



PLANNING REPORT

Planning and Zoning Commission Architectural Review Board

Thursday, November 3, 2016

Scioto Riverside Park, Phase 1 – INFORMAL REVIEW

Case Summary

Agenda Item	1
Case Number	16-094-BPR-INF
Proposal	The first phase of development for the City of Dublin Scioto Riverside Park, including park amenities and conceptual details based on the approved Master Plan.
Request	Informal review and feedback on the proposed basic plan for development and site details of the proposed park along the east and west sides of the Scioto River prior to the review of the formal Basic Plan application by City Council.
Site Location	Both sides of the Scioto River east of North Riverview Street and west of Riverside Drive.
Applicant	Dana McDaniel, City Manager; represented by Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation
Case Managers	Jennifer M. Rauch, Planning Manager (614) 410-4690 jrauch@dublin.oh.us
Planning Recommendation	Planning recommends the Board and Commission consider this proposal with respect to compatibility with surrounding context, layout, amenities and materials, and site details and use the following discussion questions to guide the conversation:
Discussion Questions	1) What types of architectural cues should be considered in developing the pavilion and other structures within the park?



Discussion Questions

- 2) Does PZC and ARB support the use of sustainable and green building principles in the development of the park?
- 3) Does the proposal provide appropriate seating, amenities, and design elements on each side of the river? Should other elements be considered?
- 4) Does the PZC and ARB find the proposed park development successfully incorporates the changes in grade across the site?
- 5) Other considerations by the Board and Commission.



Facts	
Site Area	3.5 acres ±
Zoning	BSD-HTN, Historic Transition Neighborhood District (west) and BSD-P, Public District (east)
Surrounding Zoning	<p><u>West Side</u> North, East and South: BSD-HTN, Historic Transition Neighborhood District West: BSD-P, Public District</p> <p><u>East Side</u> North and South: BSD-P, Public District West: Scioto River East: BSD-SRN, Scioto River Neighborhood District</p>
Case Background	<p>The River Corridor Framework Planning was authorized by City Council in 2013, which led to the development and planning of the public infrastructure and park improvements along the Scioto River within the Bridge Street District. A series of public meetings and input sessions resulted in the creation of a Master Plan for the park along the west and east sides of the river. City Council adopted resolution 32-16 for the Scioto Riverside Park Master Plan on May 23, 2016.</p> <p>The application was introduced to ART on October 27, 2016, and concerns were raised regarding the operations of a potential ice skating rink, and the usability of the western plaza given the proposed seating and landscaping. Some ART members were concerned regarding the grades provided on the east side of the park and recommended lighting be discussed with the consultant for both plaza areas.</p>
Public Engagement	<p>2013 January & March – City Council & Planning Commission Joint Work Sessions 2013 May through August – Community Interviews 2013 September – City Council Work Session 2013 October – Public Meeting 2015 April - HOA Annual Meeting 2016 March - Public Meeting</p>
Review Process	<p>The applicant has submitted this Basic Plan for Phase 1 on October 20, 2016 for review by City Council. The applicant is requesting informal review and feedback from the Board and Commission prior to Council's review of the Basic Plan.</p>

Facts

Review Process

The following outlines the review and approval procedures and the general sequence of each required application following the Informal Review:

1. Basic Plan Review: Reviewed by ART with recommendations forwarded to City Council for determinations within 28 days.
2. Preliminary Plat/Final Plat: Reviewed with a recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission to City Council.
3. Development Plan/Site Plan Application: Reviewed by the ART with a recommendation forwarded to the final determining body as designated by City Council for a determination within 42 days.
4. Building Permits through Building Standards.

Details

Informal

General

Planning recommends the Board and Commission consider this proposal with respect to compatibility with surrounding context, layout, amenities and materials, and site details. The following information provides details and discussion points with regard to the proposal.

Proposal

This is a request for review and informal, non-binding feedback for the first phase of development for the City of Dublin Scioto Riverside Park, including park amenities and conceptual details based on the approved Master Plan. Phase 1 contains improvements on the east and west sides of the river including the public plazas and landings on each side of the pedestrian bridge, pedestrian paths, seating, general pavilion location (east), bridge abutment walls, park maintenance storage area (east) and landscaping.

Use

The Bridge Street District – Historic Transition Neighborhood (west) and Public District permit park uses. As proposed the development meets Code.

Layout

West

The proposed Phase 1 park improvements for the west side of the river include the plaza as a landing for the pedestrian bridge. The west plaza landing aligns with future Rock Cress Parkway and provides access from the pedestrian bridge into the Historic District. The proposed landing indicates two large areas within the plaza for seating with landscape material at ground level.

East

The proposed Phase 1 park improvements for the east side of river include a plaza landing, upper and lower terraces, the general location of the future pavilion/restroom building, a large green, seating, landscape material, and an underground maintenance facility. The east plaza

Details		Informal
Layout	<p>landing aligns with Bridge Park Avenue and provides access from the pedestrian bridge to the park and private development east of Riverside Drive.</p> <p>The proposed entrance to the east plaza landing is shown at the end of Bridge Park Avenue with a proposed pavilion located in the southern part of the plaza space, referred to as the upper terrace. The location and orientation of the pavilion is sited to ensure visibility to the iconic pedestrian bridge. Moveable seating is provided on the western side of the pavilion. A maintenance facility is located at the base of the pedestrian bridge and integrated into the slope on the back side of the upper terrace.</p> <p>The proposed lower terrace contains fixed seating and landscape elements located north of the pavilion. An option for the inclusion of an ice skating rink within the northern portion of the lower terrace has been included for discussion. A series of terraced seating is integrated into the grade, as users move toward the river. The proposal includes a large green area to the north and a series of pedestrian paths connecting the park amenities.</p>	
Materials	<p>Proposed materials include granite and brick pavers, and granite and architectural concrete seating elements throughout both sides of the park. Architecture for the proposed pavilion and future structures are not included and will be included for review with subsequent applications.</p>	
Stormwater	<p>Stormwater management has not been addressed as part of the proposal. The incorporation of sustainable stormwater solutions will be expected with the park.</p>	

Recommendation		Informal
Summary	<p>Planning recommends the Board consider this proposal with respect to compatibility with surrounding context, layout, architecture and materials, and site details.</p>	
Discussion Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What types of architectural cues should be considered in developing the pavilion and other structures within the park? 2) Does PZC and ARB support the use of sustainable and green building principles in the development of the park? 3) Does the proposal provide appropriate seating, amenities, and design elements on each side of the river? What other elements should be considered? 4) Does the PZC and ARB find the proposed park development successfully incorporates the changes in grade across the site? 5) Other considerations by the Board and Commission. 	