



project summary

To: Dublin Ohio – Planning and Zoning Commission
From: Meyers + Associates Architecture
Project: 4000 W Dublin-Granville Road
Project #: 2021-15
Issue Date: Monday, February 21, 2022

Preliminary Development Plan – Project Summary

The proposed project includes construction of a multi-tenant building along W. Dublin - Granville Road (West of Sawmill Road, adjacent to and East of David Road). The property is located within the Bridge Street District (in the Sawmill Center Neighborhood overlay) and will follow all applicable guidelines of the Bridge Street District Development code (BSD).

The existing site has been limited with respects to building size (7,000 s.f. max.), use type, density and parking calculations as outlined in a 'Declaration of Easements, Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions' dated June 15, 2000. The developer/design team have worked to provide a development on the proposed site that satisfies the requirements of these restrictions

Parking will be provided in the rear of the building with vehicular access from existing Banker Drive on the North side of the property. Parking calculations have been provided based on anticipated uses of the building and found to comply. The parking lot will be screened along street frontages by the use of landscaping, trees/shrubs, and/or landscape walls, or a combination of such per BSD requirements. A drive-thru window will be located on the rear of the building for use by the Eastmost tenant. A vehicular drive-thru* aisle has been provided on the east side of the property to accommodate 12 vehicles (with mid-aisle exit) and will be screened appropriately with landscaping

***Drive Thru:** The developer/design team understands that Drive thru's are allowable in the Sawmill Center Neighborhood zoning district as a Conditional Use (Accessory) with strict adherence to the Use Specific Standards outlined in BSD Section 153.059 (C), specifically Section (4)(c), items 1-9. Special attention has been given to the planning and placement of the proposed drive thru aisle to minimize both the inward/outward appearance and potential constraints on pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular circulation routes on site. The location of the proposed drive thru is along the Easternmost side of the site, adjacent an access drive designated Neighborhood Connector Street. This location for the drive thru was chosen for its remoteness relative to the main building and ease of entering and exiting once on site to minimize unnecessary vehicular patterns and potential interactions with pedestrians accessing the building. The nearest edge of the proposed drive thru is approximately 24'-0" from the access drive allowing flexibility of screening opportunities by the use of an approved street wall. Potential street wall screening will include hedgerow landscaping consisting of closely spaced deciduous or evergreen shrubs (36" in height when planted) combined with masonry



posts spaced 25'-0" maximum apart. The remaining groundcover on the street side of the street wall will be landscaped with a mulch bed and perennial plantings. Vehicle stacking will be provided along the drive thru aisle to accommodate 12 vehicles and will be clearly delineated as such. A traffic and pedestrian circulation plan will be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission for review and approval with a conditional use application.

Public Open Space: will be provided along W Dublin Granville Road in the form of a Pocket Plaza with additional open space at the NorthEast corner of the property. This NE open space will be provided with benches and the opportunity for public art display.

The building is comprised of three separated tenant spaces varying in size with a total building square footage of +/- 7,000 s.f. The tenant space on the West side of the building will offer an outdoor terrace along W Dublin-Granville Road, wrapping from front to the West side of the site. The tenant space on the East side of the building will also provide an outdoor terrace along W Dublin-Granville Road, wrapping from the front to the East side of the site.

Building Type: The proposed building will follow guidelines as outlined for a **Loft Building Type** as closely as possible and will be positioned within the required building zone with public sidewalks to building entrances on the front and rear of the building. Landscape, Patio and Public Open Spaces will be utilized as RBZ Treatments where building does not sit at the RBZ. Building entrances will be located along W Dublin-Granville Road, and at the rear of the building, spaced accordingly per building type requirements. Consideration has been given to the exterior of the building to ensure a variety in massing through the use of varying roof parapet heights and articulation of the façade while providing pedestrian-scale details and approachability. The primary façade material is brick with aluminum storefront with wood slat utilized as an accent material. Calculations have been provided for transparency and primary materials demonstrating adherence to building type requirements.



Summary of Comments related to 21-128CP during December 8th Planning and Zoning commission Meeting:

1. Ms. Fox inquired if there were ceiling height restrictions in addition to the 7,000 square feet development limitation..

Response: We appreciate Ms. Fox's comments. Discussion was focused on the building height limitations per existing Deed restrictions. With further refinements to the massing of the building, we have provided taller parapets at the main entry points to Tenants A and B, utilizing the full extents of the height restriction. This adjustment helps break up the façade further and allows the introduction of brick detailing/recesses to accentuate the height of the building. The ceiling in these areas can be raised slightly for interior effect/sense of volume while parapet height on the exterior (relative to roof height) can be used to screen mechanical equipment.

2. Mr. Supelak stated that he has a different view. The applicant has done a very good job within a difficult situation. Much has been done to cultivate the pedestrian experience along SR161. Some of the revisions made, including the primary walkway from the north into the site, are very nice. He believes something should also be added to the west side of the site. The building does not make connection to the street at all, aside from the restaurant plaza. The increased buffer helps; the drive aisle becomes less of a problem. They have created pedestrian circulation all around the site. The passage through the building is nice. The building, however, is very horizontal, flat, a single height. They have suggested the height of the center portion could be increased. However, it might be possible to increase the height of the bookend sections and the center portion lower. The second story element could be faked, similar to what they did with the Penzone building. While he is generally supportive of the proposed plan, he is not comfortable with combing the preliminary and final development plans. He would want to stipulate conditions regarding height adjustments, in particular.

Response: We appreciate Mr. Supelak's comments. With the decision to utilize the full extents of the 28 foot building height (per deed restriction), we've chosen to accentuate the main entry points to Tenant A and Tenant C while allowing the ends of the building to progress down to pedestrian scale addressing the outdoor patios on the East and West sides of the building.

3. Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the Concept Plan. They have done a great job addressing all of the issues presented. We do not like drive-throughs, and while we might want to be a community without drive-throughs, the world is changing. With the preferred approach, we would be telling people if drive-throughs are what they want, go somewhere other than Dublin. He believes the City needs to acknowledge our changing world. The applicant has done a good job with screening the drive-through. Given the circumstances, he does not feel bound by the Code. He would like to learn if any changes could be made in the building height to achieve more variation. Other than that element, he supports the Concept Plan.

Response: We appreciate Mr. Schneier's comments. With the decision to utilize the full extents of the 28 foot building height (per deed restriction), we've chosen to accentuate the main entry points to Tenant A and Tenant C while allowing the ends of the building to progress down to pedestrian scale addressing the outdoor patios on the East and West sides of the building.



4. Ms. Fox stated that she appreciates the thought the applicant has invested in addressing the deed restriction difficulties. The intent is to have a pedestrian—friendly streetscape, and the Code has been written to accomplish that. In some cases, that Code works for us; in some cases, it does not work. In this case, the Code is hurting us, because the result will be an empty site here. However, the applicant has attempted to tackle the issue. In return, the Commission needs to consider the possibility of a hybridized approach. Although the plan is not entirely where it needs to be, it is beginning to get there. The proposed building still reads as a commercial building type across the front. The height needs to be increased at some point. Within the urban streetscapes of Granville Avenue or High Street in Clintonville, the buildings organically are different. The proposed building still reads as a commercial strip center; that must be broken up. She appreciates the fact that pedestrians have been brought to the front of the site; however, the walkway is too close to the drive-through. More separation is needed. She appreciates that the building has been set back. More activity along the front will increase business; but if it continues to resemble a strip mall, people will drive by. They need to focus on enriching the feel of the streetscape. She agrees that the height needs to be increased somewhere to achieve the more organic, Granville Avenue look. She believes the drive-through works. We need to make room for alternative vehicles with wheels, such as golf carts, but we do not want to sacrifice the pedestrian opportunity. This plan offers pedestrian connectivity throughout the site. She is unsure of the proposed space in the middle of the parking lot. She would not want to sit there without a cover overhead. Because it seems unusable, she would be interested in seeing that space moved close to the building. She would support having a lower-height building here, acknowledging the restrictions. Having a Loft Building Type does not automatically increase the pedestrian experience. In comparison, look at the Oakland Nursery site, where there is a significant level of pedestrian activity. Therefore, she believes energy can be achieved with the proposed plan, elevating the height and improving the outdoor spaces.

Response: We appreciate Ms. Fox’s comments. We believe that with the change in height and material/color across the front of the building the building mass becomes broken down in a positive manner. The building and drive thru aisle has been adjusted slightly to achieve a larger buffer between the pedestrian passthru and drive thru aisle, allowing more separation and landscape buffer. The shape of the open space in the parking lot has been adjusted and benches removed. A center planted area has been introduced with pathways shaped more organically as opposed to linear. Open space on the front of the building has been adjusted to provide more seating and opportunity for relief from the sidewalk.

5. Mr. Way stated that since the last meeting, he has spent time assessing this site and the corridor. While we have a vision for that corridor, it is a long-term vision. It will take a while to get there. To have parcels like this at key locations sitting vacant does not make sense. The applicant has worked very hard to achieve the intent of the Code to bring activity to the streetscape. They are doing that, but he would like to see even more activity along that edge, if it could be integrated. The applicant has addressed many of the issues to make this a viable, inviting site. The proposed plan could be an asset on that corner. Development changes over time, so 20 years from now, there may be something else here. He is supportive of the Concept Plan.

Response: We appreciate Mr. Way’s comments, understanding of the restrictions associated with the site and desire for development along this corridor.



6. Ms. Call stated that she appreciates that this is a difficult parcel. The deed's square footage and height restrictions along with the Bridge Street Code, discourage development. Ms. Fox has suggested that a hybridized approach might be a possibility. The difficult points for her are the proposed drive-through, which allows for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. There is too much activity occurring within a very small footprint. Currently, staff is recommending disapproval. She is supportive of a hybridized approach, if it could be made to make the City more supportive of the development. While she could be supportive of the Concept Plan, she would not be supportive of a Preliminary Development Plan, as currently proposed.

Response: We appreciate Ms. Call's comments, understanding of the restrictions associated with the site. We believe that the pedestrian has priority on site and that effective measures have been put in place to limit interactions between the drive thru component and pedestrian uses.

Summary of Adjustments

Adjustment: Building and drive thru slightly repositioned on site

Goals: 1. Widen the pedestrian passthru from North to South and allow for more buffer between the sidewalk and drive-thru aisle..

Adjustment: Parapet heights increased.

Goals: 1. Accentuate entry points and articulate the massing. Previous version appeared very 'flat' and resembled a strip mall development. We feel this adjustment relieves that concern. The ends of the building progress down in height to pedestrian scale addressing the outdoor patios on the East and West sides of the building.

Adjustment: Adjusted facade to utilize brick as a primary material with detailing, and wood as a secondary accent material

Goals: 1. Introduce brick in three varying colors to assist with breaking down the massing of the building.
2. Provide articulation and rhythm in the façade while offering a sense of height. A brick soldier course just below the parapet provides a horizontal detail prior to the wall terminating.

Adjustment: Open Spaces Adjusted

Goals: 1. Remove benches from open space in center parking lot island (would not get much use). Introduce a center landscape break in the path to be shaped more organically as opposed to linear.



2. Provide more seating and opportunity for relief from the sidewalk on front of building while maintaining public engagement.

Adjustment: Parking Lot Adjustments

Goals: 1. Increase width of tree lined islands on ends of parking rows.

Adjustment: Added storefront window and entry to Tenant C (pedestrian pass-thru wall)

Goals: 1. Increase visibility to interior space and provide more inviting view of the pass-thru sequence from North and South sides of building.

Adjustment: Additional Civil, Landscape and Building Analysis information added for Preliminary Development Plan Review