



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 19, 2015

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Matt Earman, Parks and Recreational Department Director; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Rachel Ray, Economic Development Administrator; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; and Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer.

Other Staff: Marie Downie, Planner I; Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Nicole Martin, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Charlie Fraas, Casto (Cases 1 & 2); Matt Starr and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; James Peltier, EMH&T; John Woods, MKSK; Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan; and Dan Phillabaum, dp planning & design, LLC (Case 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the November 12, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTIONS

**1. BSD R – Tuller Flats Apartments
15-110SPR/WR**

**4313 Tuller Road
Site Plan and Waiver Reviews**

Joanne Shelly said this is a request for construction details on the previously approved multiple-family residential development consisting of 29 three-story apartment buildings and a community clubhouse located on public streets east of the John Shields Parkway - Tuller Ridge intersection. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Site Plan and Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Shelly said this is a request for a Waiver for allowable locations of mechanical system vent louvers and a Waiver to the requirement of screening for mechanical system rooftop equipment. The following Zoning Codes relate to these requirements.

- §153.065(N)(4) Building Type, Façade Requirements - Vents (mechanical systems) shall not be part of street facing facades.
- §153.062(D)(1) Building, Roof Type Requirements - Parapets – where a six-foot parapet is insufficient to screen rooftop mechanical equipment, a screening structure shall be required as provided in §153.065(E)(3)
- §153.065(E)(3) Screening - Roof Mounted Mechanical Equipment shall be screened from view at ground level on all sides and to the extent practicable from adjacent buildings.

Ms. Shelly clarified that mechanical system vent louvers are not permitted on facades that face the street.

Ms. Shelly presented the site location and project plan along with the graphic illustrating the need for a Waiver for louver locations for street-facing facades. She also noted the locations for non-street facing louvers. Through coordination with the Building Department, she said the location for the louvers on street-facing facades has been minimized to the extent possible using best MEP practices. She said

louvres have been chosen that are minimal in size and will be painted to match the adjacent material colors. She provided photos of built projects using louvres in Columbus.

The consensus of the ART was that the Waivers were a result of a conflict in the Code, which is the result of unavoidable or unalterable site conditions in the case for the Waiver request to allow mechanical louvres on street-facing facades.

Ms. Shelly presented the locations of the rooftop screens. She explained the parapets heights are not sufficient to screen the rooftop equipment as they are not as tall as the mechanical equipment and do not fully hide the equipment. However, she said the mechanicals are not visible from street level or adjacent buildings, which is the Code requirement. She presented a sight line analysis elevation on McCune Avenue to demonstrate.

Ms. Shelly said the ART needs to determine if the applicant has met the criteria to approve the requested Waivers. She said the following criteria must be met for consideration for approval of Waivers:

- a) Request is caused by unique site, use, or other circumstances.
- b) Not requested solely to reduce cost or as a matter of general convenience.
- c) Request does not authorize any use or open space type not permitted in the District.
- d) Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality.

The applicant plans to go forward whether the ART supports the Waivers or not.

Ray Harpham asked if partial screening would be permitted. He said he does not believe it is the intent of the applicant just to cut costs but rather meeting the design objectives. He referred to a hotel on Frantz Road, where the screening for the mechanicals served as an accent to the architecture.

Ms. Shelly said the design for the mechanical systems was not complete at the time of the PZC review and approval for the Site Plan and architectural design. She said the mechanical systems submitted for permitting are 35 inches in height, which is 9 inches taller than the 24-inch tall parapet. She said this creates a condition where the parapet heights no longer meet the Code requirements for screening of sight lines to the interior of the rooftop mechanical systems.

Dan Phillabaum, dp planning & design, LLC, was asked at what areas are the mechanicals visible. He said the condenser units are located in the center of the roof and only 9 inches of the top of the unit can be seen. He said the applicant is asking for relief because visibility is limited to only a few specific vantage points.

Ms. Shelly asked if Staff would be comfortable supporting limited areas of screening just where the parapet does not provide the required screening height. She said the architect, Joe Sullivan, is basing his request from the architectural design aesthetic perspective and not due to cost or convenience.

Mr. Harpham indicated that relief from these requirements for screening of rooftop mechanical systems could set a precedent of the relaxation of the rooftop screening requirement and place Staff and applicants in a position where each and every situation would have to be demonstrated for review at Site Plan approval and again at building permitting.

The consensus of the ART was that the request to waive the requirement for screening of rooftop mechanical systems would set an unfavorable precedent for future projects and require excessive documentation and analysis to verify that the intent was met. Therefore, this request should be disapproved.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He said a determination is scheduled for Tuesday, November 24th.

**2. BSD C – Dublin Plaza
15-111MSP**

**225-373 West Bridge Street
Master Sign Plan**

Nicki Martin said this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for an existing shopping center located southwest of the intersection of West Bridge Street and Frantz Road. 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.

Ms. Martin said the existing shopping center is a linear strip-mall style structure and the signs were all approved under the previous zoning and are now facing challenges of the BSD Code where only half the size is permitted. A Master Sign Plan, she said, would address these issues. She presented the three different 24-inch sign details including three colors for the background: Iron Ore Grey, Rockwood Dark Red, and Rockwood Shutter Green, all using white lettering. She noted the signs would be placed in the 36-inch existing beige sign band. She said the tenants were granted one square foot of sign area for each linear foot of leased storefront under the previous zoning. Under the new BSD – Commercial zoning designation, she said one-half square foot of sign area for every linear square foot of storefront is permitted. She reported the new BSD signage requirements are intended for buildings with minimal setback lines and located much closer to thoroughfares. She said the applicant is requesting the tenants be permitted to continue to obtain sign area consistent with what already exists in the center and what is appropriate for the property and given building setback. In addition, she said the applicant is requesting the right for additional signs on the western side of the shopping center, along the portion of the shopping center facing Frantz Road. She said the applicant is requesting the right for one additional sign, per the Master Sign Plan specifications, to be permitted to be placed on this portion of the center to offer enhanced visibility and exposure for a tenant located in the space, which has frontage along Frantz Road.

Ms. Martin indicated Staff has concerns with the lack of detail presented in the MSP. She explained a very comprehensive MSP is better when notes regarding the requirements of the Code for location, size, height, color, and number of signs are provided. She noted the sign shapes are different. She said she has reservations about the size of the sign requested for Frantz Road. She reported she accessed the street view through Google. She asked if there would be tag lines or secondary signs requested. She emphasized that sign design quality all come up in the review process.

Claudia Husak said written documentation needs to be provided to specifically address all these issues in order for this to move forward. She said because of the quick turnaround, Ms. Martin has drafted a document for the applicant to simply fill in the blanks.

Charlie Fraas, Casto, asked if there would be separate approvals.

Ms. Husak replied all tenants have the same sign except for Jason's.

Ms. Husak said information needs to be included if the tenants want different shaped signs.

Vince Papsidero emphasized the need for clarity of the issues.

Mr. Fraas reported two tenant spaces have become vacant. He said he was concerned about tenant signs that were approved under the previous zoning, and how much will need to be changed with new zoning requirements. He said he does not want to hurt the tenants and the graphics are a challenge. He indicated he was concerned about secondary signs for doors and windows, etc.

Rachel Ray requested confirmation that all requests were for externally illuminated signs and if the colors requested are those that currently exist. Mr. Fraas confirmed most of the signs were white or one color.

Ms. Husak explained the ART's determination is scheduled for Tuesday, November 24th due to the holiday on Thursday. She asked the applicant if there would be a lot of updates/revisions to the MSP. Mr. Fraas asked that Staff get him the document to complete as soon as possible for him to meet the deadline.

Ms. Husak said conditions could be provided for approvals to move this forward for PZC.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.]

**3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park – A Block
15-112BDP/BSP**

**Riverside Drive and SR 161
Basic Development Plan/Site Plan**

Marie Downie said this is a request for a new eight story, 100,628-square-foot hotel, a 19,000-square-foot conference center, an office building (future phase), a 231,652-square-foot, 610 parking space garage, 0.11 acre open space, and associated site improvements on a ±3.75 acre site located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and W. Dublin Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Downie presented the site in the BSC Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the proposal includes a hotel, conference center, office, and parking garage. She reported the hotel and office uses are permitted in this zoning district, however, conditional use approval is required for conference centers and stand-alone parking structures. She indicated that the proposed hotel was the main focus at the Informal Review with City Council. She noted that there are limited details provided for the office building as a tenant has not been identified.

Ms. Downie said a number of issues have been identified as Waivers have been requested:

- Longshore Street, the one-way drive, and the extension of Mooney Street should be designated as private with appropriate access and utility easements. Ms. Downie said they will need to be renamed and will not be overtaken by the City.
- Access from Acura will need to be right-in, right-out onto the one-way access from SR 161.
- The proposed eight-story hotel has been identified as the architectural anchor for the block, however, only six stories are permitted. Furthermore, the first and eighth stories exceed the height requirements.
- The conference center is only one story and three stories are required. She said the height of the conference center is 25 feet so the number of stories may not be an issue.
- The parking garage has six stories when only five stories are permitted.
- Principal entrances are proposed along Longshore Street but Riverside Drive through SR 161 is considered the principal frontage and principal entrances are required to be off of that. The number of entrances is also an issue but that could possibly be reviewed during the Site Plan process. She said to provide additional entrances for the hotel, there is a grade issue. She recommended leaving the proposed parking garage without a front property line while the hotel has two fronts. She inquired about pedestrian access for the parking garage; the handling of the entry is unclear.
- Not enough entrances/exits have been proposed for the parking garage.
- Banker Drive should be identified as a Front Property Line.
- All doors need to be recessed a minimum of three feet from the property line.

- The rear setback has not been met for the hotel as it encroaches within the five-foot setback.
- An elevation needs to be provided of the parking garage from Banker Drive. She said Staff needs to see what is going on between the two parking garages to determine if an appropriate feel has been achieved.
- Percentages of RBZ property line coverage for all buildings needs to be provided.
- The maximum capacity for the conference center, the square footage of the office, and the number of rooms as well as the square footage of the accessory use area need to be provided to correspond to the parking calculation requirements.
- Modifications are needed to the pick-up/drop-off area for the hotel. Ms. Downie presented some example pictures that would make the area more pedestrian friendly.

Ms. Downie said the permitted façade materials for the hotel include stone, brick and glass, which has been proposed. She said a composite metal panel system is also proposed as a primary material. She said glass fiber-reinforced concrete has been proposed as a secondary material.

Ms. Downie noted the three open spaces provided between the hotel/conference center and conference center/office. She pointed out the one main open space was marked as private while the two others are public. She said as a result of Staff's review, it is recommended that a portion of the main opens space become public. She explained that pedestrians coming from the roundabout have a significant area to cross over. She said the area needs to be accessible all the way through to meet the Code walkability standards.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, noted that transformers are in the area of the conference center path that runs along the south side of the conference center. She indicated that the applicant does not anticipate a lot of people traversing the cross walk from the direction of the roundabout. She said the change in grade is a challenge. She said the public will need to walk by the fenced-in transformers.

Ms. Downie emphasized that Staff recommends the area be opened and Staff does not support a Waiver in that area.

James Peltier, EMH&T, said there is a 10-foot difference and that there is no way to make that area ADA accessible since it is a smaller space congested with transformers, etc.

Vince Papsidero said the challenge here is that this is a large block that needs multiple breaks.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said this is an issue of accessibility.

Joanne Shelly said when a path is not provided to open space, it is not considered public. She added a pedestrian path is required by the Code but does not need to be ADA accessible. She said the proposal is not meeting the mid-block requirement for walkability standards.

Ms. Downie said pedestrian pathways and open spaces need to be strongly considered when developing the office area. She emphasized leaving enough open space for the office building.

Mr. Peltier said there is access between the conference center and hotel but not open space.

Ms. Downie requested the width proposed for the path as well as additional details. Ms. Shelly indicated it cannot just be a concrete path squeezed between two buildings; this path is not currently identified as public access.

Mr. Starr said the path would be used infrequently during a 24-hour period.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the public can get through there, directed by specialty lighting and materials. He said the grade change allowed an opportunity for a grand staircase. He indicated it was an oversight on the applicant's part not to designate open space. He said 90% of the time it will be public open space.

Ms. Downie inquired about access points for the parking garage. Ms. Umbarger replied there is access at all four corners.

Ms. Downie inquired about the wall along Riverside Drive. She said a pedestrian scale is needed and it cannot be a blank wall but details can be provided later.

Ms. Umbarger commented on the grade elevation of Riverside Drive and how the applicant is challenged with the slope of the entire site. She said pedestrians coming off of the SR 161/Riverside Drive roundabout crosswalks will be going to the hotel and conference center together as a unit.

Mr. Papsidero asked where the tallest point of the site was. Ms. Umbarger answered the highest is the northwest corner. She noted the various heights ranging from four feet to six feet.

Mr. Papsidero said the material is Ariscraft stone used horizontally, on the retaining wall along SR 161 and Riverside Drive.

Ms. Umbarger said the applicant has introduced planting areas at the pedestrian level as well as in the enclosed space between the conference center and the office building.

Mr. Papsidero suggested the open space be landscaped like a garden.

John Woods, MKSK, said the area is sculptural and bio retention is not determined. He said traditional planting is proposed towards Riverside Drive.

Rachel Ray asked about the relationship between the buildings. She asked how the applicant envisions the office building to relate to the conference center.

Mr. Hunter said the focus of everything is on Longshore Street where there is parking. He said the office building is presented as a worst case scenario as large as it could get. He said if the size of the building was decreased, they could make a change to accommodate further public open space.

Mr. Starr indicated the building currently designated office space could have another use besides office.

Mr. Hunter said the applicant would like to get through the basic review and come back with refinements.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, explained the wall of the parking garage where the corner has essentially been cut off serves as an accent wall to make a good visual connection with pedestrians. He said this accent wall that hides the elevator and stairs is proposed with playful metal panels to provide depth of surface.

Mr. Hunter said this parking garage can be used by patrons of the hotel or the conference center.

Mr. Papsidero said Staff needs to see other options of elevations for the conference center.

Ms. Shelly said internal streets changed to private changes Staff's review.

Claudia Husak asked Aaron Stanford how services, such as snow removal, are provided when a public street is changed to private. Mr. Stanford replied it depends on where the snow is deposited. Ms. Shelly indicated it would be taken care of through the NCA but not as a city-wide standard.

Ms. Downie inquired about the variations of color presented for the hotel. Mr. Gonzalez said the material is a reddish-tone concrete.

Ms. Husak said the earthy orange natural color as the intent for contrast looks nice.

Mr. Hunter added since the metal panel is sleek, concrete provides a different texture but the color might not end up the rusty color proposed.

Mr. Gonzalez requested an elaboration on the drop-off area for pedestrians.

Ms. Downie said Staff wanted to see the pedestrian path continue.

Ms. Shelly said the materials in the drop-off area are flush with grade and the change of materials does not reflect the grade change. She requested a demarcation to the road between the primary drop-off area and the edge of the road as there is not enough demarcation between the street and the pedestrian paths. She suggested planters and/or street trees could be used in this area to address that issue.

Mr. Gonzalez said the area is spatially challenged and the footprint of the building is tough to wiggle that into. He said his concern was congestion at the drop-off area onto Banker Drive.

Mr. Papsidero noted the bollard pattern directs pedestrians to the door. Mr. Gonzalez indicated the applicant could choose different paver types to help differentiate the areas.

Ms. Downie asked where the hotel and conference center canopies were located. Mr. Gonzales replied over the main entries. Ms. Downie said that needed to be clearly marked on the plans.

Laura Ball expressed her concerns about the open areas not being accessible. She said they will be open for the public 90% of time, but not everyone in the hotel will be involved in the conference center activity. She suggested a completely accessible path and would rather see the area around the transformers be private. She requested more details for these areas.

Mr. Gonzalez said there should be a casual place to sit.

Ms. Ball suggested playing with forms due to the grade change to address the public aspect of this area.

Mr. Peltier inquired about private streets to be renamed. Mr. Stanford said there needs to be a distinction between public versus private. Mr. Peltier said he would like to keep the same street names to minimize confusion. He asked if maintenance signs could be used to mark the areas. Mr. Hunter added this is a wayfinding issue.

Mr. Stanford suggested keeping the street names very similar such as using "Longshore North" and "Longshore South".

Mr. Stanford said the geometry of access to the new one-way access at Mooney Street will need to be reviewed.

Mr. Peltier inquired about reserves for private streets – access easements. Mr. Stanford encouraged review of utility and water connections. He suggested the applicant start a dialogue now with the City of Columbus.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the parking space that appears to be compromised by the location of the dumpster. Ms. Umbarger indicated that was an error on the plans that would be corrected.

Ms. Umbarger inquired about next steps. Ms. Downie said a determination is scheduled for Tuesday, November 24th. She said the detail requested is needed by the end of the day today. She added digital records of the final draft for City Council is due by end of day Monday, November 30th.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.]

ADMINISTRATIVE

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.]

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 3:12 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on November 24, 2015.