations not shown.

Mr. Quackenbush said they have tree replacement information. Ms. Ray specified that overall project calculations were not included and the total bottom line per open space was needed.

Ms. Ray referred to the extensive list of items in the Building section and highlighted several items:

Ms. Ray discussed **Pedestrian Bridges**:

- Need details including appearance of undersides, lighting, interiors, etc.
- Open design needs to be modified as noted at the Basic Site Plan – the design of these bridges must discourage jumping, climbing, and the throwing of debris.

Ms. Ray emphasized the need to accomplish the design objective.

Mr. Stanford asked if lighting elements had been incorporated. Mr. Tyler said the lighting needed to be functional but aesthetically pleasing as well.

Mr. Yoder said the applicant is enclosing the bottom of the bridge and will make sure they are exceeding the Code requirement. Ms. Umbarger said the railing height had been increased.

Mr. Yoder said the objective was to prevent the pedestrians crossing the bridge to be disconnected from the activity below.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said that was the way he presented to City Council as well.

Ms. Ray said the expectation was that the pedestrian bridges be as “cool and interesting” as possible with a lot more detail. She said the design was not where it needed to be to move forward.

Ms. Umbarger said the details were in the construction documents. Ms. Ray explained that that level of detail needed to be in this set of plans; the construction documents act as backup material, not part of a submittal. She said normally Staff would have all of that information at this stage.

Ms. Ray discussed **Alternative Materials**:

- More information is needed such as specifics on installation details, inspection commitments, warranty information, and examples with better/non-blurry pictures that indicate the approximate age of the product.

Ms. Ray said Staff appreciates what has been received from the applicant so far but information about installation, quality, or depth have not been provided and emphasized the need for details. She suggested that the applicants attend the Commission meeting that evening to hear the case for Tuller Flats as they are also trying to introduce alternative materials.

Mr. Tyler added that the ART has had this same issue with the Tuller Flats applicants as they are with the current applicant regarding alternative materials. He said Staff has been emphasizing the need for detailed information to actually review to enable a recommendation to the PZC. He said it is difficult to make a case for alternative materials that depart from Code. He explained that the Commission will ask the ART if the ART supports the materials; therefore the applicants need to work toward an ART recommendation of approval as the first step.

Ms. Shelly read from Code "Other high quality synthetic materials may be approved as permitted primary or secondary materials by the required reviewing body with examples of successful high quality installations in comparable climates." Ms. Shelly emphasized that Staff's objective is to help the applicant meet the requirement. Ms. Umbarger said the applicant is trying to comply, but they are not sure what Staff expects them to submit in support of the alternative materials.

The ART critiqued the photo examples the applicant provided and asked for close-up photos of the materials as they have been used. The ART asked that the photos are identified better to show where the projects are located. Mr. Tyler recommended that the Convention Center photos be eliminated from the examples.

Mr. Yoder said he understood what the ART is asking and will show detailing.

Ms. Ray concluded there are numerous items in the Building section to work through and she emphasized that the applicant review the tables where she highlighted the need for clarifications, etc. She supplied the applicant with the Site Plan that included her mark-ups.

Mr. Yoder said he is supporting brick but inquired about cementitious material as a secondary material. Mr. Tyler said cementitious material could be used as a secondary material for their project.

Mr. Ray said she approved of the applicant's plan of intent, architecturally. She said this application will continue to be reviewed by the ART at the next two meetings and a recommendation is scheduled for March 26, 2015, which would require the applicant to submit final plans by March 23<sup>rd</sup>. She explained this will enable the application to be forwarded to the PZC for their meeting on April 9<sup>th</sup>.

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

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Mr. Gunderman asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.]

Mr. Gunderman adjourned the meeting at 3:02 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team March 19, 2015.