



**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

JULY 3, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; Jonathan Staker, Planning Assistant; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; Brad Conway, Residential Plans Examiner; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; Jay Boone, Moody Nolan; Mike Bermeister, OHM Advisors (Case 1); Linda Meneray, EMH&T (Cases 4 & 6); Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross LLC (Case 4); David Blair, Ford and Associates Architects; Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests (Case 5); and Jim Muckle, Vrable Healthcare (Case 6).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the June 26, 2014, meeting minutes. He confirmed that ART members had sent their modifications to Ms. Wright prior to the meeting. The minutes were accepted into the record as amended.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

1. Bridge Park Mixed-Use Development

**Riverside Drive and State Route 161
Pre-Application Review**

Bridge Park East

Rachel Ray said this is a request for non-binding review of a potential application for a mixed-use development with residential, commercial, office, restaurant, hotel and conference center uses on approximately 25 acres located on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of State Route 161. She said this is a request for pre-application review prior to submission of an application for Basic Plan Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(C).

Ms. Ray provided an overview of the applications that the applicant plans to file within the next week. She explained that the applicant would submit Basic Development Plan, Development Plan, and Preliminary Plat applications for the entire area shown as part of the Bridge Park East development. This area includes the land between Tuller Road to the north, east of the relocated Riverside Drive, north of West Dublin-Granville Road, and west of the new Dale/Tuller connector roadway but not including the Acura car dealership. She explained the proposed Development Plan application for Phase One that includes the new street currently identified as Park Avenue leading up to the future pedestrian bridge landing point, and adjacent development blocks. She explained that the applicant had met with City staff yesterday at their weekly project coordination meeting to review the application materials in preparation for the Pre-Application Review and the upcoming application submittals.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, provided the ART with an overview of each of the plans submitted as part of the three separate applications that would be filed.

Colleen Gilger asked if Block 'F' was slated for a medical office building.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, agreed that was presently the intent for that building.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, explained that building was not shown on the perspective rendering included in the Basic Development Plan.

Ms. Ray explained the Preliminary Plat includes the public streets of Park Avenue, Mooney Street, and John Shields Parkway. She said the Final Plat, when submitted by the applicant, will be sectioned off into smaller areas likely corresponding with the Site Plan applications.

Ms. Ray reiterated the timeline for reviewing these applications, assuming the applicant is prepared to file next week. She explained that these cases would be introduced to the ART next week, July 10, and staff would continue meeting with the applicant on a weekly basis to coordinate. She stated that an ART determination is expected for July 31st to be ready to move forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 7, 2014.

Steve Langworthy prefaced this agenda item by stating it is a pre-application review, and general comments are preferred as the applicant prepares their formal submission. He said the purpose at this stage is to raise the larger issues or concerns and note anything that may be missing for the submittal.

Fred Hahn asked if the building terraces have anything to do with open space.

Ms. Ray confirmed that the applicant is showing their roof decks and courtyards on the open space plans, but they will not count toward meeting the Code required open space. Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant to be sure to identify the open spaces that will meet the requirements, versus the other open areas shown on the plans.

Mr. Quackenbush said they are currently in the process of identifying any Waivers that may be necessary, in addition to the potential for fees-in-lieu of open space dedication.

Jeff Tyler pointed out that they are showing Block 'A' as part of the Preliminary Plat, but it is not depicted on the Development Plan. Mr. Quackenbush said Block 'A' was represented on some of the plans for the Basic Development Plan but they will rethink what they are showing.

Jennifer Rauch referred to the perspective rendering of the site and suggested the applicant label or color code the buildings/blocks included in this phase to make it less confusing. Mr. Quackenbush agreed that would help make the development area clearer and easier to understand.

Aaron Stanford confirmed that the applicant had begun coordinating with Engineering on the proposed street names for this project. He said more information will be necessary to determine how the applicant plans to address stormwater management, and the applicant will not be able to count improvements in the public rights-of-way, including the pervious pavers in the parking lanes, for managing stormwater from private sites. He said the applicant will also need to begin thinking about the provision of water service throughout the site and the water taps needed. He said the City is dealing with the same water line issue with the developer for the Tuller Flats project. He asked the applicant if they have engaged in conversations with the City of Columbus yet in terms of the provision of water service.

Mr. Quackenbush said their proposal was more straightforward than Tuller Flats with different development entities and buildings. He said Tuller Flats is an apartment complex whereas the Bridge Park project will have different building owners and developers. He said the blocks were not all separated but they were starting to think through those issues. He said one of the issues is private utilities, and they are speaking with AEP about electric as there limited areas to put transformers. He explained they are shown on the utility plan but it is hard to understand at this scale. He stated they have planned for below-grade transformers like downtown Columbus, with grates providing access to vaults. He said they could also go through the garage for access.

Mr. Stanford asked if the garages will be built on the right-of-way. Mr. Quackenbush answered the garages would be adjacent to the public streets.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any special fire issues with underground transformers. Mr. Quackenbush said these will be normal pad transformers but garages are above the floodplain and gravity drains the water. He said the submersible is explosion proof and designed for this type of location.

Mr. Stanford asked if they were incorporating street lighting on the plans. Mr. Quackenbush said he did not think so, but he would check.

Ms. Ray asked the applicant to detail each block on the Development Plan so staff can verify block dimensions and the relationships between the buildings and the rights-of-way and property lines. Mr. Quackenbush said some of those dimensions were called out on the plans.

Mr. Langworthy concluded that a more thorough review would be conducted at a general staff meeting following submission of complete applications, and that the applicant could expect comments in writing that they could respond to prior to moving forward.

Bridge Park West (94 & 100 North High Street)

Jennifer Rauch explained that the applicant had requested late the previous day to include the Bridge Park West project in the Historic District as part of the Pre-Application Review, as they are nearing completion of the application materials for the west side of the river.

Mike Bermeister, OHM Advisors, presented the Basic Development Plan application materials. He explained that as part of the submittal, they had provided a narrative that outlines how the proposal meets each element of the Bridge Street District zoning regulations, and where Waivers would be necessary. He said the project exceeds the block size requirement, street frontage, and building height.

Mr. Bermeister said with respect to the lots and blocks requirements, he pointed out the proposed parcel reconfiguration and that they end up with a block size of approximately 498 feet, where a maximum of 300 feet is required. He said the Waiver ties into the block configuration for a pedestrian pathway and the building is separated to the back of the condominiums so while it is an open view they do not have an actual pedestrianway. He said vehicular access to the parking garage below on High Street requires a Waiver as well.

Mr. Bermeister commented that in terms of the Street Type requirements of the Code, they meet all the requirements with the exception of High Street access. He noted the parking count, which currently exceeds all requirements.

Mr. Bermeister stated that the applicant had also begun to review the Building Type requirements. He said there were elements of the Historic Mixed-Use building type, with a Podium Apartment Building on the back and a parking structure as part of that, which exceeds the requirements. He presented various perspective renderings and at the request of ART members, agreed to clarify some of the views to ensure that the actual scale, massing, and appearance of the building viewed from different angles and viewpoints would be easier to understand.

Mr. Bermeister said the future location of Rock Cress Parkway is shown at the south end of the project site, north of North Street. He said the buildings in this area, adjacent to the Oscar's restaurant, were not part of the project but the renderings serve as a placeholder for a future building. He presented section views of the project to demonstrate the back of the building's limited visibility from High Street due to the change in grade.

Colleen Gilger said there are elevations for the front sides and the back views for the buildings but asked about the back side view. Mr. Bermeister said it was not included in the package and is being developed. He said they are also developing the landscape plan along High Street to incorporate benches and other streetscape details, as well as internal vistas and gateways.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, asked if the concept plan should be included in the Development Plan submittal. Ms. Rauch said to include that in the Basic Site Plan application submittal.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the scale of the drawings. Mr. Bermeister said it should be 1 inch equals 100 feet, but he would make sure to provide a scale on the plans.

Rachel Ray commented on the property lines and other details that should be shown on the plans, and that the aerial photo should be eliminated, since it makes the proposal difficult to read.

Mr. Bermeister said he would provide black and white graphics instead of aerial views.

Ms. Rauch commented that the Architectural Review Board would be very interested in seeing the details of how the "historic" and traditional portion of the building transitions to the more contemporary portion, as this was a significant topic of their discussion when reviewed informally in May.

Steve Langworthy said he was concerned with the proposal, overall. He said the plans show the historical aspect on High Street but when you turn the corner, the architectural character changes abruptly. He emphasized the need to see a transition. Mr. Bermeister said they were continuing to work on the revised renderings.

Jeff Tyler said he agreed with Ms. Gilger for needing to see the perspective of views from other buildings. He emphasized the need to sell this project and suggested more drawings are needed to convince the ART and the ARB that this is the right architecture for this area.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the garage doors with access off the High Street entrance. Mr. Bermeister said the idea was to downplay the visibility of that access point.

Mr. Hunter said he had trouble with how the parking would work. He said they have more parking than they need and want to use it, making it easier to get the public in.

Mr. Tyler pointed out that there appears to be multiple perspectives and two to three different rendering styles using several different programs, which did not result in a flattering appearance of the building. He indicated the main perspective did not show detail like the others, and articulation along this side of the street is important.

Ms. Rauch said there is no curb cut shown where Mr. Bermeister had referenced the intersection with the future Rock Cress Parkway.

Mr. Langworthy stated he was concerned about the pocket park shown on the slope toward the back of the building.

Fred Hahn said it could be nice and a very interesting space, or worthless given the slopes. He said as the project comes forward, staff will need to see a great deal of detail about this space.

Aaron Stanford asked if there was any potential to include a valet area along North High Street. Mr. Bermeister answered that valet service through the carriage doors was being considered. Mr. Stanford asked who would use the garage doors on High Street. Mr. Bermeister said from retail, public areas, restaurants, and apartments. He said the applicant wants to make excess parking available to the visitors to the Historic District.

Mr. Hahn asked about parking counts, loading zones, and restricted or designated parking. Mr. Bermeister said they need three primary loading zone spaces and restricted parking for deliveries and fire trucks on High Street.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there was any strong desire to provide metered spaces on High Street. Mr. Hunter said he did not know. Mr. Langworthy said metered parking would not just be for this section but could be needed District-wide for both the east and west sides of the river. Mr. Hunter said the garages will likely have some fee associated with them and on-street parking available for up to 20 spaces.

Mr. Stanford asked how they propose to handle trash for two restaurants at opposite ends of the building, as he was looking for a corridor with a trash compactor. He said he was accustomed to seeing trash rooms on each floor for condominium complexes.

Ms. Rauch said the change requests discussed today were not expected by Monday following the holiday weekend but the changes will be required for the full submission. Mr. Bermeister promised to get the changes and comments in the revised plans to be submitted.

Joanne Shelly said she appreciated the effort the applicant made by reading the Code. She said the graphic read pretty well but she was not seeing section lines anywhere and said the sections appear very overwhelming and massive.

Ms. Rauch said she would appreciate a scale comparison of the new compared to the existing as viewed from High Street.

Mr. Langworthy expressed he was not sure this was the whole issue; he has concerns about the river side as well.

Mr. Bermeister promised to create additional views that include pedestrian views from the street to better tell the story.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this application for Minor Project Review with one condition.

**4. BSC Residential District – Tuller Flats Residential Development 4313 Tuller Road
14-008BPR Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for a multiple-family residential development with 386 apartment units in 25 three-story apartment buildings, a community clubhouse, and associated streets and open spaces, on approximately 21.2 acres on the south side of Tuller Road, east of the intersection with Tuller Ridge Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(D) for a Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan.

Ms. Rauch said this proposal provides more density and less detail than the previous submission of this application, and as part of the Basic Development Plan, includes the proposed street network, block framework, and street types. She said the project will involve the dedication of John Shields Parkway and additional public streets, and dedication for open space and the adjacent greenway, which requires review and approval of Preliminary and Final Plans by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. She indicated the continuation of the street network south of John Shields Parkway with the connections of Watson and Deardorff Streets and Hobbs Landing West. She explained that as the plan moves forward toward a Development Plan, the applicant will need to investigate how shared access with the properties to the south could be ensured for connectivity through the development. She stated that 3.5 acres of the site at the southern end are currently zoned BSC Public District that will need to be rezoned to BSC Residential District to accommodate the proposed residential development if the Basic Plan is approved with this land included.

Steve Langworthy said the City had requested that the applicant provide a concept for development on the adjacent site to the east that is intended to include mixed-use elements to complement the proposed development and other residential uses in the vicinity and Planning has encouraged the applicant to continue exploring the potential for mixed-use components at this more economically-viable location. He added that providing commercial and service destinations for residents within a comfortable walking distance to the Tuller Flats neighborhood would be a desirable amenity consistent with the plan for the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant has made minor revisions to the overall site plan. She stated that Planning is generally satisfied with the proposed street network and overall contemporary architectural style emphasizing geometric forms, with parapet roofs emulating a flat roof appearance. She indicated the applicant has provided a more varied architectural palette with the revised submission.

Ms. Rauch said this proposal has been modified from the previous submission and incorporates a variable-width greenway along the south side of John Shields Parkway and includes a significant open space area (Village Green North) in the middle of a planned, dense urban environment. She pointed out that Parks and Open Space, as well as other members of the ART, have expressed significant concerns with the size and scale of Village Green North and its potential programming. She reported the ART has stated that it is oversized and out of scale, and requested that the applicant consider adding more buildings to this area, which would be a discussion item for the Commission.

Ms. Rauch said the proposal also includes a large park on the south side of John Shields Parkway across from Village Green North, and the existing tree row is proposed to be preserved and incorporated into the design of the greenway.

She explained that additional development to create an urban edge along the greenway in the area that is currently City-owned parkland (which was originally planned for a dog park) requires the relocation of the proposed dog park to Village Green South and the reallocation of the existing parkland and accommodation of additional development will be included as part of City Council's review and approval of a subsequent development agreement.

She said that the ART is recommending that Buildings 24 – 26 shown on the City's park land be moved as far south as possible to provide a better transition to the 80-foot wide greenway to the west of the development and the 80-foot section in front of Buildings 22 – 23. She suggested that Buildings 22-23 be moved to the east and Village Green South farther east. She noted that Ms. Cox had expressed concerns with the curb cuts shown.

Ms. Rauch reported Block 'G' exceeds the maximum block size at ± 800 feet along John Shields Parkway for which the applicant has requested a Waiver. She concluded the ART is recommending disapproval of the Waiver request and recommends an additional street connection between Blocks 'C' and 'D' be provided with the Development Plan submittal.

Ms. Rauch said the ART recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the request for **Basic Development Plan Review** with six conditions:

- 1) That the street section for McCune Avenue be revised to a typical section for a Neighborhood Street acceptable to Engineering;
- 2) That an additional street connection within Block 'G' between Buildings 'C' and 'D' be incorporated as part of the Development Plan Review submittal to continue the street network (if the Waiver is disapproved);
- 3) That a mid-block pedestrianway will be required (if the Waiver is disapproved) within Block 'G', as the proposed block exceeds the 400-foot requirement;
- 4) That Buildings 24 - 26 should be moved as far south as possible to maximize the width of the proposed greenway and to at least meet the minimum Code requirement for greenway width to provide continuity of the greenway from the west and the east;
- 5) That the applicant investigate whether additional development could be incorporated and the scale of Village Green North be sized to be more in character with the desired urban environment; and
- 6) That the applicant addresses Engineering's comments referenced in the attached memo, as applicable to the Development Plan Review.

Ms. Rauch said the ART recommends **approval** to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the request for **Basic Site Plan Review** with four conditions:

- 1) That the 3.5 acres located within Block 'G' be rezoned from BSC Public District to BSC Residential District;
- 2) That the proposed greenway fronting Buildings 24 - 26 be increased to meet at least the minimum dimension of 30 feet for a greenway;
- 3) That the plans be revised to incorporate stormwater management system details and calculations that meet the Stormwater Design Manual; and
- 4) That the applicant addresses Engineering's comments as attached to this report.

Ms. Rauch said the ART recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission consider **disapproval** of the following **Development Plan Waiver**:

- 1) Maximum Block length (Block 'G') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) – To increase the maximum permitted block length for Block 'G' from 500 feet to ±800 feet.

Steve Langworthy asked the applicant if they would like to comment.

Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross LLC, referred to the concept shown on the land to the east of the site and said this was a long-term vision. He said he was concerned from a cost standpoint about having to provide an additional road connection if the Waiver is disapproved, but they may be able to accommodate it. He stated the applicant prefers that the Waiver be approved to avoid having to build the additional roadway connection through the greenway.

Steve Langworthy stated more roads are better for traffic distribution, and that providing the right-of-way for the future road but not building it immediately could be an alternative.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if he was agreeable to the six conditions as part of the Basic Development Plan Review. Mr. Underhill responded the applicant accepted the conditions.

Mr. Underhill said he would like to discuss with the Planning and Zoning Commission the suggestion to add more buildings in Village Green North because the applicant disagrees with the request. He said the applicant feels strongly about the size of the open space.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, said for McCune Avenue, she believes they could bring that section of street in front of the clubhouse up to size. She said they would add more detail to the diagram and agreed that the applicant is not inclined to add buildings to Village Green North.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if he was agreeable to the four conditions as part of the Basic Site Plan Review. Mr. Underhill responded he was fine with all four of those conditions.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's disapproval of the requested Waiver for block size.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Basic Development Plan, Basic Site Plan, and Waiver Review. He said the application was scheduled for the Commission's meeting agenda for July 17, 2014.

INTRODUCTIONS

5. **BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center**
Partial Demolition **6700 Village Parkway**
14-064MPR **Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for demolition and removal of approximately 68,920 square feet of an existing 126,410-square-foot commercial building and associated site improvements at the Dublin Village Center shopping center, west of Sawmill Road and Dublin Center Drive, east of Village Parkway, south of Tuller Road, and north of the existing movie theater. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said a determination by the ART is expected next week. She stated the proposal is to demolish the northern portion of the Dublin Village Center shopping center but the southernmost tenant spaces

northeast of the existing movie theater will remain. She presented a plan/map that showed the large warehouse building at the northeast corner of the site at the curve in Tuller Road will also remain. She said the plan is to connect the existing curb cut on Tuller Road and provide another drive into the site. She explained that two existing loading areas currently screened by the building will become visible from the parking lot and the applicant is proposing landscaping to address the site's aesthetics in the interim. She said this would include some mounding with eight-foot evergreens for the short term. She provided elevations that showed the sides of buildings which the applicant plans to match the existing brick.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests, highlighted the proposed landscape as shown to screen from the interior of the site. Mr. McCauley asked for a delay for installing the landscaping and mounding. He said since the southern loading area may be removed in the short term, he is proposing to install the screening upon occupancy of the tenant space, or within 18 months from the approval of the demolition permit, whichever comes first. He explained that since the loading area to the east will serve a building on a separate parcel with a separate owner, he would install the screening immediately.

Steve Langworthy asked if the trees would be transplantable. Mr. McCauley responded they could if they survive and there were no tenants now. He said the flatter landscape opens up the visibility to the site, making the area more attractive for future development. He said the site area will be restored and seeded as lawn and graded for stormwater management. He said they would like to start demolition in 60 – 90 days and they have contractors lined up.

Steve Langworthy asked if there was a process for delaying the installation of the screening. Ms. Ray responded it would be written as a condition and the site would be monitored. Fred Hahn asked if it has to be done prior and Ms. Rauch answered it has to be part of the conditions.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant to describe the appearance of the ends of the buildings.

David Blair, Ford and Associates Architects, discussed the various elevations. He said they plan to use the existing brick and limestone and add the available materials to match. He said they will match the stucco to the left side, to the existing above the natural line of the brick and refacing the wall on the former BJ's warehouse building, as that wall is blank.

Ms. Ray inquired about the improvements when the wall is half the applicant's, and half belonging to a different property owner. She wondered about the legal ramifications for modifying the party wall and how the applicant needs to involve the adjacent property owner.

Jeff Tyler commented that both property owners would be required to sign the Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval for the demolition permit.

Colleen Gilger asked if any tenants would be displaced. Mr. McCauley answered that all the tenants were out. Ms. Gilger questioned the potential use for the 40,000-square-foot space that would remain on the south side of the area to be demolished. Mr. McCauley stated that they were currently looking to attract potential office tenants.

Joanne Shelly inquired about the elevation where the applicant wants to wait 18 months to plant. Mr. Blair said the concrete wall will be screened. Ms. Shelly asked if they plan to use block. She questioned the screening for the dock areas if the type of use was changed to office use where they might want windows, etc. Mr. Blair said they would then demolish the dock doors but this gives the prospective new tenant flexibility at that time.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed there were no additional comments or questions on this application and concluded a determination is scheduled for next Thursday, July 10, 2014.

**6. BSC Office Residential District – Vrable Healthcare 4500 John Shields Parkway
14-065MPR Minor Project Review**

Marie Downie said this is a request for review and approval of site modifications for a child daycare center in the Vrable Healthcare building currently under construction in the BSC Office Residential District at the southwest corner of the intersection of Tuller Road and Tuller Ridge Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066(G).

Ms. Downie presented the site in its current version and the proposal that shows the two areas being modified. She explained that the lower level includes a play structure and reconstruction of landscape areas, and the upper level shows the sidewalks. She noted the details such as where the door will replace the windows to allow access to the play area. Discrepancies over the fence height will be investigated as only a four foot fence is permitted.

Ms. Downie requested that the eight parking spaces designated for pick-up/drop-off be clearly marked. She also requested to see directional signs for the sidewalk extension and the crosswalk.

Ms. Menerey said the lower level plan marked A3-0 shows the up-to-date versions for the daycare.

Steve Langworthy requested that the two areas, the day care play area and the entrance, be represented separately.

Ms. Downie said the plans need to be better labeled overall and Jennifer Rauch said not all the sheets need to be included with the proposal and to omit those not relevant.

Colleen Gilger asked for clarification on some of the plans.

Jeff Tyler asked how the play area would be accessed. Ms. Menerey referred to where the windows will be replaced by a door that is directly in front of the play area.

Aaron Stanford asked about the stormwater plan.

Joanne Shelly inquired about the retention pond, the types of materials to be used on the ground within the play area, the grading, and if the drain would run toward the pond. Ms. Menerey said it was not there yet so no grading has been completed, but it is expected that the slope would be from the building to the retention pond.

Claudia Husak encouraged the applicant to consider using the rubber surface around the playground equipment. Ms. Rauch said the applicant will need to show the proposed play structure and surface material. Ms. Menerey said it would be forthcoming.

Ms. Menerey clarified some of the issues raised. She said four parking spaces are located up from the altered walk; she noted the 15-minute limit sign on the architectural drawing; and thought the fence height was consistent throughout but would investigate.

Ms. Rauch said deciduous trees were needed. Ms. Menerey said they would add two more trees.

Ms. Downie inquired about the various directional signs and stated they had to be located on the ground and could not hang off of a canopy. Ms. Menerey said the signs will meet the Code requirements for directional signs.

Ms. Downie inquired about the proposed fence's consistency with approved fence. Ms. Menerey replied the new fence would be the same as the other fencing but without columns.

Mr. Tyler requested appropriate drawings for the parking and the daycare entrance area to which Ms. Menerey said she would provide.

Rachel Ray said the ART's determination will be expected for Thursday, July 10, 2014 but if there is no play structure, the determination will need to be postponed until July 17. Ms. Ray asked that the applicant let Ms. Downie know if they required a time extension.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.