



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 6, 2016

ART Members and Designees: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Mike Altomare, Fire Marshall.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Chris Meyers and Tony Coalt, Meyers + Associates Architecture; Matt Dunlap, Charles Penzone; (Case 1); Randy Roberty, Design Collective, LLC and Steve Weis, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants (Case 2); Kipp Edgington, Mesh Fitness (Case 3); and Ann McGee, Gresham Smith, and Partners and Hans Schultz, VADData (Case 4).

Jennifer Rauch called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. She asked if there were any amendments to the September 29, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

Ms. Rauch reported a Minor Modification was made to Columbus Fencing & Fitness as required by outside agencies.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. BSD SCN – Charles Penzone Salon
16-071SPR**

**6671 Village Parkway
Site Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for the construction of a 12,600-square-foot building and associated site improvements on a ±3.54-acre site on the west side of Village Parkway at the roundabout with Shamrock Crossing. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted the existing Grand Salon is on part of the site and that there is no division of the site proposed. She said the applicant is proposing 85 parking spaces whereas Code permits a minimum of 25 spaces and a maximum of 31 spaces. She explained that the applicant provided information based on the existing salon for the Basic Site Plan Review by the ART and the PZC and demonstrated a need. She presented proposed elevations and noted the east façade is considered the front of the building and faces Village Parkway and the north façade faces toward the parking lot where guests will enter the salon; this entry feature is highly visible from Village Parkway as well.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for an Administrative Departure:

1. §153.062 (O)(4) - Loft Building Type - Vertical increment - No greater than every 40 feet (required); west elevation at ±41 feet (requested). *{vertical increments for other facades included in Waivers below}*

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Parking Plan:

The parking plan for 85 spaces (54 over the required maximum of 31 spaces). The applicant has provided information on projected parking demands based on counts at their current location and has demonstrated a need for additional parking for their proposed facility.

Ms. Burchett explained the need for each of the following 8 Site Plan Waivers and said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission:

1. §153.060(C)(2)(a) - Lots and Blocks - Maximum Block Length - 500-feet (required); ±1,020-feet (requested).
2. §153.060(C)(2)(a) - Lots and Blocks - Maximum Block Perimeter - 1,750 feet (required); ±2,750 feet (requested).
3. §153.062(D)(1) - Roof Type - Parapet Height - shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet in height (required); parapet height varies from less than 2-feet to ±17.67 feet in height (requested).
4. §153.062(E)(2)(a) - Façade Material Transitions – Vertical transition shall occur at inside corners (required); east elevations on the same plane (requested).
5. §153.062(J) – Treatments at Terminal Vistas – Treatments shall be incorporated to terminate the view: a tower, a bay window, courtyard with sculpture, pronounced increase in building height, or other similar treatment incorporating a distinct vertical element (required); sculptural entry (requested).
6. §153.062(O)(4) - Loft Building Type - Blank Wall limitations - No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless (required); blank walls on elevations (requested).
7. §153.062(O)(4) - Loft Building Type - Vertical Increments - No greater than every 40 feet (required); south elevation at 65 feet and east elevation at 78 feet (requested).
8. §153.062(O)(4) – Loft Building Type - Primary Materials minimum of 80% (required); west elevation: 52%; north elevation: 70%; east elevation: 57%; and south elevation: 61% (requested).

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Site Plan Review with 6 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide construction details of the surface parking lot and loading area;
- 2) That the applicant provide retaining wall details or spot elevations of the retaining wall proposed for the parking area along the western property line to ensure compliance with the provisions of 153.065(E)(1)(b)1-2: Fence and Wall Height and Opacity;
- 3) That the applicant work with staff to ensure compliance with exterior lighting requirements of 153.065-Site Development Standards- (F)(1)-(12) Exterior Lighting;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure safe pedestrian circulation;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to determine location of neighborhood street right-of-way; and
- 6) That the applicant continue to work with staff to satisfy landscaping requirements.

Jeff Tyler inquired about condition #5 as the street will not be completed prior to building permitting. He also stated that all conditions need to be tied to the issuance of the building permit. Ms. Burchett said she would edit the condition.

Jennifer Rauch inquired about the location of material transitions and Ms. Burchett highlighted the location on the east elevation.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the location of the terminal vistas. Ms. Burchett responded at the roundabout.

Ms. Rauch asked about the percentages of primary materials. Chris Meyers, Meyers + Associates Architecture, said he could clarify the calculations for Waiver #8.

Mr. Meyers asked about accurately calculating transparency. Ms. Burchett clarified the fascia and window casing are not included, just the open window areas.

Mr. Meyers presented a sample to show the stone and how the wood terminates. He noted the stone panel is important to Mr. Penzone to serve as a backdrop to a sign.

Aaron Stanford inquired about condition #5. He wanted to know if this was the same as the Basic Site Plan. He suggested the following text be added to the condition - "the right-of-way dedication is of no cost to the City".

Matt Dunlap, Charles Penzone, said he cannot support the right-of-way or they will not be able to do business. He added they cannot risk development. He explained a right-of-way would remove too many parking spaces. He indicated he would prefer a bike path or walkway for connection.

Mr. Meyers asked if there is a resolution to the right-of-way. Mr. Stanford said he does not know of a solution at this point. Until City Council gives the direction needed, he said the plan is to leave it as it is in the street network plan. Mr. Meyer said he would agree to the fifth condition.

Mike Altomare inquired about access for emergency vehicles to the back side. Mr. Meyers said they plan to meet the intent for vehicle access on adjacent streets, etc. He cautioned there is a power line on the east side.

Mr. Tyler commended the applicant for working with staff and making all the changes they have. He said he was comfortable with the design.

Colleen Gilger said it is a beautiful building.

Ms. Burchett said the amended seventh and eighth Waivers are as follows:

7. §153.062 (O)(4) — Loft Building Type – Vertical Increments: No greater than every 40 feet (required); south elevation (± 65 feet), west elevation (± 50 -feet), and east elevation (± 80 feet) (requested).
8. §153.062(O)(4) – Loft Building Type - Primary Materials. The materials to be a minimum of 80% (required). West Elevation: $\pm 50\%$; North Elevation: $\pm 70\%$; East Elevation: $\pm 55\%$; and South Elevation: $\pm 60\%$ (requested).

Ms. Burchett said the amended conditions for the Site Plan Review are as follows:

- 1) That the applicant provide construction details of the surface parking lot and loading area prior to building permit issuance;

- 2) That the applicant provide retaining wall details or spot elevations of the retaining wall proposed for the parking area along the western property line to ensure compliance with the provisions of §153.065(E)(1)(b)1-2: Fence and Wall Height and Opacity prior to building permit issuance;
- 3) That the applicant work with staff to ensure compliance with exterior lighting requirements of §153.065(F)(1)-(12) - Site Development Standards - Exterior Lighting prior to building permit issuance;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure safe pedestrian circulation prior to building permit issuance;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to determine the location of the neighborhood street right-of-way dedication, at no cost to the City; and
- 6) That the applicant continue to work with staff to satisfy landscaping requirements prior to building permit issuance.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's approval of the Administrative Departure and the ART's recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Parking Plan, 8 Site Plan Waivers as amended, and a Site Plan Review with 6 conditions as amended.

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building C2, Cap City Diner
16-080WR**

**6640 Riverside Drive
Waiver Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for the installation of operable weather screens at a new restaurant on the first floor of building C2 of Bridge Park on the east side of Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented elevations of the proposed patio area. She reported the original request for a tenant fitting was approved by the ART but the applicant has returned requesting screening for the patio space. She said the vinyl material proposed as screening is not permitted since it would be considered a primary or secondary material; therefore, a Waiver had been requested. She said Staff reviewed the proposal against Code and found the request did not meet the five criteria; therefore Staff disapproves of this request for a Waiver. She explained the reasoning for each criteria, which is also noted in the Planning Report.

Randy Roberty, Design Collective, LLC, said he had discussed in previous meetings how canvas material is found throughout Dublin in the way of awnings. He said this screening would perform along the lines of umbrellas; it is an element provided after the building has been constructed and is not built in. He indicated that since this patio is located on the west side of the building and there are no other buildings further west, the patio would get direct exposure from the sun in the evenings and that is the diner's primary times of operation. He said they would like to shield the sun from guests and driving rain could also be an issue. He explained that if they are set up to full capacity and a storm blows in, it is not their practice to evacuate that area. By having this area available and more appealing year round it would help the activity and energy on the street when it would not otherwise be set to promote walkable urbanism.

Jeff Tyler asked how many months the patio would be in use throughout the year. Steve Weis, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants, said there is potential for 8 – 9 months out of the year. He said not all panels would have to be used at one time; there may be instances where just one panel needs to be lowered to protect guests. He indicated umbrellas do not provide a great dining experience. The patio area he said activates that side of the property.

Mr. Roberty said they have taken care in selecting the fabric that will work well with the finished panels selected. He indicated this would add to the space rather than detract and it would also define the space.

Jennifer Rauch said Staff has a sense of permanence with this proposal that includes small heaters for cold weather and fans for warm weather, which would extend the use of the patio beyond a normal patio season. She said the screening should be more of a permanent material to match its use. She suggested sliding glass doors as an option. She said since this is across from the plaza, Staff would like to see higher quality alternatives.

Mr. Roberty indicated any other solution would be more permanent and would make this space more of an exterior addition rather than a patio. He said by enclosing the space they no longer have an umbrella-like fixture and no longer exude the outdoor feel.

Mr. Tyler said he disagreed.

Mr. Tyler inquired about the warranty of the screening. Mr. Roberty answered the warranty is for five years. Mr. Tyler said he has concerns if the product is only good for five years.

Mr. Roberty asked if this is like awnings. Ms. Burchett said the BSD Code addresses awnings and canopies but nothing like this.

Shawn Krawetzki stated he has seen this product used and the clearness goes away over time and becomes an eyesore.

Mr. Roberty asked if a re-approval process was possible; perhaps their application could be reviewed annually. Ms. Rauch said if the PZC is willing to approve this material, they could agree to a re-approval process but they will not receive a recommendation of approval from the ART. She said the PZC will review this on October 13, 2016.

Mr. Tyler cautioned that if the PZC were to approve an annual renewal, the applicant is at risk a year from now that the PZC will no longer support the vinyl screening and want a permanent solution, which would be major construction. Ms. Rauch said it is possible the applicant would be required to replace the material outright every few years.

Ms. Burchett concluded the proposed Waiver is inconsistent with the applicable review criteria; therefore, disapproval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Waiver Review request.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's recommendation of disapproval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Waiver Review based on the Code.

**3. BSD HC – Mesh Fitness
16-081ARB-MPR**

**12 E. Bridge Street
Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for the installation of a new wall sign for an existing tenant space on the north side of E. Bridge Street at the northeast corner of the intersection with N. High St. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066(G) and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and the proposed sign as it faces E. Bridge St. She described the proposed wall sign as 8 square feet in size at 24 inches high and 48 inches wide made out of a high density urethane panel with a baby blue background and routed letters painted white. She stated

the proposal meets all Code requirements except for height, which is a condition of approval that the applicant not exceed a height of 15 feet.

Jennifer Rauch asked the applicant how long they intend on occupying this space. Kipp Edgington, Mesh Fitness, answered January or February of 2017 at the latest.

Donna Goss thanked the applicant for taking up space in this building as a new roof was added.

Ms. Burchett concluded with a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review with the following condition recommended:

- 1) That the applicant provide revised drawings indicating the exact height of the sign not to exceed 15 feet, subject to staff approval.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for the Minor Project Review.

CASE REVIEW

4. ID-3 - Vadata, Building 2 16-087WID-DP

Crosby Court Development Plan Review

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for the construction of a data center building within the West Innovation Center for phase two, including associated site improvements on a 68-acre site on the east side of Houchard Road, north of Darree Fields, and south of SR 161 and Crosby Court. She said this is a request for a review and approval for a Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.042(D).

Ms. Rauch presented the site location and noted the access off Crosby Court. She reported that in February 2015, the ART approved the initial Development Plan that included parking and extensive landscaping for the entire perimeter of the site. Phase 2 she said includes the construction of the second building.

After an initial review of the proposal, Ms. Rauch said additional information and details are needed on the plans. She stated this should include property lines, setbacks, landscape material, internal drive dimensions, lot coverage, a photometric plan, and primary/secondary material calculations. She encouraged the applicant to refer to the Code and the plans approved for Phase 1, which demonstrates the correct level of detail. She said this second proposed building appears to mirror the building from Phase 1 with a similar layout. She indicated concerns with the previously approved Phase 1 plan where either all concrete or all gravel was to be in between generators. She said the previously approved plan differs from this proposal. She inquired about parking as the correct number of spaces has not been provided. She asked if the number would include sharing spaces with the future office building. She explained that if the proposal does not meet Code, the applicant would need to go before the PZC. She asked the applicant to verify any information about the pond.

Aaron Stanford asked what would be built with this phase as a grading plan was included. Ann McGee, Gresham Smith Partners, said this is not their final design and stormwater management would still need to be worked out.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the applicant's intentions for additional building pads and how the site would be graded. Ms. McGee said she was not the civil engineer but they were trying to prepare for the next building.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the temporary access as all the plans do not currently match. Ms. McGee answered the construction entrance would remain with the construction of the second building and the construction drive on the site would be rerouted. Ms. Rauch emphasized the need for this information to be shown and noted on the plans.

Colleen Gilger requested additional and more detailed perspectives of the elevations. She said the windows approved on the first building need to be provided on the subsequent buildings.

Ms. McGee explained the prototype has evolved; they now have a cannon design to help airflow. She explained they are converting to a more efficient flat roof and screen walls. She said they are sensitive to the form of the original building but building two will not be the same building. She indicated the first building was all white and longer. She said the buildings are in alignment along Houchard Road.

Ms. Gilger called out the differences in the two buildings and screen walls. Ms. McGee said they will make an attempt to blend the screening walls on the roof. She explained the parapet is 10 feet in height to screen the mechanicals.

Ms. McGee noted the addition of two overhead doors. Ms. Rauch said Houchard Road is the front setback and Code does not permit overhead doors along this elevation.

Jeff Tyler requested different perspectives of the Sketch-up models in order to make a determination. He indicated he wanted to compare the proposed building to the existing building.

Ms. Rauch added the elevations need to be more detailed.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the landscaping. Ms. McGee indicated she was new to the project and had planned to follow the master landscaping plan.

Donna Goss inquired about the terms of the Economic Development Agreement. Ms. Gilger said the fence was corrected. She said with building 2 being proposed smaller, she was concerned that all subsequent buildings would also be smaller and that was not what they agreed to. She indicated that as long as the applicant provided five buildings with 750,000 total data space the applicant would be in compliance. Ms. McGee assured her it would not be an issue; she said she has rendered out the other buildings and the current plan will work in the future.

Ms. Gilger indicated that each building can have a bit of uniqueness but she did not want the first building to stand out from all the other buildings.

Ms. Rauch concluded a more thorough review would be conducted internally and detailed comments would be provided to the applicant.

ADJOURNMENT

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 3:22 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on October 13, 2016.