



**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

MARCH 5, 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; Ms. Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Tammy Noble-Flading, Senior Planner; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Mike Burmeister and Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors (Cases 1 & 2); Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T (Cases 1 & 3); Vern Hoying, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Case 2) Greg Briya, Moody Nolan (Case 3); and Kolby Turnock and Brent Sobczak, 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 26, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

CASE REVIEWS

**1. BSC Historic Transition - Bridge Park West
15-014ARB-SP**

**94-100 North High Street
Site Plan Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for a two and a half story mixed-use commercial development and 42 condominium units in a seven-story building with associated parking and site improvements. She said the site is on the east side of North High Street approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for this application for Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(F) and (J). She said Staff was still going through the final details of this project, although much of it is consistent with the previous iterations reviewed by the ART.

Ms. Rauch said possible Waivers had been identified:

Apartment Building

- 153.062 (O)3 – Change in roof plane every 80 feet
- 153.062 (O)9 – Change in vertical plane every 30 feet – actually 40 feet
- 153.062 (O)(3) – 2.5 feet above the sidewalk
- 153.062 (D)(4)(5) – Tower height not greater than one additional story – 12 max, 14 proposed
- 153.062 (E)(1)(e) – EIFS only permitted as trim material
- 153.062 - Front property line coverage 75% - 61% shown

Historic Mixed Use Building

- 153.062 (D)(2)(B)(1) – Minimum roof pitch 6:12 – North Tower 3:12
- Ground story transparency – 40% required, 36% shown
- Upper story transparency – 20% required, 18% shown
- Non-street transparency – 15% required, 3% shown

Number of street façade entrances – 1 per 40 feet required, southern portion exceeds

Ms. Rauch inquired about the Apartment Building roof plan.

Mike Burmeister, OHM Advisors, said the applicant was over the 80-foot requirement by ± 10 feet as they tried to line up with the architecture. Ms. Rauch requested the applicant try to meet the requirement since they were so close.

Ms. Rauch said a vertical change in plane needed to occur every 30 feet rather than the 40 feet shown; however, due to the grade change, she anticipated the need for a Waiver to this requirement.

Ms. Rauch addressed the tower height that exceeds one story but since the tower was intended to be a prominent architectural element, the fact that the requirement is exceeded by a few feet could be justified.

Mr. Burmeister said the side elevation was changed; it was raised in proportion for the terminal vista.

Jeff Tyler said if the additional height was adding to the quality of design then this should be acceptable.

Ms. Rauch stated that EIFS was not allowed as a primary material on the backside of the apartment building. Mr. Langworthy said EIFS is being used for more than trim.

Mr. Tyler reiterated that EIFS was not a permitted primary material and if the applicant wants to use it as such they need to demonstrate the quality of the installation and other quality measures and demonstrate that the material is overwhelmingly necessary to the design. Ms. Rauch said since EIFS is not permitted as a secondary or primary material and only permitted for trim, a Waiver would be necessary.

Ms. Rauch said Code requires the front property line coverage to be 75% but only 61% is shown. She indicated this seemed appropriate because the applicant's property extends all the way out near the intersection with North Street, even though that part of the property is not included in this application. She asked the applicant to delineate the site area to show the distinction in support of a potential Waiver.

Ms. Rauch noted the north tower roof pitch at 3:12 when a minimum of 6:12 is required for a historic mixed-use building. This, she said, would also require a Waiver.

Ms. Rauch requested that the ground story transparency be met if possible as the applicant was showing 36% transparency when 40% is required, and asked the applicant to meet upper story transparency at 20% when 18% was shown. She noted that the requirement for non-street transparency was 15% and the applicant was showing 4% on the interior of the building in the private courtyard.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the roof pitch on the tower asking if it was considered a cap tower element or a roof. Ms. Rauch said she interprets it as a different kind of roof element. Mr. Tyler said if the element is not considered a roof then it would be flat.

Ms. Rauch noted that one street façade entrance is required for every 40 feet and the applicant has yet to meet that requirement.

Ms. Rauch stated she would provide more information on roof types. She asked if there was a parapet on roofs on the back side of the buildings on High Street.

Ms. Rauch said transparency and material calculations needed to be shown on some type of document sheet to validate that the numbers were correct and meet Code. She reiterated that fiber cement and

glass are not permitted primary materials for a historic mixed-use building; stone, brick and wood siding are the only permitted primary materials. She added that fiber cement is not a permitted primary material for an Apartment Building; only stone, brick and glass are permitted. Ms. Rauch said flush-mounted windows are not permitted on either building type.

Dan Phillabaum said this becomes more of an issue on a siding-clad wall.

Ms. Rauch inquired about window trim detail for siding walls; masonry walls have lintels and sills.

Ms. Rauch requested that the vertical increments and horizontal division details be provided on a separate document. She asked why some elevations showed details and others did not and asked the applicant if she could expect this information.

Mr. Burmeister said the accent detail was pretty repetitive all around. Ms. Rauch said not all repetitive pieces were being shown. She also requested a separate sheet showing transparency and material calculations per floor, per façade.

Ms. Rauch stated a parking plan was required as the parking exceeded the maximum permitted. Mr. Langworthy said the parking plan could be described in a narrative including information about publicly available parking over the amount required for the uses of the proposal.

Rachel Ray added that extra spaces are acceptable, but they needed to be justified.

Ms. Rauch said details for on-street loading spaces needed to be included within the parking plan.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the operations of the dumpsters and requested that if they are outside, to make that clear.

Ms. Rauch said the number of loading spaces needed to be identified based on the number of units.

Ms. Rauch told the applicant that a Master Sign Plan will need to be submitted later.

Ms. Rauch said calculations on lot coverage, materials and transparency for the four different building types needed to be shown and the applicant needs to demonstrate how they arrived at those numbers. She added a graphic would be needed for the Apartment Building vs. the Historic Mixed Use buildings. She said impervious calculations were needed as well.

Ms. Rauch questioned if the property line had been moved on the north of the project limits.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, said the property line was adjusted to accommodate the path, but has not been changed since.

Aaron Stanford asked if there was an update on the floodplain. Mr. Quackenbush reported the public notice had gone out; but the change will not be effective until this summer. He said a low-rise certification is being pursued. He explained there was no rise in the floodplain elevation, which allows this project to forward. He stated he was confident they could make it work.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the section of North Riverview Street and Mr. Quackenbush said he could provide information now.

Mr. Stanford cautioned the applicant to work on the details for accessibility for on-street parking and requested ramps to be incorporated.

Mr. Stanford requested detail for widening the street for a turn lane and a possible future retaining wall; the aesthetics of the retaining wall should coordinate with the building.

Mr. Quackenbush said Crawford Hoying Development Partners were responsible for the area between the right-of-way line and the building for retaining wall limits. He said Nelson Yoder would have the latest information regarding responsibility.

Mr. Stanford inquired about stormwater for the triangle piece of the site, specifically how the grade change would be dealt with both logistically and feasibly. He explained there needs to be an interim condition before anything happens to the south and to focus on what needs to be there.

Mr. Quackenbush acknowledged there were some grading issues. He said the path was close to the vertical wall.

Mr. Stanford asked how the development to the south was going to tie in. Mr. Quackenbush replied the intent is for the area to the south to be on the high side.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the valet loading spaces, since they did not appear to be ADA accessible.

Mr. Quackenbush said there will be loading spaces for deliveries. Mr. Langworthy suggested a letter of agreement stating how the spaces would be blocked off for valet service. Ms. Rauch said loading/unloading on the street should be part of the parking plan. Mr. Langworthy recommended that a narrative be included about the use of the on-street parking spaces when valet service would be provided.

Mr. Stanford requested radius dimensions on driveways at High Street and North Riverview Street.

Fred Hahn inquired about the stormwater north of Indian Run and who was designing the improvements. Mr. Quackenbush said he would need to investigate.

Alan Perkins indicated that Washington Township will approve the 26 foot dead-end drive aisle (North Riverview) without parking as shown. He said they are anticipating seeing a development agreement showing the future North Riverview extension for full approval of the project. He was also concerned about the amount of EIFS material on the backside of the building, especially in the vicinity of the balconies. He mentioned a fire last month at the Dubai Torch Tower that was ignited by either a grill or smoking material on a balcony. He discussed a recent report that the EIFS material ignited and helped spread the fire on the outside of the high-rise building. Mr. Perkins said he would like the applicant to explore the proximity of the material to the balcony amenity.

Mr. Hahn inquired about the streetscape. He asked if a new standard was being introduced to Historic Dublin as the recessed planters are different in character than what is shown in the Streetscape Character Guide and used elsewhere in the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch said the Streetscape Character Guide should be followed.

Mr. Hahn asked if the area within the right-of-way would be maintained by the owner or the City. Ms. Rauch answered the intent is for the right-of-way to be maintained by the City. She said there needed to be a certain amount of consistency on the North High Street streetscape, and this does not match.

Mr. Hahn asked for clarification on which planting areas the City would be responsible for and what was the new standard.

Ms. Shelly said a decision had not been made with regards to street furniture. Ms. Rauch said that will need to be discussed.

Mr. Tyler indicated it should be the ARB's decision on the architectural appropriateness of the tower. He said more variety in window types and storefronts from building to building was preferable but there was nothing to substantiate that in the Code. He said he did not see strong architectural character changes from one building to another.

Ms. Rauch said she would consolidate her list of outstanding issues. She indicated a recommendation by the ART is anticipated for March 19, 2015, to be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board for their meeting on March 25, 2015, therefore, the plans should be revised by March 16, 2015.

Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors, indicated the applicant did not want to present to the ARB on March 25th since he would be out of town, and would prefer to attend the April 15, 2015, meeting. Ms. Rauch said a time extension would need to be filed.

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

2. BSD Commercial District – Home-2 Hotel **5000 Upper Metro Place**
15-017BPR **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 Basic Development Plan and Basic Site Plan Reviews in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(D).

Ms. Puranik said there had been no changes since this application was introduced last week and she recapped what was discussed at the last meeting. She said mainly the comments related to the proposed architecture and the ART had said the design was not where it needed to be to move forward. She asked the applicant if there were any updates.

Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors, responded that there was no time to make changes since last week's meeting. He said since he was not in attendance the week prior, he wanted to hear the ART's comments first-hand this week.

Ms. Puranik recapped that the materials appear heavy, and more transparency and glass were suggested, especially more glass for the tower. She said that the intersection of this site at Bridge Street and Frantz Road is significant and the corner should be more active. She said the area should be more fun and that a gateway feature was needed at this intersection. She said a rendering of landscaping has been presented. She pointed out the door that was an exit only.

Mr. Sebach said they provided a design that fit within the requirements of 80% brick and stone for two elevations.

Ms. Puranik explained that windows can be included in the calculations for transparency if more glass is introduced to the point it becomes an integrated architectural element.

Jeff Tyler recapped that the ART had said the building looked institutional in character and that the windows were too long and narrow, especially on the upper floors.

Mr. Sebach said they are striving for a middle ground for the brand and Code. He said he agreed the building needs a better scale and he had some ideas. He suggested that the width of the glass could be increased.

Ms. Puranik reviewed the elevations for the back of the building. She explained that Code has restrictions for blank walls, which the applicant currently exceeds. She added a vertical division is required every 45 feet and asked if another material could be introduced.

Joanne Shelly reiterated that this site is in a prominent location and the ART would prefer something interesting to look at on that corner and this concept was not fitting of a memorable building. She said the elevation perspectives highlight the blank wall where it begs for more interest.

Ms. Puranik indicated that artwork or a mural had been suggested by the applicant last week. She said not only was this a gateway into the city but it could be the last building that people would see on their way out of the city as well.

Mr. Sebach inquired about the tower feature as he wanted to gain a better sense of what the ART desired.

Mr. Tyler reiterated that the applicant had not gone far enough with the design.

Steve Langworthy said the issue with the entrance was due to the Code requirement of have a principal entrance on a Principal Frontage Street as a public, usable entrance to the building. He said the interior does not allow for free flowing circulation for that entrance on Bridge Street and Frantz Road, and the ART had suggested a change to the interior for a Code compliant public entrance. He stated that the corner needed to be highlighted and that the tower feature should be a memorable, demonstrable part of the building. He suggested making the tower a memorable architectural element.

Mr. Sebach said he would go back and take another look at the brand.

Ms. Puranik requested a right-of-way drawing for SR161 as a corner piece and suggested contacting Tina Wawzkiewicz in Engineering.

Ms. Puranik indicated that there are deed restrictions on the site, and that Legal was involved as the City is the enforcer of the original TIF agreement for that area as well as the recipient for the benefits. She said the Planning and Zoning Commission was the decision-making body and a determination should be made in the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Burmeister inquired about the procedure.

Ms. Rauch said the procedure followed the BSD Code and it was the City's responsibility to clean up the record with respect to the deed restrictions. She stated that Jennifer Readler, the City's legal counsel, was working on this. Ms. Puranik stated the public improvements resulting from the TIF have been completed.

Aaron Stanford encouraged the applicant to place a sidewalk to the south of the hotel building along Frantz Road and to link to the existing bike path on Frantz Road. He said that portion of the wall would also need to be reconstructed to make the connection.

Mr. Burmeister confirmed he would place a break in the wall to allow for the sidewalk connection.

Mr. Stanford said the driveway layout looked a lot better but other drawings needed to be revised to show the same layout.

Ms. Puranik stated the applicant met the requirements for the area of open space but specified that neither a pocket plaza nor a pocket park appropriately fit the proposal as the open space was not the right size for either.

Ms. Ray said a Waiver could be appropriate, provided the open spaces were well-designed and would meet the intent of the open spaces that would serve the site's users.

Mr. Burmeister said the applicant would decide on one or the other type of open space. Mr. Langworthy added that nice amenities should be incorporated into the open space.

Vern Hoying, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, noted that the feel of the H2 prototype design was important to the corporate brand. He said the design aspects are a balancing act with functionality. He said Hilton has done extensive testing on the interior layout and it all works but serious work could be done on the exterior design while keeping some flavors and feel of the H2 prototype.

Mr. Langworthy suggested it might be necessary to "Dublinize" the H2 prototype.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns with regard to this application. [There were none.] He said the ART would make a recommendation for this Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan on March 19, 2015, to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

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 request for 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 provided a handout for the Development Plan showing how the application measured against the Code and highlighted the few outstanding issues.

Transportation

Ms. Ray said multiple modes of transportation needed to be considered: how buses could be accommodated within the travel lanes along Bridge Park Avenue; cycle track details including materials, delineation, sign, and intersections; and motorcycle parking. She asked if COTA needs 11 feet for buses, the applicant should show how they would be accommodated, and how pedestrians would be able to access the sidewalk, etc. She suggested that spaces for motorcycle parking could be incorporated on Tuller Ridge Drive.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, requested clarification on delineation of the cycle tracks. Ms. Ray deferred to Joanne Shelly and Aaron Stanford. She said how bikes will need to navigate the intersections at Mooney and Longshore needed to be determined as well.

Crosswalks

Ms. Ray said design and materials should be noted on the plans, consistent with the BSD Streetscape Design Guidelines.

Streetscape Detail Plan

Ms. Ray said the 12-foot clear path of travel along the shopping corridor, cycle tracks, open spaces (public and private) and possible patio areas needed to be shown on the plans. She said how pedestrians interact with that space also should be included. She requested close-up renderings along Bridge Park Avenue as well as design intent and typical layouts for areas where a patio bleeds into an open space.

Mr. Quackenbush said MKSK had the detail on the street sections.

Gateway Detail Plan/Narrative

Ms. Ray said an explanation was needed to state how the Bridge Park Avenue/Riverside Drive intersection is treated as a gateway and how it will correspond with Phase 2 to the south. She asked that the design for the tower at Bridge Park Avenue be taken a step farther by providing a perspective rendering showing the intent for a gateway.

Mr. Quackenbush said MKSK is working on the plans to show the integration of patios.

Parking

Ms. Ray said on-street parking could only be counted for buildings and uses on the same side of the block, so the Site Plan detail needed to be revised. She said the applicant will be short some spaces but could address this through a parking plan.

Ms. Ray requested the RBZ be removed from the Final Plat as it was already being shown on the Site Plan.

Dan Phillabaum inquired about the height requirements for the tower on Building C2. He said information is needed.

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, said the tower exceeds the requirements by ± 22 feet as the applicant wants the tower to be a cornerstone element.

Steve Langworthy noted that it might be possible for Staff to support a Waiver for the height of the tower, if it is a strong gateway element.

Mr. Phillabaum said Building C3 needed material transitions shown.

Joanne Shelly said it was an opportunity for the applicant to provide a rendering of the interior detail.

Mr. Phillabaum asked that the applicant confirm that the parapets are tall enough to screen rooftop mechanicals and units.

Mr. Briya said small condensers were designed for each residential unit within the footprint of the roof.

Jeff Tyler said the range hoods for restaurants also have to be screened as there is a height and screen requirement.

Mr. Phillabaum reiterated that building entrances needed to be recessed three feet from the base of the building so doors do not swing into the right-of-way. Mr. Quackenbush said he recalled the plans were acceptable. He said it would be difficult to change some of the entrances. He asked if a Waiver could be requested for key locations.

Ms. Ray said a Waiver could be considered where there is a lot of space if there was at least a five-foot sidewalk but not in the tight areas. Mr. Quackenbush asked if the applicant could show adequate space, if specific areas could be considered. He said he understood the applicant would have to demonstrate the appropriateness.

Mr. Langworthy noted that there should be as few Waivers as they can provide. Mr. Briya said they covered a handful so far but there are problems with the C2 building as changing the entrances would impact the architecture. Mr. Briya clarified the required entrance design would not visually look as good.

Ms. Shelly recommended sliding flush doors as an alternative option. She said those doors are better for weather and people coming/going. She encouraged the applicant to consider other options.

Mr. Briya said they do not know what those spaces are yet; the unknown tenants are the issue. He said the new tenant may not want an alcove. Mr. Langworthy recommended creating the alcove to meet Code now and they can come back later for a Waiver if the tenant prefers something different.

Fred Hahn said too many compromises have been made already.

Mr. Phillabaum inquired about the lobby space to the roof deck for Buildings C3 and B3, and if the counts included occupied space as the plans are sparsely detailed. He said these are not considered towers as they are in the interior of the roof, rather than connected to exterior walls.

Mr. Briya said that part of it was the elevator. Mr. Phillabaum requested that a shadow line be inserted as well as some additional architectural detailing. Mr. Langworthy suggested a color or material change.

Ms. Ray explained the planter details had changed. Mr. Quackenbush said the width of the tree grates changed from five feet to four feet making them narrower. Ms. Shelly confirmed that the tree planting area overall stayed at five feet.

Aaron Stanford said encroachments are important as well as cycle track transitions to cross the street. He cautioned the applicant to consider eliminating as many of the building entrance Waivers as possible.

Mr. Langworthy reiterated that alternative materials being considered like vinyl windows will need a strong case including specifications, installation methods, and expected longevity of materials. Mr. Tyler said it has to be stated how the materials will be physically installed and used and the depth and details of the windows should be noted, as flush-mounted windows are not permitted.

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

DETERMINATIONS

4. Sycamore Ridge Park Rezoning 15-011Z

6720 Riverside Drive Rezoning

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request to rezone a 3.5-acre parcel from BSC Public District to BSD Residential District. She said the site is on the east side of Tuller Ridge Drive between Tuller Road and Sycamore Ridge Boulevard. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council for a rezoning under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.234. She said this request is presented in conjunction with the Tuller Flats project, and approval is necessary to allow the residential uses shown on this parcel proposed as part of that project.

Ms. Rauch said approval was recommended.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed that the ART recommended approval of this rezoning application to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**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 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. Shelly presented the existing Bridge Street District zoning map and noted that the Sycamore Ridge Park rezoning is necessary prior to approval of this application, due to the residential uses shown on the park land.

Ms. Shelly presented a site exhibit that depicted the following site issues:

- Requirement for 20 feet of occupied space along the street;
- Principal entrance requirement along Principal Frontage Streets;
- Stoop in T-configurations, where additional details are needed;
- Accessory structure (waste enclosure) details needed;
- Parking encroachments into the Required Building Zone;
- Vehicular access on Principal Frontage Streets;
- Where retaining wall details are needed; and
- Where there are terminal vistas.

Ms. Shelly said possible Waivers have been identified.

Ms. Shelly showed the Street Network graphic to note reasons for a Waiver for principal frontage streets that are adjacent to the open space of Village Green. She explained that even though these streets would not normally be classified as Principal Frontage Streets, since they have frontage on a larger open space; there is a Code requirement that states they should be treated as Principal Frontage Streets.

Ms. Shelly presented a slide showing the proposed land uses to demonstrate the areas for development blocks and open space. She presented a slide showing the parking required as compared to the parking provided. She recommended that the Site Plan show the public areas and the private areas, as well as identify the ADA spaces. She said parking spaces cannot be in the Required Building Zone and noted that 10 spaces were affected. She said the ADA spaces could be positioned in better locations to allow for more ADA spaces if they were arranged to share the maneuverability space adjacent to the ADA parking spaces.

Ms. Shelly presented an open space slide showing the comparison of open space required (± 1.9 acres) to the open space provided (a total of ± 3.51 acres). She explained how Sycamore Park was part of a land exchange that had been approved by City Council with the development agreement.

Ms. Shelly said with respect to building variety, the applicant had provided renderings to show how the buildings varied in scale, character, materials, and detailing, visible from different vantage points. She included the materials palette that showed four different schemes of materials proposed for the various buildings.

Ms. Shelly presented the proposed clubhouse elevations and said no changes had been made since the ART met last. She explained that previous plans were presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission in July, and the Commission had requested the building be taller and more in scale with the other buildings.

Ms. Shelly said the Commission had also requested to see a graphic depicting the various buildings down a street so they could better see how they differ and relate to each other. She noted on the plans several instances where different building types are located across the street from and adjacent to one another. She showed more proposed elevation renderings of buildings from different vantage points and clarified the views from service streets.

Ms. Shelly said six actions were required of the ART for this application:

1. Approval of Administrative Departures
2. Recommendation for the Development Plan Waiver
3. Recommendation for the Site Plan Waivers
4. Recommendation regarding the alternative materials, based on the review criteria of §153.02(E)(1)(c) for permitted building materials
5. Recommendation for the Development Plan, including one condition, based on the review criteria of §153.066(E)(3) for Development Plan Review
6. Recommendation for the Site Plan, including nine conditions, based on the review criteria of §153.066(F)(3) for Site Plan Review

Ms. Shelly went through each of the following Administrative Departures:

- §153.062(O)(3)1: Building Types, Apartment buildings, Street Frontage: A request to allow a 10% departure from the occupation of street frontage requirements for block G, including: Front Property Line Coverage, Occupation of Corner, Front RBZ and side RBZ.
 - Building Type B, Building 11

The ART determined that this proposed Administrative Departure should more appropriately be classified as a Waiver.

- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings – Impervious lot coverage 70% maximum - a request to accept Block F, 71% impervious coverage.
 - Building Type B, Building 19
 - Building Type C, Building 20
 - Building Type E, Building 17
 - Building Type F, Building 16
 - Building Type H, Building 21
 - Building Type J, Building 18
- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings – Number of street façade entrances require 1 per 75 linear feet of façade.
 - Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30; 3 required, 2 provided
 - Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17; 3 required, 2 provided
- §153.064 Open Space - Open Space required 1.9 acres – provided 1.84 acres

- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings - Street façade transparency - minimum 20% - side elevation.
 - Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30
 - Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17 (1st story)
 - Building Type H, Buildings 12, 21 & 26 (1st story)
- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings - Non-street façade transparency- minimum 15%, side/rear elevation.
 - Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23
 - Building Type B, Buildings 9, 11, 19, & 28 (1st story & 3rd story)
 - Building Type C, Buildings 5,10, 20, 22, 24, 27 (1st story & 3rd story)
 - Building Type G, Buildings 8, 13, &16 (1st story)
- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings – Primary façade materials, 80% minimum – Front Elevation (with comp. siding).
 - Building Type A, 74.65% (with comp. siding)
 - Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30
 - Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17
- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings – Primary façade materials, 80% minimum – side/rear Elevation.
 - Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30
 - Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17

Mr. Langworthy confirmed with the ART that they understood and found the proposed Administrative Departures to be acceptable.

Ms. Shelly explained that the following criteria must be met for consideration by the ART for a recommendation of approval for 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; and
- d) Request will ensure that the development is of equal or greater development quality

Ms. Shelly stated that she had grouped the proposed Waivers by type to make the discussion a little easier. She started with the following Waivers Related to Site/Code Technicalities:

- §153.062(O)(3): Building types, Apartment Buildings, Street Frontage: Request for a Waiver for Block E and Building 11, due to the curvature of Tuller Road at the northeast corner of the site.
 - Front Property Line Coverage, minimum 75%
 - Occupation of Corner
 - Front RBZ

Criteria Met.

Ms. Shelly stated that based on §153.061(D)(1)(b), Principal Frontage Streets, Watson and Deardorff Streets and McCune Avenue are designated as Principal Frontage Streets where they are adjacent to the Square open space. She said as a result, the following Waivers are requested:

- §153.062(O)(3): Building types, Apartment Buildings Blocks B, C & F
 - Waive the Front Property Line Coverage percentage requirement for Buildings 3, 46, 8, 16 & 21
 - Waive the required number of building entrances on the PFS, as side elevations do not have entries, for Buildings 4, 6, 8, 16 & 20
 - Allow Accessory structures along a PFS where the lot is required to be occupied by a principal building, since the clubhouse is considered to be an accessory structure

Criteria Met.

- §153.062(O)(3): Minimum Finished Floor Elevation, 2.5 feet above adjacent walk required.
 - A request to waive the elevation requirement, so that the ADA accessible units can meet ADA accessibility requirements for Buildings Type A, B, C, D, E, F, H & J

Criteria Met.

- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings – No street entrances provided where 1 per 75 linear feet of façade is required along street facing façades.
 - Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23
 - Building Type B, Buildings 9, 11, 19, & 28
 - Building Type C, Buildings 5, 10, 20, 22, 24 & 27
 - Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30
 - Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17
 - Building Type F, Buildings 2, 25, & 29
 - Building Type G, Buildings 8, 13, & 16

Criteria Met.

- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings – Occupation of corner required, although a sanitary sewer easement restricts placement of buildings at the corner of John Shields Parkway and Tuller Ridge Drive.

- Block G, Building 22

Criteria Met.

- §153.062(O)(3): 20-foot minimum occupied space required on ground stories facing a street.
 - Where garage occupies the rear portion of the unit at the ground stories of Building Types A, B, C, D, F & J

Criteria Met.

Ms. Shelly stated that the next set of Waivers is Waivers Related to Design.

- §153.062(C): Building types – The height of the parapets drops below the two-foot minimum in multiple locations.

Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects, stated that the elevations would be fixed to meet the requirement, which would be provided prior to building permitting.

Ms. Shelly confirmed this no longer required a Waiver, and would be conditioned instead.

- §153.062(C): Building types – Parapets do not wrap all corners and are not continuous along all portions of the roofline.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the elevations would be fixed to meet this requirement as well, which would be provided prior to building permitting.

Ms. Shelly confirmed this no longer required a Waiver, and would be conditioned instead.

- §153.062(E)(2): Transition of materials at an inside corner along rear elevations of A, B & C building types.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the elevations would be fixed to meet this requirement as well, which would be provided prior to building permitting.

Ms. Shelly confirmed this no longer required a Waiver, and would be conditioned instead.

- §153.062(E)(3): Roof Material – A request to waive the requirement to submit roof materials.

Mr. Sullivan stated the applicant would note the roof materials on the plans as part of the building permit submittal.

Ms. Shelly confirmed this no longer required a Waiver, and would be conditioned instead.

- §153.062(H)(3): Canopy Material – A request to waive the requirement to submit canopy materials.

Mr. Sullivan stated the applicant would provide complying canopy materials as part of the building permit submittal.

Ms. Shelly confirmed this no longer required a Waiver, and would be conditioned instead.

- §153.062(I)(1)(a): Building Types – Balconies, porches, stoops & chimneys.
 - A request to waive the minimum six-foot depth requirement for balconies
Criteria Met.
- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings – Street Facing transparency- Minimum 20%.
 - Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23; side elevation
 - Building Type B, Buildings 9, 11, 19, & 28; side elevation
 - Building Type C, Buildings 5,10, 20, 22, 24, 27; side elevation (3rd story)
Criteria Met.

- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings - Non-street façade transparency- minimum 15%.
 - Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23; rear elevation, 1st story (garage)
 - Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30; rear elevation, 1st story (garage)
 - Building Type F, Buildings 2, 25 & 29; rear elevation (1st story) (garage)
 - Building Type H, Buildings 12, 21 & 26 (1st story) (garage)
 - Building Type J, Buildings 15 & 18; rear elevation (1st story) (garage)

Criteria Met.
- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings – Vertical increments required no greater than every 40’ – exceeds maximum distance for certain buildings based on scale of architectural character. Vertical façade is interrupted by the entry and canopy, but are not considered façade divisions.
 - Building Type C, Buildings 5,10, 20, 22, 24, 27; front elevation.

Criteria Met.

Ms. Shelly went through each of the Alternative Materials Determinations, which require approval of the Planning and Zoning Commission and a recommendation from the ART. She explained that §153.062(E)(1)(h): Façade Materials, states *“Other high quality synthetic materials may be approved as permitted primary or secondary materials by the required reviewing body with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.”*

- §153.062(E)(1): Alternative Façade Material type proposed as a Primary and Secondary material: Boral TruExterior siding/trim.
- §153.062(H)(1): Alternative Window type: Hurd SuperSeal Windows.

Ms. Shelly stated that if the Planning and Zoning Commission *does not* approve the alternative materials as permitted primary and secondary materials, the following additional Waivers would be necessary:

- §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings – Waiving the minimum primary façade material requirement of 80%.
 - Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23; front, side & rear elevations
 - Building Type B, Buildings 9, 11, 19, & 28; front & rear elevations
 - Building Type C, Buildings 5,10, 20, 22, 24, 27; rear elevation
 - Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17; front, side(s) & rear elevations
 - Building Type H, Buildings 12, 21 & 26; front, side & rear elevations

Ms. Shelly reiterated the six actions required of the ART for this application.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART to discuss each of the proposed technical Waivers. The ART members agreed that based on the site conditions, approval of the Waivers was appropriate.

The ART also discussed the proposed Waivers related to design, and requested that the applicant clarify the architectural considerations included with the requested Waivers.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's approval of the following 7 Administrative Departures:

1. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment buildings – Impervious lot coverage 70% maximum - a request to accept Block F, 71% impervious coverage.
 - Building Type B, Building 19
 - Building Type C, Building 20
 - Building Type E, Building 17
 - Building Type F, Building 16
 - Building Type H, Building 21
 - Building Type J, Building 18
2. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings – Number of street façade entrances required 1 per 75 linear feet of façade.
 - Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30; 3 required, 2 provided
 - Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17; 3 required, 2 provided
3. §153.064: Open Space – 1.9 acres required, 1.84 acres provided.
4. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings – Street façade transparency - minimum 20% side elevations.
 - Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30
 - Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17 (1st story)
 - Building Type H, Buildings 12, 21 & 26 (1st story)
5. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings - Non-street façade transparency - minimum 15%, side/rear elevations.
 - Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23
 - Building Type B, Buildings 9, 11, 19, & 28 (1st story & 3rd story)
 - Building Type C, Buildings 5, 10, 20, 22, 24, 27 (1st story & 3rd story)
 - Building Type G, Buildings 8, 13, & 16 (1st story)
6. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings – Primary façade materials, 80% minimum – Front Elevation (with comp. siding).
 - Building Type A, 74.65% (with comp. siding)
 - Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30
 - Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17
7. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings – Primary façade materials, 80% minimum – side/rear elevations.
 - Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30
 - Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission of the following 12 Waivers:

1. §§153.062(O)(3) Building types, Apartment Buildings, Street Frontage: A request for a Waiver for Block G, Building 22 due to an existing utility easement along Tuller Ridge Road at this location, including a Waiver to the min. 75% Front Property Line Coverage, Occupation of Corner, and Front and Corner Side RBZ requirements.
2. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings, Street Frontage: A request for a Waiver for Block E, Building 11 due to an existing utility easement along Tuller Road at this location, including a Waiver to the min. 75% Front Property Line Coverage, Occupation of Corner, and Front and Corner Side RBZ requirements.
3. §153.062(O)(3): Building types, Apartment Buildings, Blocks B, C & F, where Watson and Deardorff Streets and McCune Avenue are designated as Principal Frontage Streets:
 - a. A request for a Waiver to the Front Property Line Coverage percentage requirement for Buildings 3, 46, 8, 16 & 21
 - b. A request for a Waiver to the required number of building entrances on the PFS, as side elevations do not have entries, for Buildings 4, 6, 8, 16 & 20
 - c. A request to allow accessory structures along a principal frontage street where the lot is required to be occupied by a principal buildings, since the clubhouse is considered to be an accessory structure
4. §153.062(O)(3): Minimum Finished Floor Elevation: A request for a Waiver to the 2.5-foot minimum elevation requirement, so that the ADA accessible units can meet ADA accessibility requirements for Buildings Type A, B, C, D, E, F, H & J.
5. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings A request for a Waiver to the number of required street façade entrances, allowing none where one is required for:
 - a. Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23
 - b. Building Type B, Buildings 9, 11, 19, & 28
 - c. Building Type C, Buildings 5, 10, 20, 22, 24 & 27
 - d. Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30
 - e. Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17
 - f. Building Type F, Buildings 2, 25, & 29
 - g. Building Type G, Buildings 8, 13, & 16
6. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings – A request for a Waiver for the corner occupancy requirement due to existing utility easements for Block G, Building 22.
7. §153.062(I)(1)(a): Building Types, Balconies, Porches, Stoops & Chimneys – A request for a Waiver to the minimum six-foot depth requirement for all buildings.
8. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings – Minimum Occupied Space – A request for a Waiver to the minimum 20-foot depth of occupied space on ground stories facing a street for Building Types A, B, C, D, F, & J where garages occupy the rear portion of the unit.
9. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings – Street Facing Transparency – A request for a Waiver to the minimum 20% transparency requirement for:
 - a. Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23; side elevation

- b. Building Type B, Buildings 9, 11, 19, & 28; side elevation
 - c. Building Type C, Buildings 5,10, 20, 22, 24, 27; side elevation (3rd story)
10. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings – Street Facing transparency – A request for a Waiver to the minimum 20% transparency requirement for:
- a. Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23; side elevation
 - b. Building Type B, Buildings 9, 11, 19, & 28; side elevation
 - c. Building Type C, Buildings 5,10, 20, 22, 24, 27; side elevation (3rd story)
11. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings – A request for a Waiver to the minimum 15% non-street facing façade transparency requirement for:
- a. Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23; rear elevation, 1st story (garage)
 - b. Building Type D, Buildings 3 & 30; rear elevation, 1st story (garage)
 - c. Building Type F, Buildings 2, 25 & 29; rear elevation (1st story) (garage)
 - d. Building Type H, Buildings 12, 21 & 26 (1st story) (garage)
 - e. Building Type J, Buildings 15 & 18; rear elevation (1st story) (garage)
12. §153.062(O)(3): Building Types, Apartment Buildings – A request for a Waiver to the minimum requirement for a vertical façade division not more than every 40 feet for the front elevation of Building Type C, Buildings 5,10, 20, 22, 24, 27.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART could not recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the alternative materials. He confirmed that the ART was at best neutral on the alternative materials, as there was not enough information provided. He stated that the applicant had not yet provided examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates for the reviewing body to consider.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the applicant will need to present additional information regarding the proposed alternative materials to Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director, prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on March 12th, 2015. He inquired of the members if they were comfortable with Mr. Tyler reviewing the material and commenting at the Commission meeting on behalf of the ART. The ART confirmed that this was appropriate. He confirmed Mr. Tyler would be in attendance at the Commission meeting and would be able to comment with respect to the materials, provided the applicant supplies sufficient information for review.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the following additional Waiver would be necessary if the Planning and Zoning Commission does not approve the alternative materials:

13. §153.062(O)(3). Building Types, Apartment buildings – Minimum primary façade material 80%
- a. Building Type A, Buildings 1, 4 & 23; front, side & rear elevations
 - b. Building Type B, Buildings 9, 11, 19, & 28; front & rear elevations
 - c. Building Type C, Buildings 5,10, 20, 22, 24, 27; rear elevation
 - d. Building Type E, Buildings 6, 14 & 17; front, side(s) & rear elevations
 - e. Building Type H, Buildings 12, 21 & 26; front, side & rear elevations

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the Development Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission, with one condition:

- 1) That the Infrastructure Agreement shall be fully executed prior to approval of building permits.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART recommended approval of the Site Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission, with nine conditions:

- 1) That the proposed retaining walls supporting the parking spaces for Buildings 2, 3, 22, 23, & 24 will need to be designed to carry the anticipated loads, engineered and detailed appropriately, including railings and be approved by the City Engineer prior to issuance of building permits;
- 2) That the 3.5 acres located within Block G be rezoned from BSC Public District to BSD Residential District;
- 3) That the façade material transitions be verified to meet Code as part of the building permitting process;
- 4) That the roof materials be submitted, verified to meet Code and approved as part of the building permitting process;
- 5) That the canopies at the building entrances, materials, mounting and illumination be submitted, verified to meet Code and approved as part of the building permitting process;
- 6) That the accessory structure details for the pool house & maintenance building shall be provided and approved as part of the building permitting process;
- 7) That the applicant submit a Master Sign Plan for approval by the required reviewing body, prior to building permitting;
- 8) That the applicant submit plans clarifying stoop dimensions in relationship to the property lines and easements, prior to approval of the building permits; and
- 9) That the applicant shall provide lighting cut sheets, which demonstrate the proposed building entry, step, and wall mounted lights meet the stated requirements and limits, prior to building permitting.

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 5:05 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on March 12, 2015.