



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 24, 2015

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Matt Earman, Parks and Recreational Department Director; Rachel Ray, Economic Development Administrator; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; and Laura Ball, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Marie Downie, Planner I; Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects (Case 1); Brent Myers, Casto; and Nikki Fisher (Case 2); and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Brian Quackenbush and James Peltier, EMH&T; Teri Umbarger and Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan; and John Woods, MKSK (Case 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the November 19, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

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

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

Jenny Rauch said this is a Waiver 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(1).

Ms. Rauch presented the site.

Ms. Rauch said the first Waiver request is to allow mechanical system louvers on street-facing façades. She said this is a conflict between the building design and the Code requirement, which is the result of unavoidable or unalterable site conditions. She explained that conditions are created when the internal living space layout places the mechanical, bathroom, and kitchen equipment adjacent to street-facing façades due to the layout of the neighborhood street blocks and the townhouse style of the architecture. She added the vents for mechanical systems are located on the nearest exterior walls to provide efficiency of operation for those systems and the louvers have been chosen, which are roughly six inches in diameter and will be painted to match the adjacent material colors. She presented the graphic that identified the locations of the louvers for all building types and on all blocks.

Ms. Rauch said the second Waiver request is to waive the requirements for screening of mechanical rooftop systems focused on the locations where the parapet height is not at least as tall as the height of the mechanical equipment being screened. She said the design for the mechanical systems was not complete at the time of the Planning and Zoning Commission review and approval for the Site Plan and architectural design. She explained that the mechanical systems submitted for permitting are 35 inches in height, which is 9 inches taller than the 24-inch tall parapet; 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 for all building types D, E & H and on all blocks.

Ms. Rauch provided street views to demonstrate compliance with the intent of the Code requirement.

Ms. Rauch presented the applicant's diagrams that seek to demonstrate that the mechanical systems will not be visible from the street or adjacent buildings of similar height and will meet the intent of the Code requirements.

Ms. Rauch indicated the second Waiver request could set a precedent for the relaxation of the rooftop screening requirement and place Staff and applicants in a position where each and every situation would have to be heavily diagrammed for review both at Site Plan approval and again at permitting.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended for the mechanical system louver Waiver:

1. §153.062(N)(4)5 - Façade Requirements – Vents (mechanical systems) shall not be part of street-facing facades. Request is to allow mechanical louvers on street-facing façades for all building types and on all blocks.

Ms. Rauch said disapproval is recommended for the mechanical rooftop screening Waiver:

2. §153.062(D)(1)(a) - 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)(b) - Screening - Roof Mounted Mechanical Equipment shall be screened from view at ground level on all sides and to the extent practicable from adjacent buildings. Request is for all building types D, E & H and on all blocks.

Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects, said he understands the requirements of the Code, but explained that when this project was developed the feedback was to design different building types for a variety of elevations. As a result, he said the architects had to modify some of the parapets. He said the plan was too top heavy if they had the same parapets throughout. He said the solution to meet the Code is screening but he is reluctant to do that as the applicant believes they have met the intent of the Code. He indicated that in urban environments, mechanicals are placed on the roof instead of on the ground. He said a quality solution is not always a taller parapet. He said money will not improve the circumstances, just meet the requirements. He emphasized the mechanicals are not visible from the ground or adjacent buildings. He concluded the applicant would like to present this proposal to the Planning and Zoning Commission and gain their feedback before deciding how to proceed.

Mr. Sullivan remarked the BSD Code is significantly elevated from the basic Zoning Code. He said he appreciated the ART's support of the first Waiver for mechanical system louvers on street-facing facades.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval of Waiver #1 for façade requirements and disapproval of Waiver #2 for screening of mechanical equipment.

**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 applicant is proposing a sign plan that is consistent with the existing development's style and scale. She noted the linear-layout shopping center was developed in the 80's and has a significant setback from West Bridge Street with parking located in front of the buildings. She said the applicant is seeking to formalize a sign plan that is consistent with the existing approved signs and the character of the center as a whole. She said the application includes MSP text outlining the appropriate sign types, standards, and locations. She said the text generally follows the standards of the Dublin Sign Code and includes drawings showing the typical sign panel style and colors for the non-anchor tenants. She explained the MSP text allows signs for three unique conditions: Non-anchor In-Line Tenants, the Anchor Tenant, and Center Signs. She presented the proposal outlined below:

Non-anchor In-Line Tenants – Wall Signs

BSD Permitted

Size: ½ square feet per lineal foot - Maximum **50** square feet
Number: 2 building mounted signs of different types (1 permitted to be a wall sign)
Height: 15 feet
Colors: Any up to 3 (including logo)
Illumination: Internal or external

MSP Proposed

Size: 1 square feet per lineal foot - Maximum **80** square feet
Number: 1 per tenant space, 2 for western most tenant space
Height: 19 feet and 22 feet
Colors: 1 of 3 SW colors for background with tenant choice for copy color
Illumination: External with gooseneck fixtures

Non-anchor In-Line Tenants – Window Signs

BSD Permitted

Size: Maximum **20%** window surface area, not to exceed **8** square feet
Number: 2 building mounted signs of different types (1 permitted to be a window sign)
Location: Ground floor only
Colors: 3 maximum (including logo)

MSP Proposed

Size: Maximum **10%** window surface area or **10** square feet combined (whichever is less)
Number: 2 maximum per tenant space; 1 maximum per window
Location: Ground floor only
Colors: 1 low-chroma

Anchor Tenant – Wall Signs

BSD Permitted

Size: ½ square feet per lineal foot - Maximum **50** square feet
Number: 2 building mounted signs of different types (1 permitted to be a wall sign)
Height: 15 feet
Colors: Any up to 3 (including logo)
Illumination: Internal or external

MSP Proposed

Size: Cumulative area of the two signs shall not exceed **95** square feet and the primary sign shall not exceed **80** square feet
Number: 2
Height: 22 feet
Colors: 1 muted color (no logos or secondary images permitted)
Illumination: Internal

Anchor Tenant – Window Signs

BSD Permitted

Size: Maximum **20%** window surface area, not to exceed **8** square feet
Number: 2 building mounted signs of different types (1 permitted to be a window sign)
Location: Ground floor only
Colors: 3 maximum (including logo)

MSP Proposed

Size: Maximum **10%** window surface area or **10** square feet combined (whichever is less)
Number: 2 maximum per tenant space; 1 maximum per window
Location: Ground floor only
Colors: 1 low-chroma

Ms. Martin said the following is required for approval of a Master Sign Plan:

- a) Allow a greater degree of flexibility and creativity in sign design and display.
- b) Ensure sign work is in a coordinated fashion to meet the general intent of signs in the District.
- c) Not intended to permit larger signs, more visible signs, or additional signs than permitted, without any consideration for unique sign design and display.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That all signs are limited to 15 feet in height;
- 2) That the applicant provides gooseneck lighting fixture details prior to sign permitting, subject to Planning approval; and
- 3) That the applicant provides the approved Master Sign Plan package to Planning, prior to sign permitting.

Brent Myers, Casto, noted the height request in the proposal. He explained none of the tenants currently exceed 15 feet but wanted the opportunity to entertain a higher height in the future. He said Kroger is the anchor tenant and the sign band on their tenant space would allow for a sign at a height up to 22

feet. He indicated that if Kroger were to leave this site, he would want the opportunity to offer a sign to the new tenant at up to a height of 22 feet.

Ms. Martin said the 15-foot height limit is being recommended as the applicant moves forward; however, it is appropriate for the applicant to raise the request with the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The ART discussed other businesses in the area that might have signs at a height higher than 15 feet but it was determined those signs were likely approved before the BSD Code was established and granted variances.

Jeff Tyler suggested that as cases come forward, increased height should be considered if architecturally appropriate. He said if a sign fits better in a location that is higher than 15 feet, architectural appropriateness should be discussed.

Rachel Ray inquired about the tenants on opposite ends of the strip mall. She said one sign was requested for the tenant with frontage on Frantz Road but wanted to know what was proposed for the tenant on the east side. She asked if the signs could have individual fonts and logos.

Ms. Martin clarified the anchor tenant was not permitted to have a logo, but in-line tenants will be permitted logos, or secondary image/copy cumulatively not to exceed 20% of the area of the sign.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the PZC for a Master Sign Plan with three conditions.

**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 an overview of the application. She noted the proposed hotel is intended to serve as the architectural anchor for the site and is located southeast of the intersection of Banker Drive and Riverside Drive. To the south, she said it is connected by a plaza to the conference center. She said the proposed office building is located southeast of the conference center. She said the proposed parking garage is located at the southwest corner of Banker Drive and Mooney Street and will primarily serve the hotel, conference center, and future office. She said the parking garage has a small retail component located at the northwest corner of the first floor.

Ms. Downie reported the proposed project includes:

- A1 – Future Office – Corridor Building (size to be determined)
- A2 – Conference Center – Corridor Building: 19,000 square feet
- A3 – Hotel – Corridor Building: eight-story, 100,628 square feet
- A4 – Garage/Retail – Parking Structure: six-story, 231,652 square feet with 610 parking spaces
- 0.11 acres of Open Space
- 9 on-street Parking Spaces

Ms. Downie said no details have been provided for the Open Spaces.

Ms. Downie said any Waivers that were not addressed as part of this report will be reviewed with the Final Development Plan and Final Site Plan. She noted the number of stories for the garage and conference center do not meet the Code requirements. She said Staff will need to review these further and could potentially require Waivers in the future.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended to City Council for the Basic Development Plan with the following Waiver and six conditions:

Waiver

1. §153.060(C) – Corner lots occupied by a single building are required to have a front and corner side property line. Request is for the Hotel to have two front property lines and no corner side property line.

Conditions

- 1) That the applicant defines Banker Drive as a Front Property Line;
- 2) That Mooney Street extending from Banker Drive to W. Dublin Granville Road and Longshore Street should be identified as private drives with appropriate easements;
- 3) That the applicant revises the “Corner Property Lines” to be side yard setbacks in all appropriate locations;
- 4) That the applicant works with Engineering to finalize details and alignment of the right-in one-way access from W. Dublin Granville Road;
- 5) That the applicant works with Engineering and the Acura dealership to modify the existing access point; and
- 6) That the applicant works with Staff to provide for a more walkable, pedestrian scale, and connected site.

Ms. Downie said approval is recommended to City Council for the Site Plan with the following five Waivers and four conditions:

Waivers

1. §153.062(O)(5)(b) – Conference Center – Ground Story Height – Maximum permitted is 16 feet. Request is for ground story height to be 25 feet.
2. §153.062(O)(5)(b) – Hotel – Building Stories – Maximum permitted is six stories. Request is for eight stories.
3. §153.062(O)(5)(b) – Hotel – Ground Story Height – Maximum permitted ground story height of 16 feet. Requested is ground story height of 20 feet.
4. §153.062(O)(5)(b) – Hotel – Story Height – Maximum permitted story height is 14 feet. Request is for 8th story to be 14 feet, 8 inches.
5. §153.062(O)(12)(a)(2) - Building Length – Parking structures are permitted a maximum length of 300 feet. Request is for a parking structure length of approximately 358.04 feet.

Conditions

- 1) That the applicant works with Staff to provide for a more walkable, pedestrian scale, and connected site. This includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. The modification of the proposed open spaces;
 - b. Ensuring that all doors are not impeding on pedestrian areas;
 - c. Ensuring that all pedestrian features are at the appropriate scale; and
 - d. Modifications to the proposed hotel pick-up/drop-off area.
- 2) That any parking spaces impacted by the proposed compactor be eliminated;
- 3) That the site distance issue along Longshore Street at the proposed Parking Garage exit is resolved; and
- 4) That the applicant will need Conditional Use applications approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the proposed parking structure and conference center.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, questioned the issue of the conference center as having one story. He asked how to best proceed since this will go to City Council and then on to the determined reviewing body. Ms. Downie indicated that the desired timeline has not given Staff the opportunity to discuss and review options in terms of additional stories. She said the applicant could request feedback from City Council, but would not want them to vote without Staff having a discussion first. She pointed out that the reviewing body will have the opportunity to approve any additional Waivers coming forward.

Rachel Ray asked the applicant why the conference center is only one story. Mr. Hunter replied the conference center is considered a "jewel" building and a green roof is intended. He said the conference center does not have a large footprint on the site. He said it is a challenge to construct a two-story structure for an event space without columns. He indicated that adding office space to an event space would not work very well.

Ms. Ray asked if the green roof on the conference center would be accessible. Mr. Hunter answered that the roof would not be accessible at this point but they are offering an accessible green roof at the hotel.

Jeff Tyler encouraged the applicant to exhaust all options in terms of adding a second floor to the conference center.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said that event space added to the second floor poses a challenge as the kitchens are required to be on the first floor for delivery purposes.

Ms. Umbarger questioned the condition for a more walkable, pedestrian scale, and connected site. She asked the ART what they are looking for in terms of the areas along Riverside Drive. She indicated that the Code was not specific.

Ms. Downie said the intent of the condition is for the applicant and Staff to have in-depth discussions and provide more details in the future.

Vince Papsidero said the point is allowing for pedestrian access. He said it is important to break up a large block for connectivity. He encouraged development for the space between the event space and the office building as well as a front door on the office building that would connect to a sidewalk. Ms.

Umbarger reported that the applicant has increased the width between the conference center and the office building to 22 feet and a pedestrian path could be added.

Ms. Downie said front doors for all the buildings do not currently meet the requirement and that will need to be considered in the final Site Plan.

Ms. Umbarger questioned the condition for the applicant to define Banker Drive as a Front Property Line for the parking garage. She asked what was required besides entrances and if canopies were part of that requirement. She inquired about aesthetics since two garages face each other. She noted that people will only see Banker Drive as they walk by and that Longshore Street is more visible.

Ms. Downie noted that the setbacks and the required build zones are all the same. She reiterated that Staff wants to ensure that the area along Banker Drive is aesthetically pleasing and that the architectural details have not been provided at this point.

Jenny Rauch said that Staff would like to see the details prior to Site Plan review.

Mr. Hunter said that the side along Longshore Street is going to be the most visible. He emphasized that it will not appear as a concrete bunker.

Mr. Hunter inquired about the phasing plan. He indicated the possibility that the office building would not be completed when the other buildings are completed.

Aaron Stanford asked if the phasing plan would be prepared for the final Site Plan. Mr. Hunter said the applicant would prefer to file everything at once, but it is possible they would not submit the office building at the same time.

Brian Quackenbush asked if the conditions would be updated since the applicant has submitted revisions. Ms. Downie answered affirmatively.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan.

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 2:45 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on December 3, 2015.