

March 6 – City Council Work Session

- Supportive of project and design concept (majority)
- Replace brick with stone

Ms. Rauch reported Design Group reviewed the project, a Columbus architecture firm under contract to provide third party critiques of larger design projects. She explained their review of the library and garage were not focused on design but whether the project fits the site and connects of the area.

- The Design Group applied the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings; Standard 9 (new construction)
 - Site placement
 - Height, massing, proportion, scale
 - Materials
 - Development patterns
 - Architectural elements and details
- Standard 9 "makes no mention of design or style, which allows for an open interpretation for any design that meets the broad criteria." Their comments and questions focused on quality, not style are as follows:

Design Group: Library

- There is sensitivity to the surrounding context that is not readily apparent at first glance, more documentation/analysis would be helpful
- Landscape draws the pedestrian to the building, reduces apparent height of the building; taller trees helpful
- Consider using natural stone to face the building foundation and walls within the landscaping to better connect with the district
- Conduct a sun study to understand impact of reflective metal panels on the High Street façade

Design Group: Garage

- Consider "quieting down" the major gestures and materials
- Simplify the two elevation treatments (use only metal fins), consider spacing out the metal fins, consider breaking up the façade elevations
- Reduce the number of architectural elements, simplify stair towers
- Emphasize the pedestrian entrance adjacent to library

Ms. Rauch stated all of these factors were taken into account, in addition to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, the Architectural Review Board standards and the Bridge Street Code requirements.

Ms. Rauch presented a graphic prepared by NBBJ to provide scale and design within the context of Bridge Park West. She presented the current proposal footprint and noted the following:

- 45,560-square-foot library
- Public plaza
- Open space
- 549-space parking garage on three levels plus roof level
- Book drop within the garage

Ms. Rauch explained three motions will need to be made during the review today. She stated an additional request will be made when the project is reviewed by City Council to establish the required reviewing body, but the ART does not make a recommendation on that decision.

Ms. Rauch reviewed the request for two Administrative Departures. She said Code requires a front and corner side setback of 15 feet, which is required along N. High Street and Rock Cress Parkway, respectively. She said the northern elevation is set back 14 feet, requiring an Administrative Departure. She stated the Code permits a maximum lot coverage of 65% for a Civic Building and this proposal includes 67% lot coverage, requiring an Administrative Departure.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended for two Administrative Departures:

1. Corner Side Setback
2. Lot Coverage

Ms. Rauch said a recommendation of approval to City Council is recommended for eight Waivers and explained the Waivers as follows:

1. Block Access and Vehicular Access (2)
2. Block Length/Perimeter
3. Loading Facility Location
4. Building Stories
5. Ground Story Height
6. Building Setbacks
7. Building Entrances

Ms. Rauch presented the north, east, and west elevations to demonstrate the request for Waivers. She stated vehicular access to the site is only provided at the proposed garage entrances on North Street and (future) Franklin Street. She said the proposed service area for the library is provided along the northwest corner of the library with vehicular access on Rock Cress Parkway; therefore, these require Waivers.

Ms. Rauch said the library has frontage on three rights-of-way: Rock Cress Parkway (corner side), N. High Street (front), and North Street. She stated no additional street connections are provided between the library and garage buildings, which require Waivers to the block length and perimeter requirements.

Ms. Rauch restated that Code requires a front and corner side setback of 15 feet, but the northwest corner of the proposed building is set back 5 feet along N. High Street, which requires a Waiver.

Ms. Rauch explained the proposal incorporates a Civic Building Type for the library where the Code permits a maximum height of 5 stories; 3 stories within the Historic Core District. However, she said the Historic Transition Neighborhood District, which the site is located, permits a maximum building height of 2.5 stories when adjacent to Historic Core properties. She stated the proposed library building is three stories at the intersection with N. High Street and future Rock Cress Parkway, but is two stories along the remaining elevations. A Waiver is required to permit the three-story portion of the building adjacent to the Historic Core District.

Ms. Rauch noted the proposal requires a Waiver for the ground story height at N. High Street and Rock Cress Parkway. She said the Code permits 24 feet and the proposal reports 28.5 feet. She indicated the proposal meets story height requirements on the remaining elevations.

Ms. Rauch said the Code requires a series of street entrances: Rock Cress Parkway: 2, 1 provided; North High Street: 3, 1 provided; and North Street: 2, 1 provided. A Waiver is needed to reduce the number of building entrances she added.

Ms. Rauch said Staff will continue to work with the applicant on the blank wall requirements, transparency and façade articulations, and façade transparency. Additional information is required she said with the Site

Plan to determine if the requirements are met and the extent Waivers or Administrative Departures are needed.

Ms. Rauch stated the Code permits stone, brick, and glass as primary materials for Civic Buildings.

Tracy Perry, NBBJ, indicated stone was discussed early on and ruled out by the applicant because of the cost but offered to revisit this as the only issue is cost. She explained the proposed brick costs \$25 per square-foot and the stone option would cost around \$75 a square foot. Ms. Perry said they would propose using a 1.25-inch stone with a rain system behind as the building is civic in nature and not residential. She said the use of stone in lieu of brick on the lower portions of the building will be investigated over the next few days and updates will be provided. She emphasized this is not an issue from a design perspective but the applicant needs the library's approval.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the street network. He asked if the intent is to deal with this through the Development Plan. He suggested addressing it now. Claudia Husak suggested a condition be added that stated the street connection would be eliminated and the Street Network Map will be updated appropriately.

Ms. Rauch said a recommendation of approval to City Council is recommended for the Basic Plan Review with seven conditions:

- 1) That the applicant file a Demolition request, prior to the approval of the Site Plan;
- 2) That the applicant investigate the use of stone in lieu of brick on the lower portions of the building;
- 3) That the applicant continue to refine the architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan;
- 4) That the applicant update the required parking information and submit a Parking Plan with the Site Plan;
- 5) That the open space, gateway, and terminal vista details be addressed with the Site Plan;
- 6) That the applicant provide the final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities, and stormwater with the Site Plan; and
- 7) That the design not require the construction of Darby Street between North Street and Rock Cress Parkway as reflected on the Street Network Map and for staff to update the Street Network Map accordingly.

Vince Papsidero inquired about the metal proposed. Ms. Perry explained that several colors were presented to the applicant but found that white was the best for the library. Jeff Tyler indicated the color may change once the stone is added to replace the brick.

Mr. Tyler requested to see samples at the Site Plan to review.

Donna Goss recalled comments made during City Council at their meeting March 6, 2017. She said they expressed concern over the reflective quality or shininess of the proposal.

Ms. Perry explained that glazing is less than 11% reflective; it is a very clear glass so people can see in at all times. She said NBBJ has found this was the best for their other branches as the desire is for high transparency and not reflection. She confirmed however, the soffit is reflective. She stated different

materials had been investigated and depending on Council's feedback an alternative could be selective. She stated current the metal panel has a mirror finish but that could be changed to an anodized finish.

Mr. Tyler indicated he liked the brick but would be supportive of stone too. He suggested that the architect review an Arriscraft product. It is a synthetic stone he explained that was approved on the east side of the river for the Bridge Park Development.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART approved the two Administrative Departures and recommended approval to City Council for 8 Waivers and 7 Conditions as part of the Basic Plan Review.

**2. BSD P –Library Parking Garage
17-003ARB-BPR**

**75 N. High Street
Basic Plan Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for the construction of a new parking garage with associated site improvements located at the northwest corner of the intersection of North High Street and North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and §153.070.

Ms. Rauch stated only two motions are required for this application.

Ms. Rauch said a recommendation of approval to City Council is recommended for 11 Waivers and explained the Waivers as follows:

1. Block Length and Perimeter
2. Block Access and Vehicular Access (2)
3. Building Stories
4. Ground Story Height (2)
5. Number of Towers (2)
6. Uses and Occupancy (3)

Ms. Rauch presented the elevations to demonstrate the request for Waivers. She stated the library has frontage on three rights-of-way: Rock Cress Parkway (front), Franklin Street extension (corner side), and North Street (corner side). No additional street connections are provided between the library and garage buildings she noted, which require Waivers to the block length and perimeter requirements.

Ms. Rauch said the Code requires a street entrance along each street facing façade and a specified number of entrances: Rock Cress Parkway: 3, 1 provided; Franklin Street: 4, 0 provided; and North Street: 3, 1 provided. A Waiver is needed she said to reduce the number of building entrances; however, staff would like to continue to work with the applicant on the provision of additional entrances with subsequent submissions.

Ms. Rauch stated vehicular access to the site is provided at the proposed garage entrances on North Street and (future) Franklin Street. She pointed out a library book drop lane located within the proposed garage in the northeast corner, which exits onto Rock Cress Parkway, as a right-in, right-out only circulation, which requires Waivers.

Ms. Rauch said the proposal incorporates a Parking Structure for the garage. She explained that Code permits the building height for a Parking Structure at a maximum of 5 stories. However, the Historic Transition Neighborhood District, which the site is located, permits a maximum building height of 2.5 stories when adjacent to Historic Core properties. She said a Waiver is required because the proposed parking garage is three stories with parking on the roof of the upper level.

Ms. Rauch added the proposal requires a Waiver for the ground story height at Rock Cress Parkway because the Code requires 12 feet and the proposal indicates 11 feet. The proposal meets story height requirements on the remaining elevations she said.

Ms. Rauch indicated that Code outlines a series of requirements for parking structure elevations along a Principal Front Street (PFS). These elevations she explained are required to include commercial uses and occupied space, which are not provided in the proposed garage. Additionally, parking is shown in area of the structure with frontage on a PFS and a greenway, which is not permitted; therefore, Waivers are required to address these deviations.

Ms. Rauch said the Code permits one tower element per building; three towers are proposed to accommodate the elevators and staircases, requiring Waivers.

Ms. Rauch noted a few more changes from the previous plans. She pointed out where the zig zag stairs were eliminated for more cohesiveness in the design. She said changes were made to the design of the garage to provide two way circulation and 90 degree parking spaces in the eastern portion of the garage, which resulted in more parking spaces. She highlighted the elevation and stair locations on the garage. The west elevation was presented and she noted the color for canopies will be chosen later in this process.

Ms. Rauch pointed out the bike hub and book drop on the north elevation. Aaron Stanford asked for a condition of approval to be added regarding tightening the turning radius from the book drop exit to limit the movement to right out only.

Mr. Papsidero also suggested duplicating the condition from the library application about the elimination of the street connection.

Ms. Rauch concluded the proposed garage indicates 549 parking spaces and the Code requires 151 parking spaces for the library. However, she explained as part of the Development Agreement, the library will be allocated 200 spaces and the remaining spaces will be for public parking. She pointed out the ADA parking spaces are located at key locations on the first two levels, including at the northwest corner of the garage to accommodate visitors to the Grounds of Remembrance.

Matt Earman asked if more ADA spaces could be added because now there are only two and suggested a possible location by the bike hub.

Aaron Stanford questioned the difficulty in maneuverability for the spaces directly across the entrance on North Street by the pedestrian passage. He also asked about the width of the drive by the book drop as it appears to be only 20.8 feet across and 22 or so is required. Ms. Rauch suggested that possibly the size of the island could be decreased to provide more width for that drive aisle. She also suggested another look at the parking spaces at the entrance with the subsequent elevations.

Ms. Rauch said a recommendation of approval to City Council is recommended for the Basic Plan Review with eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant file a Demolition request prior to the approval of the Site Plan;
- 2) That the applicant investigate the use of stone in lieu of brick on the lower portions of the building and at the tower elements;
- 3) That staff should continue to work with the applicant on the provision of additional entrances;

- 4) That the applicant continue to refine the architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan;
- 5) That the applicant provide the final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities, and stormwater with the Site Plan;
- 6) That the design not require the construction of Darby Street between North Street and Rock Cress Parkway as reflected on the Street Network Map and for staff to update the Street Network Map accordingly;
- 7) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to refine the geometry of the book drop exit onto Rock Cress Parkway; and
- 8) That the applicant continue to work with staff on the internal circulation and dimensions within the garage.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART recommended approval to City Council for 11 Waivers and 8 Conditions as part of the approval for a Basic Plan Review.

**3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block A
17-012MSP**

**6540 Riverside Drive
Master Sign Plan**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for the AC Hotel, Event Center, and Hotel Garage located within Bridge Park, Block A at the intersection of E. Bridge Street and Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan for Block A. She stated the applicant is proposing five sign types within the approved Master Sign Plan for Blocks B and C with this proposal. She presented signs proposed and locations.

Hotel:

One Canopy Edge Sign (±28 square feet: east elevation); Two Fascia/Wall (Building ID) Signs (70 square feet: north elevation; 100 square feet: south elevation); One Fascia/Wall (Rooftop ID) Sign (±90 square feet: West elevation); Window Graphic (Vinyl Wall Decal) (±15 square feet: east elevation); Fascia/Wall Sign (9 square feet: east elevation); One Address Numerals (.5 square feet: east elevation); and Canopy Edge (Street Wall) Sign (30 square feet: west elevation).

Hotel Bar:

To meet requirements consistent with the approved MSP for Blocks B and C in locations shown on the plan for canopy, window, and projecting signs.

Events Center:

Two Fascia/Wall (Entry Logo) Signs (100 square feet: west elevation; and 40 square feet: east elevation) and Two Address Numerals (±9 square feet: east elevation; and 0.5 square feet west elevation).

Hotel Garage:

Parking Marquee (Blade) Sign (±33 square feet at east, northwest, and west elevations); Two Canopy Edge Signs (22 square feet: east entry; 22 square feet west entry); Two Address Numerals (3 square feet west/north elevation and north/north elevation); and two Identification Plaques (±1 square feet

at two stair entries). She noted the three blade signs and two canopy signs have already been approved in the MSP for Blocks B and C.

Hotel Garage Tenant:

To meet requirements consistent with the approved MSP for Blocks B and C, in general locations shown on the plan for canopy, window, and projecting signs but no specifics or designs are determined.

Ms. Burchett said the Code does not provide specific criteria for the approval of Master Sign Plans. She reported that Staff has reviewed this application based on the intent and purpose outlined in the Code for a Master Sign Plan, as follows:

1. Allow a greater degree of flexibility and creativity in sign design and display;
2. Intended for multiple signs for a single building or group of related buildings to ensure the requested signs work in a coordinated fashion;
3. Not intended to simply permit larger signs or more visible signs, or additional signs without any consideration for unique sign design and display; and
4. Maintains the purpose and the intent of the sign and graphics standards for the applicable BSD Zoning District.

Ms. Burchett explained some signs met the criteria but others can only be met through a MSP due to the requests for height and quantity. She stated staff found the signs creative and consistent with surrounding signs throughout the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Burchett said a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission is recommended for the Master Sign Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the height of all signs on the Site Plan; and
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure all sign information and references are consistent among the Master Sign Plans.

Ms. Burchett recalled the ART's comments about the Building ID signs on the north and south elevations; they preferred to have the box around the text removed but the applicant still prefers to have the box.

Vince Papsidero inquired about the various components of the signs with regard to illumination. Earl Lee, Moody Nolan, explained the text and box that are bronze are illuminated similar to pin mounted lettering.

Ms. Burchett clarified that option 2 proposes the sign on the south elevation at 100 square feet in size and the one on the north elevation at 70 square feet. She said the ART can recommend their preference to the PZC but the applicant will also present their preference with the box. The ART had consensus on recommending option two, which removes the box from the AC Hotel wall signs and shows a 70 square foot sign on the north elevation with a 100 square foot sign on the south elevation.

The ART had discussed with the applicant modifying the sizes of the signs for the Event Center in the past. The resolution is for the sign on the front entry on Riverside Drive to be 100 square feet in size and the sign on the rear entry/east elevation to be 40 square feet in size.

Ms. Burchett explained that sign height is measured from grade to the top of the sign and that those details need to be included since the applicant is requesting them in specific locations.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He said the ART recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan with the aforementioned two conditions and the second option for the hotel wall signs.

INTRODUCTION

4. BSD HTN – Riverside Park, Phase 1 – West Plaza 17-019ARB-SPR

North High Street Site Plan Review

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for the first phase for the City of Dublin Riverside Park, West Plaza and associated site improvements based on the approved Master Plan. The West Plaza site is on the east side of N. High Street, approximately 400 feet north of North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch presented an aerial view of the site and two phases of the Basic Plan and highlighted the West Plaza. She reported after internal meetings of discussing public art etc., challenges with grade and the need for ADA compliance were discussed. She explained the seating and planters all in one will be permanent elements and that they are contemporary in nature, not historical.

Ms. Rauch noted that a Development Plan is needed for the West Plaza and the Z2 building. She said she is hesitant to go before the ARB for an Informal Review without a Development Plan.

Ms. Rauch explained outside seating can be permitted for building Z1 but there needs to be an allowance of 5 feet clearance for around the bench planters. She added there will be some sort of marker to contain seating for liquor consumption, a defined barrier that is seasonal without a gate. She suggested maybe planters could be used as dividers. She pointed out that a water connection can be made from the north side of the Z2 building after discussions with Crawford Hoying.

Ms. Rauch pointed out the tiny dots on the plan and explained this is where the bollards are intended to be placed but the design of the bollards has not been determined. She indicated bike racks need to be noted on the plans as well.

Ms. Rauch presented the wall stone abutment. She presented different views shown from the perspective of the pedestrian level with lighting included.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He said the ART is scheduled to make a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board on April 13, 2017, for the meeting on April 26, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. Claudia Husak announced there is going to be a change in the ART meeting schedule and the changes will be rolled out, later in the month. She explained the process is to become more streamlined by accepting applications on Tuesdays and conducting a more thorough review at the beginning. She indicated that starting in April, the ART will only meet on a bi-weekly basis and agenda items will be consolidated. Her plan is for the ART to meet the first and third Thursdays and conduct a General Staff meeting on opposite weeks for more internal review of all cases. She explained an agenda will be distributed earlier in the week so if there is not anything one finds interesting then one would not have to attend and/or other designees could attend.

At the April Work Session, she said it will be announced that the ART will only review MPR and the rest of

the cases will go directly to PZC. She said since the ART played a huge role in planning the West Innovation District and is intended to be involved in the Dublin Corporate Area Plan they will probably continue to review those applications. There is a possibility that we will eliminate deadlines and due dates as listed in the Zoning Code. She concluded next week we will switch the calendars.

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 3:35 pm.