

# Memorandum

To: Rati Singh, Planner  
Community Planning and Development  
City of Dublin Ohio

From: Mark Ford

Date: May 2, 2025 **REVISED May 29, 2025**

Re: Material Review – Crown INEOS

---

Per your request of April 25, 2025, I have reviewed the proposed revisions to Subarea B described in the “Amended Final Development Plan: Crown Ineos PUD District March 2025” and the associated proposed building alterations design materials prepared by Archall dated February 20, 2025. Below is an outline of my comments and findings. Please contact me if you have any questions regarding my comments.

## Architectural Design Comments.

1. The overall building footprint is not being modified. The design proposal focuses primarily on limited site improvements and exterior building modifications to the showroom and reception area facades that include:
  - a. Removal of the existing paver sidewalks and replacement with new concrete sidewalks.
  - b. Additional plant materials on the southern (front) portion of the site.
  - c. New site lighting.
  - d. A new exterior building canopy including a geometric steel support framing (painted red).
  - e. Painting of the façade brick veneer (painted black). See comments below.
  - f. New exterior cladding materials that include two types of prefinished metal wall panels.
  - g. New exterior aluminum and glass curtainwall systems.
2. The proposed exterior finish materials are indicated on the architectural elevations and renderings include the following:
  - a. S-01 – Painted Steel, Color: Real Red SW 6868.
  - b. BR-01 – Painted Brick, Color: Tricon Black SW 6258.
  - c. SF-01 – Kawneer Trifab Versaglaze 451T Storefront System, Color: Black.
  - d. AP-01 – DMI, Horizontal Wall Panel. Color: Black.
  - e. RS-01 – Trespa, Woodlike Rain Screen, Style Meteon. Color: Elegant Oak Satin.
  - f. ACM-01 – Apolic Aluminum Composite Metal Panel. Color: BLX Black.
3. The renderings illustrate a ribbed panel on the face of the new canopy and note this as AP-1. My recommendation is that the face of the canopy should be the apolic smooth face composite panel, ACM01 for a more finished appearance for this predominate design element.
4. There are two elevation design concepts provided. The first option illustrates painting the existing brick veneer on all existing exterior walls. The second option illustrates painting the existing brick veneer on the showroom and reception area exteriors walls and generally in limited to the areas of new storefront and the inclusion of metal wall panels. It is my opinion that the first option of painting the entirety of the exterior brick presents a more wholistic

approach to the alterations, while the second option simply appears to be incomplete. If the second option is accepted, I would recommend that all doors, window systems, overhead doors and any wall louvers also be replaced or painted to provide a fully integrated design solution.

5. Based on the information provided via email the proposed exterior glass is Solarban 70 Clear. This is appropriate for the proposed storefront/show window application.
6. The proposed application of the Trespa wall panels is appropriate for the location and scale of the exterior canopy. The product data provided via email (Details TS210-134, Vertical Panel Joint, Detail TS210-134, Soffit Detail, Detail TS 210-285, Inside Corner, Detail TS210-285 Horizontal Mide Panel and Detail TS210-295 Horizontal Panel Joint) each indicate a concealed fastener system. Please note that there is a 3/8-inch open joint between the panels. ***The key element for this product will be the quality control during installation and maintaining a clean, straight edge at any panel cuts.*** The Meteon panels are a compact high-pressure laminate (HPL) panel made from 70% natural wood fibers and thermosetting resins. The product is manufactured in the Netherlands. The panels are wear-resistant and are not adversely affected by moisture. The panels are scratch and impact resistant. The panels are 6 mm thick (approximately ¼ inch). The manufacturer's literature indicates that there is a ten-year warranty that covers the material and color stability (fade and color change). A majority of the material is proposed on the underside of the entry canopy and as such will be protected from direct sunlight and rain. There are small portions of the material proposed on vertical accent wall planes. The proposed locations are limited in area and are appropriate for this material provided it is installed per the manufacturer's recommendations.
7. The pole mounting height of the proposed site light fixtures is not defined. Please confirm. Are the existing poles being reused with new fixtures? The Subarea B Development Text defines a maximum height of fixtures of 28 feet (page 12).
8. The Subarea B Development Text indicates a maximum site light fixture wattage of 400 watts (page 12). The lighting schedule on the submittal page 4 list new LED HID Type B lamps. It would be my recommendation that the text be revised to specify a maximum lighting output and color temperature rather than simply the lamp wattage.
9. Signage, the proposed canopy signage is internally illuminated signs with a white acrylic face. The placement of the signage is appropriate for building design and scale. The sign height is less than the 3 feet high sign height permitted in the Subarea B Development Text (page 13).
10. Canopy support framing: The geometric structural steel canopy support framing and angular canopy presents a continuation of the more contemporary designs within the "automotive district" along SR 33 at Perimeter. The red inverted "V" framing is a reference to the red "A" logo found on the Ineos corporate website (see image below).



Three items need to be considered.

- First is the scale and position of the design feature. The referenced imagery to the “A” may or may not be perceived; but the location, severe angle and scale of the feature certainly is front and foremost to the proposed elevation design. The proposed Development Standards for subarea B (page 10) states “Contemporary and modern design with a mix of materials, including glass, metal, ACM, EIFS and concrete are appropriate and encouraged in the transitional zone”. This element would fall within the contemporary and modern”
- Second is the red color. Is this high chroma color appropriate for this PUD subarea?
- Third, I think additional specific architectural details need to be provided on how the base of the framing is connected to the foundation (i.e. what anchorage is exposed to view) and how is this framing connected to the angular canopy. The information provided via email is a narrative description of the design intent; I believe that actual details should be provided for review. In the renderings the top of framing perfectly aligns with the face of the vertical metal wall panels. Additional information/details should be provided to illustrate the actual proposed construction details for the two conditions.

**END OF MEMO**