



**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**

**APRIL 9, 2015**

**ART Members and Designees:** Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; and Laura Ball, Landscape Architect.

**Other Staff:** Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jenny Rauch, Senior Planner; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Tammy Noble-Flading, Senior Planner; Marie Downie, Planner I; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

**Applicants:** Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Brian Quackenbush and James Peltier, EMH&T; Mike Burmeister and Greg Lonergan, OHM Advisors; Vern Hoying and Jason Hartke, Bracket Builders (Case 3).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the April 2, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

**DETERMINATIONS**

**1. BSD Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – Studio J – Sign  
15-027MPR 4505 West Dublin-Granville Road  
Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for an installation of a new 41.9-square-foot wall sign for a new retail tenant in the Shoppes at River Ridge shopping center on the south side of West Dublin-Granville Road at the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.065(H) and under the provisions of Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Ray presented the site and the new furniture store that occupies the tenant space. She presented the proposed wall sign with an overall height of 15 feet from grade. She presented the proposed sign as it will be seen during daytime/nighttime with dark green channel lettering with teal translucent vinyl to create a teal halo illumination.

Ms. Ray said there have been no changes since meeting with the ART last week. With the removal of the two center awnings, she said the proposed sign integrates into the architecture by centering the proposed wall sign over the main entrance. She said the sign coordinates with the remaining two awnings that are green with vertical white stripes. She said the proposed sign meets applicable zoning regulations for sign number, size, color, and height. Therefore, she said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or comments. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this Minor Project Review with no conditions.

**2. BSD Historic Core – Keller Williams – Sign  
15-028ARB-MPR 14 South High Street  
Minor Project Review**

Tammy Noble-Flading said this is a request for a replacement of an existing projecting sign with a new 7-square-foot sign. She said the office building is on the east side of South High Street, south of Bridge

Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Noble-Flading presented the proposed projecting sign for the Keller Williams real estate office and The Close Connection. She said the applicant plans to use the existing scroll metal brackets to hang the sign from the existing location. She said the sign design had been changed since receiving the ART's comments last week. She described the sign created in the shape of a house, with a raised border, text, and logo created by the client. She said the text, logos, and border are black, and the background color is white.

Ms. Noble-Flading said the proposed sign meets height and size requirements.

Colleen Gilger said she was concerned about legibility of the text with a smaller font including both company names. Ms. Noble-Flading said the applicant was adamant about keeping both names on the same sign.

Jennifer Rauch said the changes consolidated the information and the font style is similar, which is the direction provided by ART.

Steve Langworthy said it is a pedestrian scale sign.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were issues with the projecting sign encroaching into the right-of-way. Aaron Stanford confirmed there were not.

Ms. Noble-Flading said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board of this request for a Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant verifies the sign is located within six feet of the principal entrance, as measured horizontally along the building façade at sign permitting; and
- 2) That the applicant verifies that the height of the sign will not extend above the sill of the second story window at sign permitting.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or comments regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated that a recommendation of approval will be forwarded to the ARB for their meeting on April 15, 2015.

**3. BSD Historic Transition – Bridge Park West  
15-014ARB-SP**

**94-100 North High Street  
Site Plan Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for a two and a half story mixed-use commercial development and 42 condominium units in a seven-story building with associated parking and site improvements. She said the site is on the east side of North High Street approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for this application for Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(F) and (J).

Ms. Rauch explained there are two parts of the Site Plan Review approval, which include 12 Waivers and 28 conditions.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for 12 Site Plan Waivers:

Historic Mixed Use Buildings

- 1) Pitched Roof Requirements
- 2) Tower Height
- 3) Front Property Line Coverage
- 4) Non-street Transparency
- 5) Vertical Increment Requirements
- 6) Number of Entrances

Apartment Building

- 7) Façade Materials
- 8) Front Property Line Coverage
- 9) Corner Side Lot Line Coverage
- 10) Minimum Finished Floor Elevation
- 11) Vertical Increment Requirements

General

- 12) Pocket Park Street Frontage Requirement

Ms. Rauch briefly highlighted the justification for each Waiver.

Steve Langworthy asked if Ms. Rauch believed any of the Waivers were an especially major concern as application is forwarded to the Architectural Review Board. Ms. Rauch indicated the pocket park frontage was the only Waiver that might be an issue. She explained this was an issue in part because of the transformer located in the triangle section of open space. She added the existing parcel line is larger than the proposed project limits; however, the property line coverage requirements are based on the entire site.

Ms. Rauch said she had significant concerns with the appearance of the transformer given its prominent location to the street and within the open space. She asked if the enclosure could be more thoughtfully designed.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the enclosure could be covered on the top as it would be viewed from the pedestrian bridge above. Jason Hartke, Bracket Builders, stated they typically have to remain uncovered, but they could look into the clearance requirements.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the transformer is tested periodically. Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said it depends on the size. He said sometimes it can be tested once a week or sometimes once a month and does generate noise.

The applicant responded affirmatively in response to a question from Laura Ball as to whether the doors on the enclosure will face the street.

Mr. Langworthy reiterated the condition of the approval regarding the applicant working with Planning on a solution to better screen the transformer. Ms. Rauch emphasized the need to provide a better design for the transformer as it will be highly visible.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART and the applicant if there were any further questions about the Waivers. [There were none.] Ms. Rauch reiterated that approval was recommended on the 12 Waivers.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board of this request for a Site Plan Review with 28 conditions. She said these were listed in the Planning Report and grouped by the nature of the conditions to be discussed. The conditions are as follows:

*Conditions to be met with building permit submission ~*

- 1) More detailed information regarding the heights of the parapets will be required with the building permit submission to ensure adherence to the Code requirements.
- 2) The calculations provided on the drawings regarding material provision should be revised to accurately reflect the requirements.
- 3) The details and structural information regarding the proposed retaining wall shown at the northwest corner of the site adjacent to the existing culvert will be required with the building permit submission.
- 4) Prior to the submission of building permits, a more detailed roof plan will need to be submitted for review and approval by the Planning and Building Departments. All mechanical equipment within the designated mechanical spaces on the roof and Code required screening will need to be shown.
- 5) A means of egress from the south entrance must be designed and approved.
- 6) A site photometric plan will be required with the building permit to ensure compliance.
- 7) The location of the parking garage exhaust fans, equipment, and grills will need to be shown and approved by the Planning and Building Departments prior to the issuance of building permits.
- 8) Additional details regarding sanitary and water service will be required as part of the building permit submission.
- 9) The applicant will need to continue to work with Staff regarding the details of the bio-retention swale.
- 10) Additional details regarding the specifications for each fixture will need to be provided to ensure Code is met.
- 11) The site data tables included on the plans are inconsistent and have significant discrepancies and will need to be corrected prior to the building permit submission.
- 12) The applicant should continue to work with Planning and Building to further define designated loading, valet, and fire access areas indicated along North High Street.

*Required Site Plan revisions and submissions ~*

- 13) The entrances located along the North Riverview Street extension façade lack the required entrance details and the drawings will need to be revised to meet the requirement.
- 14) The plans will need to be revised to incorporate the required lintel and sill treatment.
- 15) The plans will need to be revised to incorporate three additional street trees along North Riverview Street and relocate one of the proposed trees along North High Street to meet the requirement.
- 16) The proposal indicated the inclusion of bike racks on the east side of North Riverview Street, which should be removed from the plans.
- 17) The proposed towers use fritted glass in lieu of the proposed frosted glass, providing an opportunity to incorporate a unique design feature in the tower.
- 18) Additional calculations are provided regarding the balcony percentage for the north and south elevations.

*Additional Architectural Review Board approvals required ~*

- 19) A Master Sign Plan will need to be approved for the entire development or individual signs may be brought forward for approval by the Architectural Review Board.

*Additional Staff approvals required ~*

- 20) Additional details regarding the specific windows selected will need to be provided.

- 21) The applicant work with Planning to coordinate a complementary color palette for the building awnings.
- 22) The applicant work with Staff to find an alternative location or use the generator enclosure design as an opportunity to provide a more aesthetic solution.
- 23) The developer should continue to work with Staff regarding the details and location of the pedestrian connection along Indian Run, and are responsible for the construction for this segment of the path.
- 24) The applicant should work with Planning and Engineering on the design and detail of a retaining wall adjacent to the top of the exposed rock face wall on the North High Street elevation wall to ensure a safe and aesthetic barrier is provided.
- 25) The applicant should work with Washington Township regarding the location of the loading spaces and how the area will be designated and maintained on the east side of North Riverview Street, across from the Apartment Building.
- 26) The applicant should work with Engineering and Planning regarding the interim condition of the terminus of North Riverview Street at the northeast corner of the site.
- 27) The applicant will need to work with Staff regarding final location of street furniture along North High Street and ensure the required clear walking space is provided along North High Street, adjacent to the on-street parking spaces.

*Additional City Council approvals required ~*

- 28) The proposed plans indicate an encroachment into the right-of-way at the southern end of North High Street buildings, which will require approval by City Council.

Ms. Rauch welcomed discussion of the conditions and said Condition #22 was just discussed.

Mr. Hunter inquired about Condition #23. He said he did not feel comfortable being responsible for the cost of the path segment since it is not yet known how it is going to be engineered and the cost associated. He suggested the developer be responsible for the difference in the path segment than what was originally planned and not the entire path.

Joanne Shelly said this path was an issue early on as the Director of Parks and Open Space had asked about the property lines, and if there would be sufficient room for the path and its connection. She said it was assumed this would not require ADA access or other special accommodations. She said a group had met at the site and questioned if there is enough room now. She said it appears now that the path will be farther from the building and more into public property. The reason for the additional cost she said would be because of where the building is situated; therefore it could be the responsibility of the developer. Mr. Hunter agreed the building affected the path but does not want to be responsible for the cost of construction for the whole path, not understanding the total cost. Mr. Langworthy said it is not up to the ART or ARB to decide who should sustain the cost; that could be decided as part of the development agreement. He emphasized that a path needs to be constructed there.

Mr. Langworthy suggested modifying the condition to tie the details of cost and construction to the development agreement. Mr. Hunter agreed. Condition 23 would now read: "The developer should continue to work with Staff regarding the details and location of the pedestrian connection along Indian Run, and are responsible for the construction of this segment of the path, as provided for in the development agreement."

Mr. Hunter referred to the FEMA section on page 10 of the Planning Report that states "The adjustments to the floodplain/floodway have been accepted by FEMA, but will not take effect until August 1, 2015. No building permits can be issued prior to this date. FEMA approval will be required should the applicant wish to complete grading and filling within the affected area prior to the August date." He explained a no-rise certification would be granted once LOMAR (Letter of Map Revision) was complete.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, confirmed FEMA has approved the LOMAR, but the understanding was Dublin could issue permits prior to the formal map revision in August. He asked if in the interim a building permit could be obtained prior to that date.

Aaron Stanford said he thought advance work of grading and fill could be approved, but a building permit for the structure, including foundation could not move forward until the August 1, 2015 date.

Mr. Quackenbush and Mr. Hunter indicated this information was different than previous information they were provided.

Mr. Stanford asked to meet with him to further discuss. Jeff Tyler suggested the other parties involved should be part of a conversation on this topic.

Ms. Rauch suggested this topic be added, written as a condition of approval (see new condition 13). Mr. Hunter agreed.

Ms. Rauch said the Fire Marshal had indicated he had some issues that carried over from the Basic Plan and Development Plan Reviews.

Alan Perkins said he was concerned with the issue of timing. He said since the plans for an extension of North Riverview Street, north of the intersection with North Street have not been finalized and the timing of the road's design and construction may not fully coincide with the development of the Bridge Park West project. He said this is an issue because the dead end does not currently meet the requirements of the Ohio and Dublin Fire Codes. The occupation of the building before the extension is completed is his concern. He stated he needs to see the development plan once the building is occupied; it could be 2 – 5 years before the extension is complete, which he can be comfortable with but there is no guarantee without the completion of the development agreement. He reiterated the extension to connect back to Dublin Road alleviates the dead end.

Mr. Perkins stated the rear access (North Riverview Street) would be required to have an aerial apparatus access road designed to meet the requirements of Fire Code (DFC), based on the topography of the site and height of the building exceeding three stories. He added there needs to be at least two means of fire apparatus access at the front and rear for the structure with a minimum width of 26 feet and proximity of 15 – 30 feet from the building. He asked why the area had been tapered down from 26 feet to 22 feet.

Mr. Quackenbush said the approach was to get the character of the road crossing over the stream to be more of a park road.

Mr. Perkins said he needs every foot he can get but understands the appearance of the extension is important.

Mr. Quackenbush said he could make the transition more abrupt. He asked if this was in the list of conditions. Ms. Rauch referred to condition #25 regarding the location of the loading spaces and how the area will be designated and maintained on the east side of North Riverview Street, across from the Apartment Building.

Ms. Rauch asked what happens if the road never gets extended. Mr. Perkins replied the site would not meet the Fire Code requirements. In this case, Mr. Tyler said after a certain time frame, a cease and desist order could be written, if the requirements are not met.

Mr. Stanford noted this is a risk they are taking. He said they will want North Riverview extended to be safe for occupancy. He said the question is what to allow initially.

Mr. Hunter asked if there were further discussions on the City's side of this issue. Joanne Shelly said the road is being contemplated as part of the improvements for the park. She said it would not occur until there was an understanding of the pedestrian bridge and she did not anticipate progress until this summer.

Mr. Hunter asked if this should be another item to include in the development agreement. Ms. Rauch agreed it should.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any other conditions to discuss. Mr. Hunter answered he was fine with the remaining conditions.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or comments regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated that a recommendation of approval for the 12 Basic Site Plan Waivers and a recommendation of approval for a Site Plan Review with 29 conditions will be forwarded to the ARB for their meeting on April 15, 2015. The 29 conditions are listed below noting revisions in italics:

**Conditions to be met with building permit submission ~**

- 1) More detailed information regarding the heights of the parapets will be required with the building permit submission to ensure adherence to the Code requirements.
- 2) The calculations provided on the drawings regarding material provision should be revised to accurately reflect the requirements.
- 3) The details and structural information regarding the proposed retaining wall shown at the northwest corner of the site adjacent to the existing culvert will be required with the building permit submission.
- 4) Prior to the submission of building permits, a more detailed roof plan will need to be submitted for review and approval by the Planning and Building Departments. All mechanical equipment within the designated mechanical spaces on the roof and Code required screening will need to be shown.
- 5) A means of egress from the south entrance must be designed and approved.
- 6) A site photometric plan will be required with the building permit to ensure compliance.
- 7) The location of the parking garage exhaust fans, equipment, and grills will need to be shown and approved by the Planning and Building Departments prior to the issuance of building permits.
- 8) Additional details regarding sanitary and water service will be required as part of the building permit submission.
- 9) The applicant will need to continue to work with Staff regarding the details of the bio-retention swale.
- 10) Additional details regarding the specifications for each fixture will need to be provided to ensure Code is met.
- 11) The site data tables included on the plans are inconsistent and have significant discrepancies and will need to be corrected prior to the building permit submission.
- 12) The applicant should continue to work with Planning and Building to further define designated loading, valet, and fire access areas indicated along North High Street.
- 13) *The applicant should continue to work with Engineering regarding the timing and approval of building permits as it relates to the acceptance of the adjustments to the floodway by FEMA.*

**Required Site Plan revisions and submissions ~**

- 14) The entrances located along the North Riverview Street extension façade lack the required entrance details and the drawings will need to be revised to meet the requirement.
- 15) The plans will need to be revised to incorporate the required lintel and sill treatment.

- 16) The plans will need to be revised to incorporate three additional street trees along North Riverview Street and relocate one of the proposed trees along North High Street to meet the requirement.
- 17) The proposal indicated the inclusion of bike racks on the east side of North Riverview Street, which should be removed from the plans.
- 18) The proposed towers use fritted glass in lieu of the proposed frosted glass, providing an opportunity to incorporate a unique design feature in the tower.
- 19) Additional calculations are provided regarding the balcony percentage for the north and south elevations.

**Additional Architectural Review Board approvals required ~**

- 20) A Master Sign Plan will need to be approved for the entire development or individual signs may be brought forward for approval by the Architectural Review Board.

**Additional Staff approvals required ~**

- 21) Additional details regarding the specific windows selected will need to be provided.
- 22) The applicant work with Planning to coordinate a complementary color palette for the building awnings.
- 23) The applicant work with Staff to find an alternative location or use the generator enclosure design as an opportunity to provide a more aesthetic solution.
- 24) The developer should continue to work with Staff regarding the details and location of the pedestrian connection along Indian Run, and are responsible for the construction for this segment of the path, *as provided for in the development agreement*.
- 25) The applicant should work with Planning and Engineering on the design and detail of a retaining wall adjacent to the top of the exposed rock face wall on the North High Street elevation wall to ensure a safe and aesthetic barrier is provided.
- 26) The applicant should work with Washington Township regarding the location of the loading spaces and how the area will be designated and maintained on the east side of North Riverview Street, across from the Apartment Building.
- 27) The applicant should work with Engineering and Planning regarding the interim condition of the terminus of North Riverview Street at the northeast corner of the site.
- 28) The applicant will need to work with Staff regarding final location of street furniture along North High Street and ensure the required clear walking space is provided along North High Street, adjacent to the on-street parking spaces.

**Additional City Council approvals required ~**

- 29) The proposed plans indicate an encroachment into the right-of-way at the southern end of North High Street buildings, which will require approval by City Council.

Mr. Langworthy explained two new members are expected for the April 15<sup>th</sup> ARB meeting assuming they will be appointed by City Council on April 13. He said this does not allow the new members any time to review and analyze this application and is not certain how comfortable they will be approving it. He recommended that a more detailed presentation be made for the new members.

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [Hearing none.] He said he wanted to discuss the Bridge Street District's open space requirements. He said that there has been a lot of discussion with applicants regarding the amount of required open space, and how that balances with the private open space amenities that they offer to serve a project's own

residents or users. He suggested that perhaps the private amenities could count toward a portion of the required open space. He offered to write a report outlining examples of which there have been implications and asked the ART to think about this further to continue the discussion next week. He indicated the change could be forwarded as a Code amendment recommendation if the ART determined an amendment to be appropriate.

Colleen Gilger asked for further clarification. She inquired about group spaces that are private within a building like workout rooms and game rooms.

Laura Ball said an interior atrium space could be made to feel like a public space. She said an atrium could work as an entrance to pass through to another building and be a gathering space. She cited Nationwide in downtown Columbus as a good example. She said the space functions as an energized space in bad weather.

Joanne Shelly said an open central courtyard could gain circulation and ventilation points toward LEED certification. She said a person seated at a table outside is not the only way to energize a street.

Jeff Tyler said he needed to understand the real purpose of the potential amendment.

Mr. Langworthy said the issue is the amount of acreage required for Bridge Street, with Bridge Park as an example, as the open space requirement can take up to an entire block of development if applied as required. He said that is why he is asking if a different calculation is needed. He said some adjustments would not work as well for smaller projects. Or, he said developers could provide their own amenities to go towards public open space.

Ms. Shelly said adjacency had to be considered with regards to small projects and open space. She said Bridge Park could count the future riverfront park across the Riverside Drive. As an example she said, Tuller Flats' square is too big. She said there are three more open spaces/parks within a five-minute walk. She questions the close proximity of each other. She suggested a percentage discount.

Ms. Ball said we have to be careful not to double count the riverfront park.

Jennifer Rauch said on the Bridge Park West project, there is open space on one corner and none on the other but the patio is counted.

Ms. Shelly questioned the connectivity.

Mr. Langworthy suggested an internal meeting prior to discussing this issue at the ART again.

Mr. Langworthy adjourned the meeting at 2:50 pm.