



**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

FEBRUARY 26, 2015

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Jeremiah Gracia, Economic Development Administrator.

Other Staff: Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jenny Rauch, Senior Planner; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Mark Ford, Ford and Associates; Tom Warner, Advanced Civil Design; Todd Faris and Dan Magley, Faris Design and Planning (Case 1); Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 2 & 3); Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan (Case 3); Paul Rockwell, Average Joe's Pub & Grill; Eric Hilty, Hilty Sign (Case 4); and Kolby Turnock, Casto; Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Yaross; Linda Menerey and Scott Schaffer, EMH&T; and Joe Sullivan, B&S Architecture (Case 5).

Others Present: Dan Phillabaum, dp planning & design, LLC, consultant to the ART.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the February 19, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATION

**1. West Innovation District – ID-3 – Project Granite, Phase 1
15-015WID/DP**

**Crosby Court
Development Plan Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for construction of Phase 1 of a data center building on a 68-acre site within the West Innovation District, including site improvements, landscaping, and site buffering. She said the site is on the east side of Houchard Road, north of Darree Fields, and south of SR161 and future Crosby Court. She said this is a request for review and approval for a Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.042.

Ms. Rauch said Staff reviewed the application for the first phase of development and identified the following items that will need to be clarified or revised with the building permit submittal:

- 1) The drawings need to be revised to label the setbacks correctly along the northeastern and western property lines. The setbacks on the plan are correct, they are just incorrectly labeled.
- 2) The applicant will need to provide revised drawings for the guard house demonstrating the proposed building meets the Code requirements for primary and secondary materials.
- 3) A revised landscape plan will need to be provided to demonstrate how the perimeter buffering will be met at the temporary access point.
- 4) The applicant will need to provide the Code requirement for five feet of maneuvering area around the bicycle parking area.
- 5) The applicant should revise the plans in accordance with Engineering's comment letter dated 2/23/15 prior to building permitting.

Aaron Stanford asked the applicant if they were aware of extensive field tile through the site.

Tom Warner, Advanced Civil Design, said he reviewed aerial maps and it appeared that there was a darker line where the soccer fields were added. He said there may be a line of field tiles that Fred Hahn had referred to at the last meeting to the south of the site. He reported that the County exhausted all records and the presence of field tiles could not be determined.

Fred Hahn said his recollections were pre-park developments and that the field tiles could just be in the park.

Mr. Stanford said the County was the best resource for field tile information and if their records had been exhausted then that is sufficient. He said if field tile is encountered it would have to tie into the stormwater management system for this project. He pointed out that the release rates for which the ponds are designed are very conservative and this also makes the ponds oversized beyond what is required by Dublin regulations.

Mr. Warner said since they have the room, they want to get as much depth as they can.

Mr. Stanford said the plans will need to clarify if the City is constructing the improvements associated with the Crosby Court infrastructure. He said if improvements are to be the responsibility of others there needs to be coordination. He noted the existing pond on the north side of the existing AEP substation will be removed with the Crosby Court improvements. Mr. Stanford said he preferred to see stormwater management plans submitted with the Development Plan.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the building materials for the proposed guard house. Mark Ford, Ford and Associates, said the client has used this design in other locations but he would provide more information.

Ms. Rauch said the guard house should look more substantial and must adhere to the primary and secondary material requirements as with all buildings on the site.

Jeff Tyler said a separate building permit would be required for the guard house.

Joanne Shelly asked if the guard house will have signs on it. Mr. Ford said no signs are proposed on any of the buildings but there may be directional signs for the site. Ms. Rauch said that directional signs can be administratively approved.

Alan Perkins said the fire access has been addressed but he is still concerned with the sprinkler connections. He said it is not clear where the main water line comes in and how it will coordinate with future phases.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated this Development Plan application was approved with the following five conditions to be addressed at building permitting:

- 1) That the applicant revises the drawings to correctly label the setbacks along the northeastern and western property lines;
- 2) That the applicant provides revised drawings for the guard house demonstrating the proposed building meets the Code requirements for primary and secondary materials;
- 3) That the applicant provides a revised landscape plan demonstrating that the perimeter buffering will be met at the temporary access point;
- 4) That the applicant provides the Code-required five feet of maneuvering area around the bicycle parking area; and
- 5) That the applicant revises the plans in accordance with Engineering's comment letter dated February 23, 2015.

INTRODUCTIONS

2. BSD Commercial District – Home-2 Hotel 15-017BPR

5000 Upper Metro Place Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan Reviews

Devayani Puranik said this is a request for construction of a new four-story hotel with 126 suites and associated site improvements on a 2.57-acre site on the west side of Frantz Road between West Bridge Street and Upper Metro Place. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Development Plan Review and Basic Site Plan Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(D).

Ms. Puranik said the design has not changed substantially since the Pre-Application Review at last week's ART meeting. She reported the open space area meets the requirement, but the proposed open spaces do not meet the individual size requirements for pocket plazas and pocket parks, since they are sized somewhere in between each type. She said six possible Waivers have been identified to date, including: shared parking; main entrance location; primary materials; transparency on the ground floor; and the building type since corridor building types are not permitted in in the BSD Commercial District.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said Hilton has officially approved this design. He explained this is a H2 prototype. He said they need to strike a balance with adding more windows for privacy but adds to the cost. He said they have made changes to the stone and are bringing down the parapet to help with the appearance of heaviness in terms of the architecture.

Gary Gunderman inquired about the transparency percentages. Ms. Puranik said the first floor is 37%, the ground floor is 60%, and the other stories are 15%. She said the 18% transparency for portions of the ground floor is an issue.

Jeff Tyler said the applicant has not gone far enough with the architectural design. He explained this intersection is a gateway into the City of Dublin. He indicated that the proposed design looks corporate in character and almost institutional. He said if this comes back to the ART again the same way, he will not support this project. He indicated that the City is looking for more than a corporate design; the City needs a gateway piece at this location.

Steve Langworthy said he would have been more comfortable with the design if the whole corner was treated the same as the tower element. He said now the building appears to be just blocks of stone between bricks and nothing is prevalent as a gateway feature. He emphasized that all four corners of this intersection should eventually have something interesting. He asked if perhaps more glass could be incorporated.

Mr. Tyler also liked the idea of introducing more glass as well as insets where a siding treatment could be used. He suggested opening it up to make it separate and with more depth.

Joanne Shelly stated this design was architecturally plain and this was an opportunity to do something really interesting. She said the corner begs for art, especially at the brick corner. She said she echoes Mr. Tyler's and Mr. Langworthy's comments.

Fred Hahn inquired about the transparency on the ground floor. He said he thought the requirements were intended for another building type, not a hotel. He said revisions should be centered on more interesting architecture instead of compliance with transparency. Mr. Tyler agreed.

Mr. Langworthy said public activity should be placed on the outside walls.

Rachel Ray added the floor plan has not changed since the ART had provided comments last week, and this design showing hotel rooms on the ground floor at the corner of Bridge Street and Frantz Road is not appropriate.

Ms. Puranik clarified that last week the applicant was asked to move the public space to the corner.

Mr. Hunter said that moving public spaces to the corner was an operational issue.

Mr. Tyler asked if the pool would fit on the west side of the building, which would open up the entryway from the street and the parking lot. Mr. Hunter said there would still be some operational issues, but it was worth consideration.

Mr. Langworthy asked Mr. Hunter if he would recap what he was hearing from the ART.

Mr. Hunter said he was hearing the ART say that the design of the corner needs attention, although the overall ground floor transparency could be appropriate. He said he is being told that there are other options to be considered and that putting the pool on the west end of the building but also along SR161 may be appropriate.

Mr. Gunderman stated the proposal still appears institutional.

Mr. Langworthy indicated that if changes were made at the corner, it would drive other changes to occur.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns with regard to this application. [There were none.]

3. BSD Scioto River Neighborhood District – Bridge Park – Phase 1 (C Block)

15-018 DP-BSD/SP-BSD

Riverside Drive and Dale Drive Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews

Rachel Ray said this is a request for the first phase of a new mixed-use development, including four buildings containing 149 dwelling units, 98,700 square feet of office uses, 48,900 square feet of eating and drinking uses, and an 864-space parking structure on a 3.47-acre site. She said the proposal includes four new public streets and two blocks of development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Ray stated that she had spoken with the applicant earlier in the week and they had discussed the boundaries for the Development Plan, Site Plan, and Final Plat. She said the Development Plan encompasses the street network, block framework, and building arrangement. She said this proposal includes Tuller Ridge Drive, Bridge Park Avenue, Mooney Street, and Longshore Street. She said the Development Plan Review examines street requirements, rights-of-way, and bike network. She added the review determines lot and block requirements and permitted building types.

Ms. Ray said the Site Plan Review encompasses four buildings in the area identified as the C block. She said a Final Plat was submitted and includes the same roadways, which form three blocks. She said the Site Plan Review serves as a review of uses, building types, open space types, and site development standards including parking, landscaping, and signs.

Ms. Ray noted that there were still some timing issues to work out in terms of the final disposition of the COTA site and the development agreement.

Ms. Ray reported the applicant provided numerous plans for C block but she did not have an opportunity to review them thoroughly prior to this meeting. However, she noted the following:

- Street sections are not consistent with the Preliminary Plat, including no cycle track shown along Bridge Park Avenue.

- The Final Plat does not show easements for pedestrian bridges over right-of-way or public access easements for the open spaces.

Fred Hahn inquired whether the pedestrian bridges would require a mid-air easement.

Rachel Ray inquired about open space as there has been a change since the Basic Site Plan. She noted that the pocket parks were no longer being shown along Riverside Drive or Bridge Park Avenue, and the only open spaces were those between the buildings and the riverfront park acreage.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, said there are too many unknowns to designate open spaces along the streetscape. Mr. Hunter said they still know they will have the pocket plazas and seating areas, but they were not able to identify them on the plan as yet.

Joanne Shelly stated that this was not acceptable in that the point of the open space requirement is to guarantee there will be a variety of spaces for public use. She noted that the City wants these public spaces and cannot be made to adjust to what a tenant may want later. She emphasized that public spaces needed to be carved out in the plans and maintained. She indicated credit was being given for the public park across the street, but some of the requirement needed to be provided through the pocket parks and pocket plazas along the streetscape. Ms. Ray agreed with Ms. Shelly.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said a tenant is required to come before the ART with an application and the ART can make a determination then about the open spaces being proposed.

Ms. Shelly reiterated that the Site Plan Review includes a guarantee for permanent, required public open space, and delineating these spaces cannot be put off until later when a tenant decides what they may want. She said the Site Plan Review will likely not be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission if the Code required open spaces are not shown on the plans. She said right now just one type is being shown and multiple types are required, therefore the project is not in compliance with the open space variety requirement. Ms. Ray agreed with Ms. Shelly's assessment.

Ms. Ray said Staff had requested elevations on how the façades of the building, framing the open spaces, will look and the elevations have not yet been received. She said the intent is to review these open spaces in three dimensions, not just in plan view. She said there are a lot of blank façades and service areas, and it will be important to see how the buildings frame these spaces rather than detracting from them.

Mr. Hunter confirmed that the elevations were provided in the application submission package. Ms. Ray said they were, but they were only included with the architectural plans. She reiterated that the particular elevations framing the open spaces should be provided and considered with the open space plans for the three-dimensional context.

Ms. Ray noted that on the architectural plans, some of the building floor plans appear to encroach into the right-of-way. Ms. Umbarger said some buildings are right on the ROW, but she was not aware of any encroachments. Ms. Ray said at a minimum, the door swings encroached into the ROW, which was not permitted by Code.

Ms. Ray stated that prior to Staff's complete analysis it appears that Waivers will be required for all buildings for transparency, building materials, and primary materials, at a minimum.

Ms. Ray said the designs were almost identical to the Basic Plan Review except for Building C2, which had been modified. She asked the applicant to summarize where the application stands with respect to Building C2.

Mr. Hunter said the applicant considered several changes in the design of the C2 Building corner tower. He said they considered curves, circles, shrouds, etc. as were shown to the ART previously, but they were not satisfied with any of those designs. He explained that many of the designs were trendy and could be appropriate for five years, but would soon fall out of fashion. He said they decided to enhance the original design for a more timeless look. He said the original design had a metal panel tower with inset glass. He explained they thinned down the brick, and the metal panel is now all glass and wrapped the corner with intricate horizontal metal bands added for three-dimensional character making it a three-sided piece. He added they pulled the brick out on all the balconies for additional outdoor space. He said they also modified the canopy at the base of the tower. He said they are happy with the revised plans and the building is now iconic without being trendy. He said they are happy with the direction they have taken as the design is more timeless.

Mr. Langworthy said he never understood the term 'timeless' as it refers to architectural design and asked Mr. Hunter to explain his view of the term.

Mr. Hunter said the term 'timeless' is subjective and is usually a basic design concept. He said the design is more about detail. He said last week they had presented a glass box with a shroud around it. He said that made the building more sculptural than architectural. He said it did not look like it belonged with the buildings that would be around it.

Jeff Tyler said he saw some really cool ideas in this latest design, with lots of interesting details. He said he liked the design of the corner piece with the corner balconies as it creates a series of nice spaces. He said the revised plan certainly has potential.

Ms. Umbarger said there will be activity on that corner.

Ms. Shelly said the revised design was interesting looking. She said where the building meets the streetscape it begs to do something on the corner so the building and the corner relate to each other. She emphasized making the design relatable all the way through.

Mr. Hunter indicated there was a charcoal brick that could be spread out through the sidewalk.

Dan Phillabaum questioned the use of the tower lighting to make it a complete iconic element. Mr. Hunter said that was the intention; they did not want to see the tower go dark each evening.

Ms. Ray identified a Waiver needed for the C1 Building for the north elevation facing Tuller Ridge Drive. She said the design feels harsh and lacks detail. She asked what the vision was for the expansive brick section.

Ms. Umbarger answered the intent was some type of a mural or a place for artwork. She explained that the stair and elevator were on the interior side of that brick wall.

Ms. Ray asked that details be provided, if art or a mural is planned.

Ms. Ray stated that the applicant had provided some information with respect to the proposed materials that are not directly permitted by Code. She said a lot of the information speaks to more descriptive features, rather than quantifiable specifications. She said the material provided in support of these materials and should make a strong case including specifications, installation methods, and expected longevity of the materials.

Mr. Tyler added specifications should state how the materials will be physically installed and used. He said the depth and details of the windows should be noted, as this is required.

Mr. Hunter agreed to provide that information.

Ms. Ray indicated there would be a few more weeks to review this application as the determination from the ART was scheduled for the end of March to be forwarded to the PZC for the meeting on April 9, 2015.

Mr. Hunter said he would like to meet internally as needed.

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

4. BSD Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center –

Average Joe's Pub & Grill – Signs 6711 Dublin Center Drive Minor Project Review

15-020MPR

Marie Downie said this is a request to install a new 20.75-square-foot wall sign and a 9.6-square-foot projecting sign for a restaurant tenant in the Dublin Village Center shopping center, east of Village Parkway and south of Tuller Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Downie said the applicant was a new tenant. She explained they are proposing two signs: one wall sign and one projecting sign. She said the projecting sign has to be within six feet of the main entrance and presently did not meet that requirement.

Paul Rockwell with Average Joe's Pub & Grill, said they are considering remodeling the outside.

Jeff Tyler said to make sure the shopping center owner knows that proper permits need to be obtained before any remodeling can happen.

Rachel Ray said if the applicant applies for a Master Sign Plan, it will need to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission as a separate submission.

Mr. Langworthy asked if it was understood what happens if the applicant is not in compliance. He said they would have to go to the PZC. He said ART will make a decision on this Minor Project application next week.

Mr. Rockwell said the property owner would be taking the Master Sign Plan forward. He asked what if Average Joe's wanted to redo the front entrance door, as they are considering relocating the door.

Jennifer Rauch said the applicant could delay the request for a projecting sign.

Eric Hilty, Hilty Sign, asked the ART if there were any concerns with the designs of the signs. He said they were considering LED lighting or a tall vertical sign. He asked if the ART could provide aesthetic guidance as they are not 100% sold on the current proposed designs.

Ms. Ray said Staff submitted the sign designs to the City's design consultant and would relay any feedback provided. Mr. Langworthy asked Staff to inform the design consultant that there may be other design options in the pipeline.

Ms. Downie asked the applicant if they had a copy of the other designs being considered. Mr. Rockwell said they were still working through them. Mr. Langworthy requested the drawings as soon as possible.

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

Mr. Langworthy called a short recess at 3:15 pm

Mr. Langworthy reconvened the meeting at 3:45 pm

CASE REVIEW

5. BSD Residential - Tuller Flats 15-012DP-SP

4313 Tuller Road Development Plan/Site Plan Reviews

Joanne Shelly said this is a request for a multiple-family residential development consisting of 420 apartment units in 29 three-story apartment buildings, a community clubhouse, and associated streets and open spaces on approximately 20.44 acres south 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 for this application for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Shelly presented the location of the site and the public improvements proposed per the development agreement for Phase 1. She presented the street network and identified the alleyways. She noted that the total parking required is 484 spaces and ± 549 are shown although the ADA space counts and on-street parking numbers are unclear. She said there should be no parking behind garages and signs are needed to ensure people do not park in the fire zone spaces. She indicated a parking plan is needed and that the calculations are above what is permitted.

Ms. Shelly said to avoid Waivers for open space the description is more closely matched to a "square" than a green and should be counted that way. She said the open space allocation for the City's parcel per the development agreement provides parameters for what has already been made fact and what is left to comment on.

Ms. Shelly said building materials need to be addressed. She said this is an opportunity for diversity and to propose the alternative Boral material, which is being proposed in five different colors. She said the alternative Hurd Super Seal windows in bronze need to be addressed as well.

Dan Phillabaum had noted on his comments dated February 25, 2015, that installation details are not clear on elevations and flush mounted windows are prohibited. He said lintels appear to be missing on several windows at masonry walls as required by Code and projecting sills seem to be missing on several windows at side walls. He asked what materials are proposed for use as trim – windows/doors and parapet caps/decorative eaves. He said there is an inconsistency for how these areas are trimmed out on masonry as well as where there is siding.

Mr. Phillabaum asked if there was a roof plan for the parapets to screen mechanicals and what roof material was being proposed.

Ms. Shelly reiterated that the new primary materials need to be introduced as offering quality, variety, and diversity. She explained that the Boral material is a man-made fly ash that is highly recyclable with high resistance to moisture and better accommodates fasteners. She said the same fasteners can be used that would be used for wood and Boral has a quality connection to different material types. She said Boral accepts paint to the surface better than wood and does not have to be painted as often.

Ms. Shelly said the Hurd vinyl windows being proposed are of a higher quality material and has a better installation opportunity to allow for more character and depth. She restated that Staff looks to the applicant to carry the burden of making the case for the vinyl windows. She said the applicant will need to supply the architectural support from people that have actually used this product and can attest to its longevity.

Mr. Langworthy said this is not going to be an easy sell. He said over the past year, vinyl windows kept coming up viewed as a negative product by the various reviewing bodies. He emphasized the applicant will need to demonstrate the higher quality for these materials to be considered.

Ms. Shelly recommended that the applicant bring a window sample and demonstrate why it is superior to building grade.

Joe Sullivan, B&S Architecture, said he will bring a 3-foot by 3-foot triangular section of wall showing the Hurd windows in conjunction with the Boral materials for the outside.

Ms. Shelly said the building variety is good but the issue relates to how the variety will be presented.

Ms. Shelly reported the tree survey and landscape plan had been completed but the plans show a shortfall of 40 trees. She said the comments received from Brian Martin, Landscape Inspector, was that the trees identified for preservation are not necessarily what we want; these trees are mostly multi-stem undesirable trees.

Ms. Shelly referred to the letter dated February 26, 2015, received from Alan Perkins. He had asked which side of the street that parking would be permitted for McCune Avenue, Watson Street, and Deardorff Street. He had inquired about phasing. He asked how the development will be phased so that fire access can be determined based on building construction and the future extension of Hobbs Landing West. He said if Buildings 12, 13, 17 and 18 were built before Hobbs Landing West is constructed, parking will need to be restricted on McCune Avenue between Deardorff Street and future Hobbs Landing West.

Mr. Perkins said potential occupancy is also his concern. He said the sprinkler FDC location proposed on the meter building behind Building 28 does not meet the Fire Department's approval. He further stated that the FDC needs to be visible and recognizable from the street side of fire department vehicle access and that the alley behind Buildings 22 – 30 is a required fire apparatus access road due to the proposed FDC locations for these buildings; the service street is critical. He said infrastructure is not finalized and a phasing plan is needed in a timely fashion for fire approval for the infrastructure agreement.

Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Yaross attorneys, said the applicant is close to an infrastructure agreement. He said they were always wanted Hobbs Landing West constructed sooner rather than later.

Aaron Stanford said he needs street utility information; grading for ADA access; and a parking plan. He asked where there will be parking when there is not parallel parking available. He said signs are needed for fire access aids.

Mr. Sanford inquired about the water service with the City of Columbus.

Mr. Stanford stated infrastructure was needed.

Mr. Underhill said he had been given the run around; the City of Columbus was giving the same response for sites he is associated with all over town. He asked if the City Staff might set up more leverage.

Ms. Shelly said Code requires trees spaced at 40 feet on center and right now the proposed plans show 25 feet but she wants to see the trees closer to the 40-foot requirement.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the easement section details on the plat. She said the plat approvals will need to run concurrently.

Mr. Phillabaum inquired about the units facing the greenway as no RBZ is being shown. He suggested that if this was shown on the south side of the greenway, a Waiver could be eliminated.

Ms. Shelly said primary and secondary material numbers appear to be accurate for the front elevations but side and rear elevations appear to have the biggest problems with transparency and may need a Waiver. She said balcony voids appear to be counted as transparency.

Ms. Shelly inquired about the sign plan. She said ground signs are shown on public property, which is problematic. She noted that some of the ground signs could be moved back as an easy solution. Her concern was how to squeeze a sign as shown into the corners of the blocks. She added the signs may not fit in the spaces the applicant is presenting and some signs seem large.

Mr. Stanford asked the ART if they were comfortable with the number of ground signs proposed.

Ms. Rauch said Code permits two signs depending on the façade and the number of streets. She suggested the applicant reconsider the number of ground signs they are proposing and said she liked the proposed projecting signs.

Ms. Shelly said for a lighting plan, light plans need lumens and foot candles. She said cut sheets could be completed at building permitting. She indicated there is a concern about the look of the fixtures. She found that the ones that have been shown are nice but most of the fixtures are hidden.

Ms. Shelly concluded her review by stating she liked the brushed aluminum vinyl address numbers.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further comments or questions regarding this application. [There were none.] He said a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission is scheduled for next Thursday's ART meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

Mr. Langworthy adjourned the meeting at 4:20 pm.