

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

BOARD ORDER

SEPTEMBER 21, 2016

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**3. Holder Wright Earthworks
16-054ARB**

**4729 Bright Road
Building and Site Modifications**

Proposal: Building and site modifications for the Holder Wright Earthworks site located between Bright Road and Emerald Parkway, east of Riverside Drive.

Request: Review and approval of an Architectural Review Board application for a designated property located outside of the Historic District and under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.170, Appendix G and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; represented by David Parkinson, CT Consultants

Planning Contact: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager; (614) 410-4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to table a request for Building and Site Modifications with eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant incorporate a different mix of materials for the restroom facility to soften the design and blend with the surrounding natural and historic areas;
- 2) That the applicant use a high-quality stained wood paneling, or equivalent material in place of the proposed concrete masonry units shown along the entrance wall to the restroom facilities;
- 3) That the roof design and surrounding mounding be reviewed to discourage opportunities for visitors to climb up the grade and stand on top of the roof;
- 4) That the building entrance be relocated to face the parking area for security reasons;
- 5) That the plans be revised to incorporate lighting on or around the proposed building for safety purposes;
- 6) That a softer material choice be incorporated for the retaining wall and the design be a stepped design;
- 7) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering on the coordination of any required improvements related to the Emerald Parkway and the park entrance drive; and
- 8) That the applicant provide a tree removal, preservation and replacement plan, and a landscape plan with the building permit that meets Code.

**3. Holder Wright Earthworks
16-054ARB**

**4729 Bright Road
Building and Site Modifications**

VOTE: 4 – 0

RESULT: This request for Building and Site Modifications was tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Thomas Munhall	Yes
Everett Musser	Yes
Jane Fox	Absent
Shannon Stenberg	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager

DRAFT

**3. Holder Wright Earthworks
16-054ARB**

**4729 Bright Road
Building and Site Modifications**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for building and site modifications for the Holder Wright Earthworks site located between Bright Road and Emerald Parkway, east of Riverside Drive. He said this is a request for a review and approval of an Architectural Review Board application for a designated property located outside of the Historic District and under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.170, Appendix G and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site, which is outside of the Historic District but one of the twelve properties on Appendix G that fall under the ARB's purview. She said the 18.8-acre site is surrounded on the north and east sides with single-family residential, the southern side with the last phase of Emerald Parkway, and the north is undeveloped land. She said there is a creek that runs through the middle portion of this site with tree stands as well as additional trees at the perimeter. She noted the earthworks that exist on the site. She reported the single-family house on the property was repurposed and incorporated into the park design.

Ms. Rauch referred to the overall master plan of what this park could look like. She said plans change as the plan is moved forward with the different phases and noted the specific section of the property being addressed tonight.

Ms. Rauch said the proposal includes construction of a restroom facility, parking lot, pathways, pedestrian bridge, and landscaping/mounding. She noted the vehicular entrance at Emerald Parkway, which will continue to be worked out with Engineering. She said the parking area has 34 spaces that lead up to the plaza and restroom facility. She pointed out the multi-use path as well as the current path at the end of Jenmar Court but that has been reworked after meeting with the neighbors and interested residents to provide additional screening to mitigate the noise from Emerald Parkway going into this neighborhood. She said there is no lighting within the parking lot as the park area is meant for dawn to dusk activity. She said minimal light fixtures will be requested for the restroom facilities in terms of safety in case anyone was there after hours. She noted the bridge element across the creek adjacent to the plaza. She said the restroom facility and the plaza is oriented towards the north providing direct access and visibility to the pedestrian bridge. She indicated the grading up behind this facility is to make it appear as it was buried into the ground to mimic the earthwork design. She reported Staff had concerns about the potential reorientation due to safety concerns. She explained that if anyone is doing a drive-by in this parking lot for safety concerns, one cannot see around the corner of this mound. She said there are significant concerns about the design of the facility, especially about the materials and the colors, therefore, modifications were requested. She said the proposed facility shows retaining walls on either side of the central portion of the entrance to the facility made of concrete with a wood texture design finish. She added the seating portion of the retaining wall has the limestone veneer with a stone cap. She said overall this does not fit within the soft natural character that is out there on the site. She focused on the proposed pedestrian bridge that shows the same stone columns that would match the seating wall on the restroom facility with wire mesh in front of stained railings to provide security as one transverses the creek.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended with eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant incorporate a different mix of materials for the restroom facility to soften the design and blend with the surrounding natural and historic areas;
- 2) That the applicant use a high-quality stained wood paneling, or equivalent material in place of the proposed concrete masonry units shown along the entrance wall to the restroom facilities;

- 3) That the roof design and surrounding mounding be reviewed to discourage opportunities for visitors to climb up the grade and stand on top of the roof;
- 4) That the building entrance be relocated to face the parking area for security reasons;
- 5) That the plans be revised to incorporate lighting on or around the proposed building for safety purposes;
- 6) That a softer material choice be incorporated for the retaining wall and the design be a stepped design;
- 7) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering on the coordination of any required improvements related to the Emerald Parkway and the park entrance drive; and
- 8) That the applicant provide a tree removal, preservation and replacement plan, and a landscape plan with the building permit that meets Code.

Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation, introduced himself. He reported the City went through a restructuring last year and created the Parks and Recreation Department. He said with the retirement of Fred Hahn and the departure of Laura Ball have resulted in a transition and new roles. He indicated he and Shawn Krawetzki have taken this project on while assuming these new roles.

David Rinaldi asked what the Parks and Recreation Department thought of the recommendations for the changes of materials and orientation. He indicated we could have a different project if this application were approved with these conditions.

Mr. Earman said he thought the conditions could be managed and agreed upon; none of the conditions are serious enough to go outside the character of the design. He said he was concerned with re-orienting the building itself as it would take away the ceremonial effect of it. From a safety standpoint, he questioned whether visibility could be provided in an alternative manner; aesthetics are a lot less of a priority than the safety of the public.

Mr. Rinaldi asked for their recommendations for softening the concrete and retaining wall design so it would be limited to masonry or concrete.

Chad Knight, CT Consultants, said it would depend on how the building was reoriented and the new configuration. He said the original design was to provide the appearance of a mound being excavated for exploratory purposes. He said they will reconsider the design and remember it is a structure for restroom facilities. He said they will consider bringing down the scale of the eight-foot-tall walls to a more pedestrian level. He explained the wood texture on the walls was the initial attempt at softening the appearance. He said the concrete color in the renderings is not accurately reflected; there is a series of different colors to look like if one was cutting into a mound, the different colored layers of the earth would be illustrated.

Mr. Rinaldi said he liked the design. He asked if the backside is meant to be accessed to which Mr. Knight answered it was not.

Everett Musser said he liked the design, too. He asked Staff if the recommendation for the entrance to be turned was so that it could be visible from the parking lot. Ms. Rauch answered yes.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the restrooms would be locked like other facilities to which Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively.

Mr. Rinaldi said he did not understand what was being accomplished by rotating the facility. He said if anything inappropriate was going on, it would always be hidden by the mound itself.

Tom Munhall said with all these conditions and a total re-work of the design it would be difficult to vote on project they have not yet been presented.

Ms. Rauch said if the Board finds the design is appropriate, they have the ability to approve the proposal and eliminate any of the conditions they do not agree with.

Mr. Munhall indicated the proposal seems to be at the discussion stage and not ready for a vote this evening. He inquired about timing.

Mr. Earman said the applicant will do whatever it takes to get this right, no matter how long it takes. He added the capital funds are available this year for construction to begin so they intend for this to be available for bid and under contract by the end of the year but if that does not happen, he can certainly work with the finance department to encumber those funds.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the application was approved with the conditions identified, if Parks would work with Staff to meet the conditions. Ms. Rauch answered in the affirmative but offered the Board the option to table the case if they did not agree with Staff's recommendations or conditions.

The Chair called for public comments.

Don Spangler, 3614 Jenmar Court, said his home is next door to this public parking lot and restroom. He said this is not what they planned on and initially thought this was a horrible thing to be placed here but over time with discussions with the City, they have been able to get many of the elements softened with the addition of trees and mounding. He indicated that noise from Emerald Parkway currently is not that bad; everything they have seen with this project is good. He said they like the building in the position proposed. He said he does not want to see the doors to the restrooms but the mound will help and he does not want to see a lot of light. However, he said he had suggested that the walking path route be changed due to the way the snow is plowed and produces mounding and drifting. He said a lot of people use the path and would expect a lot more to use it once this earthworks project is completed.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, suggested adding warmer colors to the project to tie into the theme of the earthworks. He suggested the use of information kiosks at the plaza to help prepare people for what they are about to encounter at the site.

Randy Roth, 6897 Grandee Cliffs Drive, said he is very excited about all of this. He said the City has been great to work with on this. He said he resides behind the Spanglers' home. He asked that the evergreen lines be extended to provide visual protection year round. He asked if permeable pavers could be used for the parking lot instead of piping water directly into the creek that runs through his backyard, which they are trying to rehabilitate in many ways. He reported the neighbors have been working with the City's Green Team to restore natural flora and fauna. He said a 100-foot setback is not needed to protect a creek but 10 - 20 foot strip of natural vegetation is needed. He said he hopes any blasting would not be as extensive as to what was done to complete Emerald Parkway because it caused a lot of damage to his home.

Mr. Musser inquired about the drainage of the stormwater from the parking lot and where the detention areas are located.

Dave Parkinson, CT Consultants, said the stormwater and sediments will be captured and taken to a stormwater detention, two-bay facility and then after there is a controlled release back to the stream. He said the detention area is west of the restroom facility.

Mr. Musser asked if permeable pavers had been considered for the parking lot. Mr. Parkinson said the City has had turnover of staffing during this project and his company has experienced turnover as well so since he did not start with the project, he cannot speak to the history of the project. He said pavers for the parking lot are not in the plans now and is uncertain if it was evaluated during the development of the plan. He said cost would be a consideration when installing permeable pavement versus the traditional/conventional method of conveying and treating stormwater.

Mr. Musser said using permeable pavers would eliminate any detention areas. Mr. Parkinson said not all stormwater is generated at the parking area, some is generated at the roadways and the patio area at the front.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the City would consider using permeable pavers for this project. Mr. Earman said they are not part of this project because of the soils on site. He said the City has permeable pavement in two of its parks currently; they have been experimenting with the life span of that product and the maintenance aspect is on-going.

Mr. Munhall said he was not ready to vote on this as he needs to see the changes being proposed. Mr. Musser agreed.

Mr. Rinaldi said he finds the facility to be designed properly but if the City believes rotating the building is a safer option than he is not opposed.

Mr. Earman said this can be taken back to the risk department and discuss any concerns the risk manager may have. He indicated there may be some creative ways to adjust the retaining walls to give it the visual effect we are looking for without changing the orientation of the building itself to keep the ceremonial type aspect to the project. He offered to bring back alternatives for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Rinaldi agreed the earth-tone colors would be more appropriate and really likes the concept of the design as it fits the site very well.

Shannon Stenberg requested a better rendering of the wood texture design for the concrete to show the softening effect they expect it to provide. Mr. Earman said a better illustration could be provided at the next meeting.

Mr. Musser inquired about the security issue. Mr. Earman reported that as a result of public input sessions, the perception of public safety was considered. He said from a visibility standpoint, it is nice to see all four sides of a structure and in this case it would be the circumference of the structure as police do their patrols.

Mr. Spangler said he is not in favor of lighting but if it is a necessity, he suggested motion-sensor lighting. He said if the police drive by at 3 am and the light is on, they would know to check the facility. Mr. Rinaldi said there is a perfect soffit to provide minimal light that would not spill out beyond what is necessary.

Ms. Stenberg emphasized the site should not be so visible from the houses on that street.

Mr. Munhall indicated the City has done a great job with this so far and will continue to do a great job to address these concerns to help the residents.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to table a request for Building and Site Modifications. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes, Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Tabled 4 – 0)