### Berlin Township Architectural Review Board of Delaware County, OH 43015 Administrative Review

Wednesday July 12, 2023: 6:30 p.m.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was held at Berlin Township Hall, 3271 Cheshire Rd, and was called to order by Christina Littleton at 6:30 p.m.

ARB members present: Christina Littleton, Quinn Hoffman, Jennifer Ludwigson

Also present: Subsitute Clerk Tara Shields

Not present: Kristin Yorko

### AGENDA ITEM: Chairperson's reading of adopted policy

Ms. Littleton reviewed the adopted policy. Ms. Littleton added the purpose of the Architectural Review Board and the process that it follows.

#### **AGENDA ITEM: Proof of Publication**

Ms. Shields stated that the meeting was advertised in the Delaware Gazette on July 1, 2023.

### **AGENDA ITEM: Minute Approval**

Ms. Littleton motioned to approve ARB organizational minutes, 06/07/2023. seconded by Ms. Hoffman

VOTE: Littleton, yes; Hoffman, yes; Ludwigson, yes

#### AGENDA ITEM: Berlin Business Park 23-003

Berlin Business Park 23-003, filed by N Old State, LLC., (Brent & Jordan Yates) 3216 S 3B's & K Road, Galena, OH 43021. The applicant is requesting an administrative review for a Multi-Family Residential Development, Parcel #418-120-01-009-002, 418-120-01-012-002, 418-120-01-011-000, +/- 31.683 acres, zoned Berlin Commercial Overlay (BCO)/R-10, N Old State Road, Delaware, OH 43015

### **Applicant Presentation**

Jordan Yates of 3216 S 3B's & K Road, Galena, OH 43021, introduced the project by giving a history of how he and his mom purchased the land in 2017 with different plans for the land. He currently lives in the township and has children at Johnnycake Corners, Berkshire, and Berlin. He references that the BCO is a blank slate west of Alum Creek and wants to be the gateway for what this will look like. The applicant has worked with Delco to put in a 6,500 ft extension all the way down their property from Lackey Old State. In addition to water, the applicant has worked with Regional Sewer in order to provide lines along 36/37 to the lift station on Africa Rd. These oversized lines will allow for additional utilities to developers along 36/37. overview of a multifamily apartment complex that includes ten 3-story residential buildings including a central green space with ravine and secondary greenspace on the south side. 7,000 square foot clubhouse with a pool and a dog park on the northside of the property. The 31 acres are being developed at a density of 8 units per acre. They are able to maintain a lot of the greenspace and he is excited that it backs up to Alum Creek and the Army Corp properties. Mr. Yates is excited that they are able to maintain a lot of the natural spaces on the property. It backs up to Alum Creek and Army Corp property. He stated that residents in the community and the adjacent landowners will love outdoor feel.

Mr. Yates introduces Todd Faris. He indicates that we have the meeting minutes from Regional Planning. Mr. Faris states that Scott Sanders from Regional Planning gave them an A/A-. He states that obviously we needed to go through the checklist and that it is a big project with a lot of components.

#### Checklist Review

Ms. Littleton started the BCO portion of the checklist for review. Ms. Hoffman could not find an exhibit of 8-foot sidewalk and 8-foot landscape between sidewalk and building. Ms. Littleton also had a question about the arterial roads and whether that was to be discussed by the Architectural Review Board or part of the application because the code is referring to public roads when it refers to the 5-foot sidewalk. Mr. Faris stated they have a 5-foot sidewalk on North Old State. Mr. Yates states that he is unsure about the connecting roads, but the sidewalk is on the interior, so it is private. Secondarily, it's only required if it's attached to undeveloped parcels. The parcel to the north is occupied by a single-family home and the entire east side is the state park. Ms. Littleton stated that she would like to see a 10-foot multi-use trail along North Old State Rd. The rooftop mechanicals units and rooftop screening was determined not applicable.

Under the Architectural category, it was determined at first that the requirement for Building Materials was not met. Ms. Littleton said they requested a divergence for HardiePlank, although Mr. Faris stated that they have stucco in the plans in case they do not get the divergence. They asked to have the discussion as to why they are requesting the divergence and they stated that in the industrial and commercial overlay, cement border is allowed in all cases except for R-4 or R-10. Mr. Yates stated that if you look in the Berlin Commercial Overlay, with over 2,500 acres, only a small portion won't be allowed to have HardiePlank. In the U.S., the HardiePlank market is a 4-billion-dollar industry and the EIFS market is a 400 million dollar industry and it's typically going to be used on commercial building, not residential. He stated that his architect does thousands of multi-family units every year. He asked him the last time he put EIFS on a multi-family product and he said he didn't know, maybe in the nineties. He questioned his developer sitting in the audience (David Ruma 485 Metro Place S. Suite 350, Dublin, Ohio 43017) asking how many units he's built around Central Ohio. Mr. Ruma stated that it's never used anymore; maybe on single family, but the long-term maintenance, cracks, water, infiltration is tough on a large residential property. He doesn't know anybody that has used it in this practice. Mr. Yates then states that since this will be the only ingredient allowed in R-4, we would be burdening a homeowner with something they can't repair on their own. That's why HardiePlank has come so far along because the pricing is somewhat comparable between the two. It's not like it's drastically cheaper. If it was drastically cheaper, that would be fine, but that's not what they are proposing. For their specific use, HardiePlank is the far superior material and the president they are going to set with this is going to be expected to be upheld around the remaining R-10 and R-4. Mr. Yates thinks that the flexibility that allowing HardiePlank provides is a far better solution for everybody that will come after them both from a property owner, a homeowner, as well as a developer's perspective. He believes it's the logical thing to add because it's present both in this overlay already other that R-4 and R-10 along with the industrial. He does know that they are talking about a divergence but said that it seems like it got left out more than a divergence. He hopes that we can come to a place where it's an acceptable use for the and his thought would be that there's potentially an amendment to the Overlay Code to allow for it versus just a divergence every time. Ms. Littleton states that she sees a lot of stone and asks what percentage of it would become HardiePlank. Mr. Yates shows on the diagram that it wouldn't be a matter of adding more HardiePlank, but that they would just be replacing the current EIFS on the design with it. Mr. Yates states that as your driving by or touching it, you won't be able to tell the difference and Ms. Littleton replies that it looks like minimal use. Ms. Hoffman states that she appreciates the design style. Mr. Yuma explains that the request is to use HardiePlank panels, not lap siding so it doesn't change the look. Ms. Littleton agrees that it seems as if the HardiePlank was left out unintentionally and she doesn't anticipate that they will have a hard time getting it approved. She also could see it being amended, hopefully sooner than later. It was then determined that it was met with the current EIFS, but that they were still requestion the divergence.

Under the Layout category, Ms. Hoffman and Ms. Ludwigson said it was met, but Ms. Littleton agreed with Regional Planning and would like to know how that 15% is usable. She knows it's not retention ponds but thought they may have mentioned adding a path along the woods or starting a path along the south side and reach around to the dog park. The other suggestion by Ms. Littleton was making a deer path bigger. Mr. Faris stated that the only issue was that if you made it for one, you have to make it for everyone, including ADA and that it is too steep for that. He suggested that people can get off of their trails and go down the deer trails. Ms. Littleton suggested that it would take care of the usability. Ms. Littleton stated at this time that the conditions were not met. Ms. Ludwigson liked the ideas and agreed. Access and Connectivity was not applicable. The other condition not met was Pavement. Ms. Littleton was unable to find it in the plan and Mr. Faris stated it wasn't in there but will make sure it's up to code. Ms. Littleton stated that there have been questions about our requirements and that there are superior pigments materials and methods. Mr. Yuma wondered if RCC was in the county standard because it's a better base than an aggregate, and that's what they typically use. Ms. Hoffman states that the standards for roads and parking are a 20-year design life with a minimum pavement depth of eight inches of aggregate and two inches of pavement. Mr. Yuma states that RCC is stronger than aggregate, so they use 6 inches of RCC and inch and a half of asphalt. Ms. Littleton states that this is something that needs to be specified eventually and the trustees can sort it out.

Under the Lighting category, neither condition was met. Ms. Littleton asks about the Max Height of 12 feet but in their text states that it states a max height of 20 feet. She asks if it's a typo and Mr. Faris states that it could be. The board stated that also for the next one that the text is far too small to read the lumens as well. Page 4 of the application is where it's in question. Ms. Hoffman questions 20 feet in some area and Ms. Littleton states that the code says 20 feet somewhere, but not parking in part. Mr. Faris states he can't find it, but he will take care of it. He is going to double check everything so the board can see if it's enough, but as far as light spillage and all of that stuff, he is sure they are good. Ms. Littleton points out in 15-37 of the code that in R-4 and R-10 the max height is 12 feet, but in all other uses it's 20 feet for parking lots.

In the Other category, Ms. Littleton suggested that they had already discussed the Sidewalks and multi-use paths and so that was going to be a no. She referenced the 10-foot path along the frontage on North Old State and the addition of multi-use path related to green space. In regards to the Environmentally Sensitive Areas subcategory, Ms. Littleton states that like previous plans brought in by Mr. Faris, she cannot find anything specifically called out. It appears they are meeting the requirement, but it's not specified. Mr. Faris states there's a larger wetland to the north that they've preserved, but there is not a lot of reporting there. They also have a donation report and shows a small portion that jurisdictional. He stated they are going to enclose it and it's going to be mitigated the same as other projects.

Ms. Littleton states that signs are not on the checklist and she is not sure why they were omitted from the checklist, but they should confirm to Article 25. She states that she doesn't know if they will hear that at all, but she feels like their signage meets all the requirements.

For the Landscaping overview, In the Perimeter are subcategory, Ms. Littleton states that she sees the 8-foot tall mound but cannot find the 3:1 slop or minimum 10 foot wide crest. They need to specify that in detail.

Under General Regulations, Ms. Littleton questioned what opacity was related to if it wasn't related to service structures. Ms. Shields suggests that they are probably referring to the perimeter trees and the ratio of evergreen to deciduous. Ms. Ludwigson was concerned about some of the clubhouse shrubs being 2 feet versus 3 feet. Mr. Faris had a coding question of what that actually meant based on the variety of plant and age. He stated he would look into it. The board reviewed the code and Mr. Faris stated how hard it can be to get such established plants.

All other Landscaping conditions were met and there were no other questions or concerns. Ms. Hoffman stated that she believes they are setting a nice standard for the area and there are some that they've seen before that weren't quite as modern design, won't age well, and will be dated quickly. She thinks that this is really slick. Ms. Littleton agrees that it sets a good standard and that she loves Worthington and New Albany and how everything is copacetic and consistent and really nice and beautifully capped. She loves this for Berlin Township.

### **ADGENDA ITEM: Public Comment**

Ms. Littleton opened up the meeting for public comment:

Melinda Cremeans 598 Congress Court, Delaware, Ohio - Corner parcel to applicant's property. Ms. Cremeans wants to know what is planned around the perimeter that butts up to her parcel. Mr. Faris states the requirement for screening and that there is a 6-foot high wooden fence for the majority of it as well as native landscaping with evergreen magnolias and evergreens. Resident concerned about people cramming her dumpster with garbage, specifically people moving out. Mr. Faris states that they will have to go around a fence and through a bunch of bushes, so it would be easier to stick it in their car and take it to their dumpster. Mr. Ruma (485 Metro Place S. Suite 350, Dublin, Ohio 43017) states that they have compactors and bulk dumping areas within the complex. Mr. Faris points out where that is and states how it's easily accessible to the tenants.

Ms. Littleton goes through the checklist again to make a clean copy for zoning and trustees.

### Berlin Township Architectural Review Board of Delaware County, OH 43015 Administrative Review

Wednesday, July 12, 2023: 6:30 p.m.

Checklist Review:

BBP 23-003 July 12, 2023



#### Berlin Business Park Architectural Review Board Checklist

|                                |  | Conditions Met? | Notes  |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| Туре                           | Residential Uses   | 200 B B B B     | ALTERNATION OF THE PERSON OF T |
|                                | R-10   |                 |  |
| Min. Tract size                | 10   |                 |  |
| Density                        | 10 per NDA   | 1               |  |
| Max # of units                 | 500  |                 |  |
| Setbacks                       |  |                 |  |
| Jethacks                       | 100'   |                 |  |
|                                | Drive aisle and one row of parking allowed. 8' sidewalk required and 8' landscape between sidewalk and building  | <b>/</b>        | ~  |
| Min. side and rear<br>setbacks | 1/3 the height x depth of structure or 250' from existing res.   | <b>✓</b>        |  |
|                                |  | -               |  |
| Building Height                | 45', 3 stories   | V               |  |
| Rooftop Mechanical units       | Can't exceed 8', sum of building can't exceed 53'  | N/A             |  |
| Rooftop Screening              | Must be screened by features more than 10' above<br>height   | N/A             |  |
| Building Size                  | 1 bedroom: 800<br>2 bedrooms: 900<br>3 or more bedrooms: 1,000   | /               |  |
| Architectural                  |  |                 |  |
| Building Design                | Traditional, Artisan Design, same detail on all sides  | _               |  |
| Building Materials             | Wood, EIFS, native or cultured stone. Brick as accent.   | ~               |  |
| Design elements                | Minimum 3 design elements per 40 feet facing ROW, or<br>2 no facing ROW (Elements in code)   |                 |  |
| Garages                        | Rear encouraged. If front, maximum of 30% of the elevation. Not beyond front plate. Other parking limited to behind the building façade.   | <b>\</b>        |  |
| Layout                         |  | 4.973.75.07     |  |
| Ground Coverage                | Max 75%  |                 |  |
| Open Space                     | 25% of tract. Min 15% of total tract Central Green<br>Space, front of buildings shall face green space   | No              | Suggest to add a path alone woods to dog park = Usable   |
| Landscape (table)              | Street trees 30' on center/15' buffer between uses   | V               |  |
| Access and Connectivity        | Direct access, allow for cross easements, min. 200<br>between driveways for access roads.  | N/A             |  |
| Pavement                       | Roads20 year design life, Parking: 8" aggregate, 2"  | No              | missing content  |
| Parking                        | Behind or side of building. May encroach no closer than 5' into internal setbacks.  VUA max 24 spaces, max 12 spaces in single row. Industrial max 48 spaces, max 24 spaces in single row. | /               |  |
| Parking Islands                | Single-loaded island: 162 sq ft, min width of 9'. Double-<br>loaded island: 324 sq ft, min width of 9'.<br>One shade tree 2" caliper, min 50 sq ft of other                                | <b>\</b>        |  |
| Parking Spaces                 | Min 1 space per unit, max 3 spaces per unit  | V               |  |
| Space Size                     | 9'x20' with aisleways min of 24'   | V               |  |

### Berlin Township Architectural Review Board of Delaware County, OH 43015 Administrative Review

Wednesday, July 12, 2023: 6:30 p.m.

| Perimeter                          | No building or parking within 250' of residential<br>purposes. See mounding and planting detail.   |    |   |
|------------------------------------|--|----|---|
| Lighting                           | Cut-off type fixtures  |    |   |
|                                    | Height: Max 12' (can't exceed building height)   | No |   |
|                                    | Max 1,600 lumens, 0.3 foot candles at lot line   | No | can't read lighting info                    |
| Other                              |  |    |   |
| Sidewalks and MUPs                 | Arterial and Collector Roads: 10' along one side of the road and min 5' sidewalk on other side.  Local roads: min 5' sidewalk on both sides. Locate outside right-of-way within easement for public use.  Street trees with Section 15.05(C) (4)(d). Sidewalks shall connect building entrances to existing sidewalks. | No | Suggest to add 10' MUP<br>along N Old State |
| Environmentally Sensitive<br>Areas | Preserve slopes >20%, 100-year FP, and maintain contours >6% where possible  | No | Info not provided on plans                  |



### Landscaping

|  |  | Conditions Met?                         | Notes                    |
|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| Туре   | BCO and BIO  |   |                          |
| Perimeter Areas  |  |   |                          |
| Perimeter area (withing 250 feet of residential at time of adoption) - Design  | 8' tall mound,<br>3:1 slope,<br>minimum 10' wide crest   | No                                      | specify mounding defails |
| Perimeter buffer (within 250 feet of<br>residential at adoption) - Landscaping | 5 deciduous trees, 5 coniferous trees,<br>and 25 shrubs per 100'   | V                                       |                          |
| General Regs   |  | 12/20/20/20                             |                          |
| Ground Coverage  | Max 75% excl. of pub. ROW  | V                                       |                          |
| Min Sizes  | Deciduous: 2" cal,<br>Coniferous: 5' high,<br>Shrubs: 3' high  | V                                       |                          |
| Opacity  | 50% winter, 70% summer   | V                                       |                          |
| Street Trees   | Deciduous, 30' on center   | V                                       |                          |
| Buffers, Zones, and Screening  |  | 111111111111111111111111111111111111111 |                          |
| Screening (internal) between non-<br>residential/mixed-use and residential     | 15' wide buffer, hedge and tree<br>combo 3' min. at install, mounding<br>and fencing may be used   | <b>V</b>                                |                          |
| ROW landscape zone   | 10' wide,<br>3 deciduous trees,<br>5 medium shrubs every 100'  | <b>V</b>                                |                          |
| Building landscape zone  | 8' wide,<br>one shrub every 5'   | <b>/</b>                                |                          |
| Vehicular Use Area   | 4' wide,<br>vehicle overhang no more than 2.5'<br>3' height continuous planting, hedge,<br>fence, mound                                  | <b>✓</b>                                |                          |
| VUA Islands  | Single-loaded: 162 sq ft, width of 9' Double-loaded: 324 sq ft, width of 9' Min 1 shade tree, 2" caliper and 50 sq ft of other material. | V                                       |                          |
| Service Structures   | Continuous, 90% year-round planting,<br>hedge, fence, wall.<br>1' more than height of structure, 10<br>maximum.                          | ~                                       |                          |

Ms. Hoffman motioned to approve their agreement on the checklist that they have reviewed and provided for BBP 23-003 on June 12, 2023.

Ms. Ludwigson Seconded. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed.

### **AGENDA ITEM: Motion to Adjourn**

| AGENDA ITEMI. MIOLIOII LO AUJOUITI                                       |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Ms. Littleton made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Hoffman seconded the motion. |   |  |  |  |  |
| VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.                                       |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Christina Littleton, Chairperson        |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Quinn Hoffman, Member of the Board      |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jennifer Ludwigson, Member of the Board |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Kristin Yorko, Member of the Board      |  |  |  |  |
|  | •                                       |  |  |  |  |