



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, March 4, 2021 | Live Streamed on YouTube at 1:00 pm

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Rauch welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm.

Per the State of Emergency, laws were enacted including the Stay at Home Order for which the City will need to live-stream all public meetings until that order has lifted. Comments can be submitted on the City's website before or during the meeting.

ROLL CALL

ART Members and Designees present: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Director (Chair); Brad Fagrell, Director of Building Standards; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect Manager; Renae Rice, Police Sergeant; and Brad Flora, Washington Township Fire Department Inspector.

Staff Members present: Chase Ridge, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner II; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Assistant II.

Applicants present: (Case 1) Carter Bean, Architect; Wayne Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants and Karen Hanlon, Karen Hanlon Design.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Rauch made a motion and Ms. Gilger seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on February 11, 2021.

Votes: Mr. Fagrell, yes; Mr. Stanford, yes; Mr. Krawetzki, yes; Mr. Flora, yes; Sergeant Rice, yes; Ms. Gilger, yes; and Ms. Rauch, yes. The minutes were approved 7 – 0.

Ms. Rauch noted the two Minor Modifications:

1. Bates and Brown Barbershop – Storefront modifications – Change in building material or color.
2. Germain Honda of Dublin – Permeable pavement – Other modifications deemed appropriate by the Planning Director.

INTRODUCTION

1. **Baltimore Corner Restaurant** **21-017MPR**

4595 Bridge Park Avenue **Minor Project Review**

Ms. Martin said this an introduction for a proposal for the construction of a ±6,200-square-foot restaurant with 400 square feet of outdoor dining patio space at an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park with Riverside Drive in Block B of the Bridge Park Development. She presented a graphic of the proposed site plan and noted the tenant space was in the northwest corner Building B2. She provided detail of the site, noting the terminus of the Dublin Link Pedestrian Bridge and River Crossing Park.

Ms. Martin presented the existing conditions of the tenant space as viewed from Riverside Drive looking east up Bridge Park Avenue, including sidewalk, cycle track, and outside patio. The tenant space above will be discussed later in this presentation. The tenant space is within the black enclosure proposed to be occupied by the applicant. Additional views were provided of the site and the surrounding context. The first looks south along Riverside Drive; note the black enclosure is the tenant space to be modified with this application. Looking north along Riverside Drive; note the planters along Riverside Drive that were part of public improvements with the realignment of Riverside Drive. Building B2 sits right along the right-of-way line with the majority of the sidewalk and planter in the public right-of-way. Additional context of the pedestrian gathering area right at the intersection was presented.

Ms. Martin presented a graphic of the overview of Block B in context with the surrounding blocks in the development. It is important to note that with the original approval of this block development, a shopping corridor was designated as required by the neighborhood standards and this site is presently zoned the Scioto River Neighborhood District. The shopping corridor has additional standards with a use-specific standard of a minimum 12-foot clear pedestrian circulation area that shall be provided along the shopping corridor frontage. This allows for activation of the public street in the shopping area.

Ms. Martin presented two graphics of the approved open space plan in detail. She noted the designated public open spaces and the 512 square feet of open space designated as a pocket plaza for Building B2, which serves as a gateway location and contributes to the overall amount of open space.

Ms. Martin presented the site plan in detail with interior tenant improvements as well as exterior improvements proposed. She highlighted the right-of-way encroachments including the open and enclosed patios along Riverside Drive. The enclosure of the plaza area extends along Riverside Drive, west of the right-of-way line. The enclosed patio encroachment is 6 feet, 5 inches and encroachment of the open and covered patio area is 4 feet, 3 inches. To accommodate the clearance requirement, the applicant is proposing to modify the size of the City planter within the right-of-way by decreasing the width by 2 feet to provide 8 feet of clear circulation. This modification would provide only 6 feet in some areas whereas 12 feet is the minimum requirement in the shopping corridor.

Ms. Martin said the applicant provided character images to help the ART understand the text and scope of improvement. In the graphic, the enclosed covered patio and the Nano wall system for the covered and open patio system, along with the modified planter width were shown as part of this proposal. She noted the main entrance to the restaurant and the modifications along Riverside Drive that occur within the public right-of-way. For context, a view looking north along Riverside Drive shows the covered and open patio as well as the enclosed patio, which becomes a building addition in this case. The main entrance enclosure is part of the original dedicated open space area.

Ms. Martin provided an overview of the ART process for this application. She said in today's meeting, the expectation is that the ART makes a determination that this proposal impacts the greater surrounding community so it should be further reviewed by the PZC for ultimate consideration. Hence, the scope of the presentation today only covered overarching improvements of this proposal; at the next ART hearing, Ms. Martin plans to provide design finishes. She concluded her presentation by opening the meeting up for discussion.

Mr. Krawetzki said he understands modifying the front planter but inquired about how the pedestrian way is impacted on the other side with the cycle track. Ms. Martin answered, the modifications along Bridge Park Avenue will not encroach the right-of-way. Therefore, clearance for the cycle track and sidewalk will be maintained.

Mr. Fagrell asked how patrons enter into the narrower eating area. Mr. Bean, Architect, shared his screen to show there are accessible paths for the two doors leading out to the eating area in the outdoor patio space. He indicated it is tight at the pier but he established accessible eating in the northern portion of the dining area. He noted the access and egress aisle is 44 inches narrowing down to a 36-inch path. Mr. Fagrell

requested the total width of the area out toward the building. Mr. Bean answered 7 feet, 8 inches.

Mr. Bean asked if it was appropriate to add some discussion about building materials or to just entertain more questions. Ms. Rauch asked the ART if there were additional questions. [Hearing none] the applicant was permitted to move forward with a presentation.

Mr. Bean indicated he was aware the proposal does not fit within the original requirements established for this block. He indicated the submission did not address overarching planning for getting where they are today. Mr. Bean said he had a series of slides he wanted to present to show their thought process for this project. As one drives along Riverside Drive from the roundabout, the vehicle is at a higher speed of travel and the site scape and the buildings react to this condition with taller buildings with detail elevated, pedestrian spaces on the exterior, and elevated pedestrian areas to establish clear definition between car and person. Proceeding north, the traffic slows down in the "compression zone". Approaching the end of Block A, views start to open up, the scale of buildings is reduced, and more pedestrian ways are introduced continuing north. Block B is the beginning of the compression zone; pedestrian areas become closer to street level. Moving toward Pins, there is more guarded outdoor space. The building is set back and the height of the building is reduced down to two stories. Levels of pedestrian space open up above. This is where one becomes aware of the Dublin Link Bridge. Along with the pavilion in Riverside Crossing Park that is now erected, one starts to see break lights from the stacking of traffic. Moving toward the northern part of Block B, where this proposal exists, the northern building has a much more reduced scale, and the pedestrian activity is down at the streetscape level. This is where the pedestrian crossing is approached. The intersection shows the tenant space and area the applicant plans to occupy along the street. There is a clear definition of street scape space and the intention of slowing traffic approaching the pedestrian crossing where there is: more outdoor activity spaces; canopies coming off the building at a pedestrian scale; off-street parking; and pedestrian seating areas translating these zones to an overall plan. He noted the Dublin Link Bridge, terminating at the north side of the intersection. Along Block A there is a higher vehicular speed zone, along the south half of Block B is the beginning of the compression zone and in the north part of Block B is the height of compression approaching the pedestrian crossing. Once through that intersection with on-street parking, there is a reduced speed zone. With a reduction in scale and the increase of detail and activity, this proposal reinforces the evolution of space and perception additionally, as one is arriving as a pedestrian that crossed the bridge, creating an inviting, energized space. This tenant space is an opportunity to further detailing of the building and pedestrian scale for further awareness of pedestrian activity and calmness of traffic.

Mr. Bean presented renderings of a higher quality than what was submitted. He said they created intentional spaces where pedestrians are invited, feel comfortable, and activate that area to increase everyone's awareness and experience.

Mr. Bean explained the precession of elements from a covered outdoor patio to an indoor/outdoor enclosed space is further compression from outside. This piece on the corner will be indoor/outdoor space. The windows will fold up and project out providing a lot of communication at a high level of detail to this plaza. By building out into this area, this is still a very sizeable plaza at the corner.

Mr. Bean indicated he likes how the pavilion has turned out across the street. The best aspects of it, since he has seen it mainly at night, is how that corner is lit up at night. The applicant does not want this to disappear at night and by adding a nice lighting plan, it will heighten one's awareness and marks the important pedestrian intersection crossing. Lastly, he presented a patio view for the pedestrian.

With regard to the 12-foot pedestrian way along the street, Mr. Bean said they are asking for a reduction in width, in conjunction with modifying the planter, proposing 8 feet of clearance instead of 12 feet. He presented the City's planter in its existing condition - a before and after modification of the planter as proposed with the new edge pushed in. This will still remain out of the drip line of the trees planted there and will not impact the plantings negatively. The building would project out and they would maintain an 8-foot clearance. The aerial view he presented was a recap of everything he mentioned – the scale heading

northbound from Block A to Block B south to Block B north. This proposal is in line with the intention of reducing scale and increasing interest and activity in this area.

Ms. Rauch indicated that by the applicant providing a background and the additional pictures, it was helpful to the team to better understand the proposal.

Ms. Rauch asked if any public comment was received. Ms. Martin answered there were no public comments. Ms. Rauch called for questions.

Mr. Krawetzki indicated there has been a lot of discussion on how protrusions might affect the cycle track and movement of pedestrians. He noted that the rendering shows that it is still fairly open for the cyclist. He stated he was not concerned with the planter but is concerned about the compression of that open space that is receiving pedestrians from the Dublin Link Bridge and cycle track as that whole movement is being compressed.

Ms. Martin stated pedestrian circulation is the number one goal of the Bridge Street District as a whole - to prioritize the pedestrian experience. When we consider vehicular uses versus pedestrian uses, we will always maintain as much room for the pedestrian as possible. Hence, the reason for the 12-foot clearance that was adopted in the Zoning Code. By asking to narrow pedestrian circulation that is asking for a deviation of the Code and conflicts with the goals and objectives for the Bridge Street District. The PZC may be better able to address. Staff would always advocate for as much space as possible for pedestrians. Staff believes the applicant can still achieve objectives while being cognizant of the City's intentions.

Mr. Krawetzki said he likes the design but because this is a gateway and the amount of space that was carved out for that purpose, he is concerned about the gathering of people happening at that corner. He thought the PZC should review.

Ms. Rauch asked Mr. Krawetzki where he thought people will be coming from. Mr. Krawetzki answered the corner and how it protrudes into the space where the brick was a little deeper into that corner. This puts pedestrians in conflict with cyclists at the corner. Ms. Rauch noted the corner of the building extends out a little bit.

Mr. Bean addressed to some degree movement around the corner to be eased is the goal and was a design challenge for establishing a canopy and dealing with the relation with the balcony above. From an aesthetic standpoint, it was completed while allowing for a path at the corner. Mr. Krawetzki asked if the post for support could be removed and have the corner of the balcony cantilever out. Mr. Bean said he will consider that option as he could justify removing the column. Mr. Schick said the corner was designed as such because of the structure above it. He agreed to study what type of support would be needed in place of that post.

Mr. Krawetzki added that with the south end of the planter being modified, there are two bike racks that may need to be adjusted so the back of bikes do not extend into the pedestrian way.

Mr. Stanford indicated Engineering focused on transportation mobility and the streetscape. He said a reduction of 12 feet to 8 feet is fine by engineering as measured from outside the planter boxes to the planter bed areas. He requested the applicant study the streetscape purpose and not just modifying the end planter and then engineering would evaluate.

Mr. Stanford asked the applicant to consider the second planter in this transition as it is a long planter. This is an opportunity to ease transition, visually. Mr. Stanford asked Mr. Krawetzki if all planters in the Bridge Street District have irrigation. Mr. Krawetzki answered there may be drip irrigations and they are not difficult to move. He added he likes Mr. Stanford's idea of transition. Mr. Stanford further explained, that overall, engineering wants balance and activations to make this happen but not by making critical mistakes. Engineering believes 8 feet gives everyone what they need while still allowing pedestrians space in that zone. Engineering can provide their perspective while providing the applicant guidance and direction.

Mr. Bean asked if they needed to modify the whole planter or organically transition just part of it. Mr. Stanford answered this is an opportunity to achieve the goal of a fixed point to the south, lining up with the short planter. He suggested making the transition gradual so it does not appear abrupt or forced, opening naturally to the corner. Tree placement is important as well.

Mr. Krawetzki stated conceptually that could work. He reiterated ensuring there is no abruptness from a holistic standpoint.

Ms. Rauch asked Mr. Fagrell, Mr. Flora, and Ms. Gilger if they had any comments. Ms. Rauch said she would relay any concerns Sergeant Rice might have had; she had to leave the meeting early due to a scheduling conflict.

Ms. Martin reiterated that with the development of Block B, there was an open space plan approved by the PZC and in order to alter, the PZC needs to be the reviewing body. She added the neighborhood standards include a schematic that shows a gateway at this intersection. Because of the overlap between the shopping corridor and the gateway requirement, this corner was designated as a pocket plaza. A condition of approval was imposed on the original application to work with the Dublin Arts Council for public art to be installed at a future date.

Ms. Rauch asked what the Code states for meeting gateway requirements. Ms. Martin paraphrased from the Code that states gateways are identified as points of identification, provide a sense of arrival, are required to be pedestrian oriented in scale, and may include a combination of architectural elements, landscape features, and/or public open space. The area is required to be consistent with the Principles of Walkable Urbanism, as defined in the Code and should be provided per the schematic in the neighborhood standards.

Ms. Rauch advised the applicant to prepare to answer the gateway questions during the PZC review and how that requirement might be accommodated.

Mr. Bean said that by creating a place that is architectural, begins to satisfy the gateway requirement. He stated he would work with Crawford Hoying Development Partners for the transplant of 514 square feet and establish a place for public art.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the sign as shown on Riverside Drive and the adjacency to the balcony above.

Mr. Bean stated final signage has not been determined but will return when fully designed but this is what they are working toward. A dentist's office is the second floor user at this corner. They would see the sign out and below them but it would not be terribly obtrusive. Because of their use, the space would be unoccupied at night so light from the sign would not affect the dentist office. Residential units start on the fourth floor.

Ms. Rauch asked the ART if they are comfortable recommending this proposal to be heard by the PZC. She said the recommendation would be determined at the next ART meeting. By asking each member: Mr. Krawetzki agreed; Mr. Stanford agreed, as he said this is a very important corner and a lot has to be taken into consideration; Mr. Fagrell agreed, stating the proposal is important enough to do that; and Mr. Flora and Ms. Gilger agreed, also.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any other comments or questions [Hearing none]. She stated staff will be meeting internally and will provide feedback to the applicant in time so they can review the comments and direction. She adjourned the meeting at 1:57 pm.

