



**Land Use and Long
Range Planning**

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 30, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Lieutenant Steve Farmer, Police.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Justin Goodwin, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Flora Rogers, Administrative Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicant: Brad Petro, Cicogna Electric & Sign Company; Aaron Underhill, Underhill Law Office, LLC; Kolby Turnock, Casto; Linda Menerey, EMH&T; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; Jeff Haines, Gainar Consulting; Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction; Mark Ford, Ford & Associates Architects; Gayle Zimmerman, Ford & Associates Architects; Matt Booms, State Bank; Jason Hockstock, Advanced Civil Design; and Todd Faris, Faris Design & Planning.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the January 23, 2014, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTIONS

**1. 14-007MPR– BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Covelli Enterprises
– Sign – 6693 Sawmill Road**

Justin Goodwin said this is a request for review of a 29.5-square-foot wall sign for a tenant space in an existing retail building at 6693 Sawmill Road, known as the Rite Rug Center. He said the site is located west of Sawmill Road approximately 200 feet north of Village Parkway. He said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Mr. Goodwin said a determination will be made at next week's ART meeting, February 6, 2014.

Mr. Goodwin said Covelli Enterprises had submitted a tenant fit-up permit a couple of months ago, which involved a Minor Project Review for minor architectural modifications. He said the tenant would now like to install a sign within the existing sign band on the front façade of the building. He presented a graphic of the proposed sign. He said the maximum permitted sign area for this tenant space is approximately 30 square feet, and the proposed sign is 29.5 square feet. He said Covelli Enterprises is the regional parent company of the multiple Panera Bread franchises and this location will serve as the area market headquarters for southern Ohio.

Mr. Goodwin asked the applicant which part of the sign text was considered as a registered trademark.

Brad Petro, Cicogna Electric & Sign Company, said the name "Covelli Enterprises" is the company brand and the registered trademark is "Panera Bread" with their logo.

Mr. Goodwin described the Code requirements for sign colors, logo sizes, and other graphic requirements. He said the applicant is proposing opaque black channel letters for the "Covelli Enterprises" portion of the sign, with a "shoebox style" cabinet with acrylic push-through lettering less than a ¼ inch in depth. Mr. Goodwin reported that the City had a consultant conduct a review of the proposed sign design, and he had just received the report earlier today. He said one of the suggestions for the "Covelli Enterprises" text is to use a more consistent font across the sign and he asked the applicant if the font is something the company uses consistently.

Mr. Petro said the text within the sign cabinet portion is only 2 inches tall and the manufacturing equipment is limited in choices for fonts that size. He said the proposed font for the channel letters is a comparable font used by Covelli Enterprises.

Mr. Goodwin said the City encourages uniquely designed signs, typically more than just shoebox-style sign cabinets. He said he researched examples of other Panera signs and presented a few examples showing more three-dimensional sign designs. He said at a minimum, they ART would like to see more depth in terms of the sign lettering.

Mr. Petro said this is the existing logo and the company is changing the "Bread" lettering style. He said Panera is moving beyond the types of "bow tie" signs that Mr. Goodwin presented from other locations. He said Covelli Enterprises has other franchises, such as O'Charley's and Dairy Queen, and they had those logos incorporated in the original design of this proposed sign. He said they decided to just list Panera Bread.

Mr. Goodwin asked if the applicant had considered a sheet of aluminum mounted to the wall to help frame the lettering in lieu of a cabinet.

Mr. Petro said the proposal is approximately 5 to 6 inches off the wall as shown on the examples and the design suggestions need to be presented back to Covelli.

Mr. Goodwin said they need to determine how to deal with the market headquarters text and whether it can be considered a logo. He asked how important it is to the applicant that all the text is illuminated.

Mr. Petro said originally they had proposed non-illuminated text, and the applicant wanted it illuminated, which affected the design of the sign.

Mr. Goodwin said he would provide a final version of the consultant's memo to the applicant and allow them to work on some alternatives based on today's discussion.

Steve Langworthy said the ART is also looking beyond the details and prefers signs designed with a high degree of creativity.

Mr. Goodwin suggested looking at alternative materials such as a wood background or something else outside the norm that would create some additional interest in the sign.

Mr. Petro said the proposal is cost-driven, and originally they looked at options involving halo lighting but due to the cost, the back-lit lettering was cut from the proposal. He said they will look at different design concepts.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were additional comments from the ART. [There were none.]

Mr. Petro confirmed that there were 5 colors within the proposal and asked if it complied with Code.

Mr. Goodwin said the EIFS background does not count as a color, and currently the sign has four colors: black, white, apricot, and green.

Mr. Langworthy said the ART would make a determination on this case at next week's meeting.

2. 14-008BPR – BSC Residential District – Tuller Flats Residential Development – 4313 Tuller Road

Justin Goodwin said this is a request for a multiple-family residential development consisting of 392 apartment units within 30 three-story apartment buildings, a clubhouse/community center, and associated streets and open spaces on approximately 17 acres on the south side of Tuller Road, approximately 700 feet east of Tuller Ridge Drive. He said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D) for a Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan.

Mr. Goodwin said he sent an email to the ART earlier in the day attaching the application materials. He said this application came in for Pre-Application Review in November 2013, where comments were provided to the applicant and they had responded with revisions. He said the applicant had planned to file for Basic Plan Review in the beginning of January, but because this project is likely to involve a development agreement between the City and the applicant for the construction of significant public improvements, the City suggested that it be reviewed informally by the Planning and Zoning Commission first before initiating the formal review process. He said the Commission reviewed this proposal informally on January 9, 2014. He said there was much discussion and a number of specific recommendations, but there appeared to be general support of the conceptual plan. He said the minutes from that meeting are being transcribed and hoped to have a draft soon.

Mr. Goodwin said there was some discussion of alternative site layouts; however, not all the Commissioners necessarily agreed on an alternative layout. He said they suggested more architectural diversity but left it open to the applicant to address that issue as the application proceeded rather than providing specific architectural recommendations. He said the ART had focused on architectural variety with the Pre-Application review and this remains a concern. He said there was discussion about whether mixed uses should be included in all Bridge Street District applications. He said this 17-acre site within the BSC Residential District does allow for

some mixed uses; however, it does not require them. He said the applicant reviewed the Commission's comments and made some adjustments to the plan and site layout. He said Engineering and Planning had some concerns with the site layout, which was very similar to the plan reviewed by the Commission at the informal review.

Mr. Goodwin said the proposal includes a segment of John Shields Parkway that would ultimately extend from Riverside Drive to Sawmill Road. He referred to the internal neighborhood street system with a clubhouse in the center of site. He said the proposal includes 33 residential buildings as shown in the architectural renderings with a contemporary architectural style. He presented a larger area plan with this site and the proposed greenway. He said the graphic shows the proposed street system, including the streets that would be publicly dedicated and the streets that would remain private with public access easements to address the private water line issue. He said that the City of Columbus would not allow private water lines to cross public rights-of-way, which made the block system with public streets problematic. He said Engineering planned to continue discussions with the City of Columbus on this issue, and hoped that it can be resolved. He said ideally, these would be public streets.

Aaron Underhill said the tap fees associated with each new line on each block are approximately \$225,000 each, which is prohibitively expensive.

Mr. Goodwin said they will make sure that Columbus and Dublin are on the same page with respect to a resolution. He said the utility plans have one item of concern related to stormwater and how it will be handled since the applicant intends to use a large amount of pervious pavement and provide an alternative stormwater management plan. He said the use of pervious pavement is a standard within the on-street parking spaces in the Bridge Street District and they are looking to find other means to deal with stormwater, potentially even integrating the stormwater management with the planter boxes in front of the buildings.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, said pervious pavement can be challenging to work with during construction. He said they are working with Casto, the contractor, and the maintenance company to ensure long-term maintenance and are working through the options with the team.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, said Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects, could not attend, so she described the modifications to the architecture including buildings with two versions of brick.

Mr. Goodwin said the proposed pocket parks did not meet the Code requirements, referring to a table that noted those which did. He said the buildings that have pocket parks in front of them on McCune Avenue are set back off of the secondary street away from the required building zone. He said the streets need to have as much of an architectural edge as possible. He asked the applicant to consider options of keeping the same number of units but relocating some of them and to consider overall open space planning for the greenway, possibly incorporating a dog park immediately west of the property.

Ms. Menerey noted the changes that had been made and discussed more options for buildings fronting John Shields Parkway.

Mr. Goodwin said a lot more can be done. He said he appreciated that the applicant added more surface parking following the Commission's remarks on providing visitor parking. He asked the applicant to focus on the tree line and sidewalk system. He said brick sidewalks are not appropriate for public streets; they should be concrete.

Mr. Goodwin noted the different materials presented for the various building types and the raised wall in front of the 12-unit building. He asked if stormwater could be integrated in this area. Mr. Quackenbush answered that would be difficult because it would put the stormwater right next to the building. Mr. Langworthy asked how far the planters protruded. Ms. Menerey responded that they were approximately 10 feet wide.

Mr. Goodwin said he liked the additional building materials proposed for the clubhouse. He emphasized the City's concern with overall architectural diversity. He said that individually, these were nice buildings with contemporary architecture, but over 30 buildings with very similar designs and forms are too repetitive.

Mr. Underhill asked about next steps. Mr. Goodwin explained that after meeting Code they would go before the Commission for Basic Plan Review, and then the Commission would determine whether the next step would involve final determination by the ART or by the Commission. Claudia Husak said the applicant should assume the Commission will have the final say. Mr. Langworthy agreed, since this is one of the first and largest projects proposed for the Bridge Street District.

Mr. Goodwin reiterated that this case would be reviewed by the Commission on February 20, 2014. He said in the coming weeks, the ART would continue to review the proposal, and staff would communicate with the applicant to confirm timing and address some of the issues that had been raised. He said the ART would make a recommendation to the Commission on February 13, 2014, and the report would be prepared February 14th for the meeting on the 20th.

Kolby Turnock, Casto, said he was concerned about the process and asked what would happen if there was a long list of conditions, and how the Commission was likely to view a project with a long list of conditions.

Mr. Langworthy said that if all of the detail requirements are met or met with conditions, and the Commission still requests further changes beyond what Code requires, staff can point that out in the meeting. He noted that the Code does not permit either the ART or the Commission to change any item that meets Code.

Mr. Goodwin said additional details would be expected with the next submittal for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews.

Mr. Underhill asked if the Commission would be informed of all the efforts made by the applicant to address the Commission's comments. He said he was concerned with how this case would be presented, particularly with respect to the site layout.

Mr. Langworthy noted the alternate layout included with the submission and asked which site layout the applicant preferred. Ms. Menerey said there were pros and cons to both plans.

Mr. Goodwin said the overall concept for the revised site layout had some merit but technical issues on function. Mr. Underhill said they made an effort and will continue to work with staff on the Economic Development side.

Ms. Menerey said they would provide a better orientation and color rendering to reflect the rhythm of the streets and building diversity.

Mr. Goodwin reported that the plan was sent today to Moody Nolan, the City's architectural consultant for this project, to provide a review. Ms. Menerey asked if Joe Sullivan should engage directly with Moody Nolan or go through staff to discuss architectural comments. Mr. Goodwin said the applicant should coordinate with City staff, but if Joe would like to meet with Moody Nolan to discuss specifics, perhaps a meeting could be arranged.

Ms. Cox said she had to leave the meeting and said she had no further comments until she had a chance to review the plans.

Mr. Langworthy invited comments from the other ART members.

Mr. Hahn inquired about building #16, which was the southwestern-most building that was cut off from the rest of the development by the western north/south street. Ms. Menerey agreed that it was "lonely," but the applicant wanted to keep the building.

Ray Harpham stated he liked the site plan, but was concerned about the lack of architectural diversity. He explained that "diversity" had to do more with form than just changing building materials.

Mr. Goodwin thanked the applicant and said staff would continue to work through the issues raised.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were additional comments from the ART. [There were none.]

DETERMINATION

3. 14-003ARTW – Sprint Wireless Rooftop Co-Location – 5080 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard

Rachel Ray said this is a request for Sprint to replace three panel antennas and install six new remote radio heads and three new fiber optic cables on the roof of an office building located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and Bradenton Avenue. She said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless telecommunications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Ray said the applicant was present to answer any questions the ART may have to allow a determination today. She said this request is similar to one reviewed by the ART for Verizon a few months ago, noting the difference being a temporary equipment cabinet to be located on the ground. She recommended a condition by which the cabinet would need to be screened until the existing cabinet is removed from the equipment compound.

Jeff Haines, Gainar Consulting, said it would be placed on a temporary concrete pad.

Ms. Ray approval is recommended with the following six conditions:

1. That the antenna panels and associated RRUs are painted beige to match the adjacent screen wall;
2. That the applicant removes the mounting brackets for the existing antennas to be replaced and covers any openings left in the building wall;
3. That the applicant select a fiber optic cable color that is designed to be as unobtrusive as possible;
4. That any associated cables are trimmed to fit closely to the panels;
5. That the existing antenna panels and equipment cabinets be removed not more than six months from the date of final inspection by the City; and
6. That the temporary equipment cabinets are relocated inside of the equipment shelter, with the temporary concrete pad removed and the ground restored to its original condition, not more than six months from the date of final inspection by the City.

Steve Langworthy asked the applicant if he understood and agreed to the conditions. Mr. Haines responded that he did.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments regarding this application.

Ray Harpham confirmed that a building permit was not necessary, just a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments regarding this application. [There were none]. He concluded that the Administrative Review Team approves the wireless communications co-location application under the provision of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances with 6 conditions.

CASE REVIEW

4. 14-002BPR/CU – BSC Office District – State Bank – Shamrock Boulevard and West Dublin-Granville Road

Gary Gunderman said this is a request for review of a 10,754-square-foot office building (Loft building type) to be constructed on a ±1.25-acre site that is currently part of a 2.85-acre parcel at the northeast corner of Shamrock Boulevard and West Dublin-Granville Road. He said the proposal includes a retail banking and mortgage services facility and a request for conditional use review for a drive-through. He said this Basic Site Plan Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(D), and this conditional use review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.236.

Mr. Gunderman said the ART has another week to review this case before a determination is requested on February 6th. He said he would like to discuss the street system with the ART. He pointed out that the applicant does not own all three parcels on the block, and while the City would have liked this block to develop comprehensively, since that is not the case, the ART should consider this as a smaller site on an existing block. He explained that although the

Bridge Street District street network map in the Code shows a street dividing this block, there is no street shown in that location in the Bridge Street District Area Plan. He said that given the existing conditions and the fact that the block as it currently exists only exceeds the maximum permitted block length by about 90 feet, it was determined that an additional street was not necessary. Mr. Gunderman concluded that since no new public infrastructure is required, Development Plan Review is not necessary.

He said however, given the length of the block, he asked the applicant to consider providing a mid-block pedestrian walkway, although not required by Code. He said a preferred location is the west side of the site, connecting with the open space. He said a 14-foot area is required by Code. Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction, asked if the pedestrian walkway could be put in the setback. Rachel Ray answered yes, since the intent is that this parking lot and a future lot to the west would function cohesively.

Mr. Sanford asked if additional trees would need to be removed to provide the path. Ms. Ray said the path could perhaps be sited to avoid trees. Mr. Sanford pointed out that most of the trees with any value are freestanding, while the others are not as desirable.

Mr. Gunderman said he received a comment from Parks and Open Space and the potential stone walkway with brick curbing adjacent to the pocket plaza, which could present a tripping hazard. Ms. Ray asked the applicant to consider relocating the bike parking to the pocket plaza, to which Mr. Sanford agreed.

Mr. Gunderman referred to the east/west parking lot drive aisles and asked the applicant to consider how future parking lot access to the adjacent sites could be provided. He said that existing service structures may need to be relocated. Mr. Sanford agreed and said that they had revised the site plan and had already considered the cross-access question.

Jason Hockstock, Advanced Civil Design, presented a revised site plan showing the reconfigured drive-through.

Mark Ford, Ford & Associates Architects, said the end of the drive-through emptied onto the drive aisle that could provide future cross-access. He said the drive-through has been reconfigured to eliminate the turning movement.

Mr. Sanford pointed out that they had already relocated the transformer.

Mr. Gunderman said he was still concerned about the limited stacking spaces, particularly for the ATM.

Mr. Sanford said that Matt Booms was present from State Bank. Mr. Sanford said that State Bank has researched their drive-through needs and the number of vehicles that will frequent the drive-through is expected to be very low – only about four vehicles per day. He said he did not believe there would be a stacking issue.

Mr. Sanford explained that this branch will be used more for private banking by appointment. He reported that David Homoelle with State Bank indicated that he is not concerned with the stacking, but will request the drive-through data to justify this viewpoint. Mr. Sanford pointed

out that new banks are even doubling up tellers in a row providing one transaction at the first window and an opportunity for a different transaction at the other window.

Mr. Ford noted that he was concerned the location of the dumpster and said he planned to review that further.

Mr. Gunderman referenced a cover letter reflecting parking space numbers and asked the applicant to provide an anticipated number of employees.

Ms. Ray recommended that if the applicant is considering additional parking spaces adjacent to Banker Drive, they should be reflected on the plans and factored into the parking plan, stormwater calculations, and landscaping, etc.

Mr. Gunderman asked Engineering to comment on the proposal.

Aaron Stanford said that, with respect to the existing sanitary sewer easement along the property's frontage, there is a conflict with the proposed building. He said that the sanitary sewer line actually is not located along the entire frontage on this site, since it veers south to the west of the proposed building. He suggested that a portion of the easement be vacated, which would require City Council approval.

Mr. Sanford inquired about the width of the easement and Mr. Stanford confirmed that it is 20 feet.

Mr. Stanford requested that the pavement plans be updated to meet the standard drawings and to reflect the cross-access easements planned for the adjacent lots. Mr. Stanford said any approval would be based on the lot split.

Mr. Gunderman suggested a discussion on the architecture. He said that comments from the City's architectural consultant for this project, David Meleca, had been received and shared with the applicant prior to the meeting.

Mr. Sanford said he was not happy with the comments from Mr. Meleca. He said he had great respect for Mr. Meleca, but his suggested architectural modifications were not what State Bank envisioned for a contemporary office building. He said he was very concerned about Mr. Meleca's comments being shared with the Planning and Zoning Commission since he did not believe it to be a good representation of a Loft style building, nor was it consistent with State Bank's vision.

Jeff Tyler and Colleen Gilger agreed with Mr. Sanford that the suggested modifications were a dramatic change from State Bank's architectural concept, and they did not necessarily prefer the revisions.

Mr. Ford said he appreciated the ART's comments. He said the recommendations are consistent with what he expected from Mr. Meleca as this project's architectural consultant, and since he had worked with him for many years, he was familiar with his work, which he likes very much. Mr. Ford agreed to review Mr. Meleca's comments and respond to as many as possible, but the

style of architecture recommended is not what they intended. He said that he and his team had already begun making revisions to the building that he believed addressed many of the comments.

Mr. Ford said he would provide color renderings and revise the application based on the comments received.

Ms. Ray confirmed that ART would make a determination next week. She suggested for the architectural review, they carefully consider their responses and that a different rendering style might reflect the architectural character a little better.

Mr. Ford was concerned about revealing all the revisions that have been made along the way to the Commission, understanding that it may be confusing between the different versions and the changes that had been made. He said he would also provide material samples. He explained that after an internal review, they added stone to the windows. He distributed conceptual renderings of the revised architectural elevations and pointed out some of the additional modifications, many of which are in the spirit of Mr. Meleca's comments.

Ms. Ray thanked the applicant for their efforts, confirmed the expectations and deadlines, and said the ART would make a determination on this project next Thursday, and go before the Commission on February 20, 2014.

Mr. Sanford said he appreciated the application review process despite his concerns with the architectural consultant's comments and thanked the ART for their comments.

Mr. Langworthy said he liked Mr. Meleca's comments on lighting and asked the applicant to consider that in particular. Mr. Sanford said he was in the process of getting bids on lighting and intends to use up-lighting for the building, especially on the sides of the columns to light up each edge. He said he is considering varied lighting for different sides of the building due to some competition from street lights.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments regarding this application. [There were none].

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 pm.