



## MEETING MINUTES

# Administrative Review Team

Thursday, November 17, 2016 | 2:00 pm

**ART Members and Designees:** Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Michael Hendershot, Civil Engineer II; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshall; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

**Other Staff:** Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Nichole Martin, Planner I; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

**Applicants:** Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; David Keyser, DKB Architects; and James Peltier, EMH&T (Case 4).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the meeting minutes from November 10, 2016. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

### DETERMINATIONS

**1. R-1 – T-Mobile Co-Location – Avery Water Tower** **7697 Avery Road**  
**16-096ARTW** **Administrative Review - Wireless**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for the replacement of three antennas on an existing City of Dublin water tower at Avery Park. She said the site is on the west side of Avery Road, approximately 550 feet south of the intersection with Brand Road. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Wireless Communication Facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances.

Ms. Burchett said the proposal is for the replacement of 3 existing panel antennas and 12 di-plexers with 3 proposed panel antennas and 3 proposed TMAs on an existing wireless telecommunications facility. She added the replacement antennas and TMAs will utilize the Avery Park water tower for mounting.

Ms. Burchett stated the proposal meets all regulations and requirements outlined in Chapter 99 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances; therefore, approval is recommended for the Wireless Communication Facility with the following condition:

- 1) That any associated cables are trimmed to fit closely to the panels.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the Wireless Communication Facility.

**2. Earlington-Brandon PUD, T-Mobile Co-Location – Dublin Baptist Church** **7195 Coffman Road**  
**16-099ARTW** **Administrative Review - Wireless**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for the installation of T-Mobile antennas on existing mounts at a 45-foot elevation concealed within an existing steeple. She said the site is located on the west side of Coffman Road, approximately 400 feet southwest of the intersection with Brand Road. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Wireless Communication Facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances.



Ms. Burchett said the proposal is for the replacement of 3 existing panel antennas, 6 TMA's, and 6 Di-plexers for 3 new panel antennas, 3 new TMA's, and 3 new Di-plexers for a Wireless Communication Facility located in the steeple of the Dublin Baptist Church. She said the towers, antennas, other wireless communications facility support structures, and supporting electrical and mechanical equipment shall be sited, designed, and/or painted to minimize visual impact and be screened so the equipment is not visible from ground level.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for the Wireless Communication Facility with no conditions as the proposal meets all regulations and requirements outlined in Chapter 99 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the Wireless Communication Facility.

**3. BSD SRN – Enchanted Care Learning Center - Sign  
16-091MPR**

**4370 Dale Drive  
Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for the installation of two new signs at the existing Enchanted Care Learning Center on the east side of Dale Drive, north of the intersection with East Bridge Street. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.065(H), §153.065(I), and §153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed 33-square-foot wall sign that will be integrated into the west elevation/front façade, above the main entrance on the fascia of the building. She said the wall sign meets all Zoning Code requirements with the exception of height not being identified.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed 20-square-foot ground sign to be mounted on the existing brick sign base that is consistent with the Zoning Code requirements with regard to size, height, and design. She added the ground sign is appropriately located for the site and matches the character of the main building.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures the 15-foot maximum height for wall signs will be met and revised sign drawing is submitted with the proposed installation height with the sign permit.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the Minor Project Review.

**4. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block H  
16-097SPR**

**PID: 273-012703  
Site Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for the construction of a residential condominium development consisting of 73 townhome units. She said the site is located on the west side of Dale Drive, south of the intersection with John Shields Parkway. 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 said that once the recommendation is received from the ART, the proposal will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their review on December 1, 2016. She presented the Bridge Park development blocks as they relate to each other and noted (future) Larimer Street located within H-Block.

Ms. Burchett explained she is requesting one motion and two recommendations today: 6 Administrative Departures, 17 Waivers, and 3 conditions for approval of the Site Plan Review. She said none of the Waivers are unusual and explained each one:

1. Incompatible building types
2. Parapet height
3. Parapet continuous
4. Tower quantity
5. Projecting sills
6. Balcony size
7. Maximum impervious lot coverage
8. Permitted primary material types
9. Front property line coverage
10. Occupation of corner
11. Street façade transparency
12. Non-street façade transparency
13. Blank wall limitation
14. Parking lot façade; entrances
15. Permitted primary materials
16. Vertical increments
17. Minimum finished floor elevation

Ms. Burchett presented the overall Site Plan noting the layout of buildings 3 pairs of buildings - 6 buildings total. She provided an example architectural elevation to convey the general concept. She indicated the architecture is varied and interesting using a mix of materials, varying heights of the parapets, proportioning, recesses and projections, varying entrance and window locations, and varying building height. She said the materials will include two colors of brick veneer used thoughtfully to break down the massing of the facades into a pedestrian scale. She recalled at the Commission's last review, they liked the open railings. She said two Basic Plan Waivers were approved previously by Council. She explained the 3 conditions proposed:

- 1) That the applicant define a portion of the courtyard as Public Open Space in order to comply with the Open Space Node shown on Figure 153.063—Neighborhood Standards (6)(d)(2)—Open Space Network;
- 2) That the applicant submit construction details for the surface parking lot to the satisfaction of staff, prior to building permit approval; and
- 3) That the applicant remove the off-street parking spaces from the parking count on the site plan.

Ms. Burchett noted the 6 Administrative Departures:

1. Street Façade Transparency
2. Non-Street Façade Transparency
3. Vertical Increments
4. Minimum Primary Façade Materials
5. Street Façade Transparency
6. Off-street parking space and aisle dimensions

David Keyser, DBK Architects, recalled that comments were made at the ART's meeting on November 10<sup>th</sup> about the pool building. He said they have since added a middle awning element that is similarly used on other buildings, increased the height of the parapet, added detail that is being used on the tower, and

brought the design to pedestrian scale. He explained that the seemingly blank wall on the back of the building faces the motor court side and will be landscaped with trees to soften the motor court.

Mr. Keyser said the level of sophistication for individualizing units was also discussed last week at ART. He said the applicant is now proposing a color scheme for the front doors of three colors. He described Townhouse 2 as mostly buff brick and will have an ebony door frame. Another color to be used he said is an anodized silver, or natural lighter wood look (pressed aluminum) and they will switch some railings from black to some silver in strategic locations to provide additional visual interest.

Ms. Burchett inquired about mechanical screening. Mr. Keyser answered the condensed units are mostly hidden behind the towers and set back a significant distance from the railings. He explained that from the street level the mechanicals will not be visible but they will be visible from the taller building across the street. Ms. Burchett suggested a Waiver be added to approve the request citing the ART's support given the unique architectural elements.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for 6 Administrative Departures:

1. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Street Façade Transparency. Minimum 20% transparency required; proposed: 19% on first floor at Tuller Ridge South (Building H1 East).
2. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Non-Street Façade Transparency. Minimum 15% transparency required; proposed: 14% on first floor at 2nd floor motor court, west (Building H1 East); and Minimum 15% transparency required; proposed: 2nd floor motor court east: 14.0% (Building H2 West)
3. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Vertical Increments Required (location on principal structure); Required every two units or no greater than every 40-feet; proposed: maximum vertical increment 42.71 ft. at west elevation of motor court (Building H1 East); Maximum vertical increment 42.71 ft. at east elevation of motor court (Building H1 West); maximum vertical increment 42.7 ft. at east elevation of motor court (Building H2 East); maximum vertical increment 42.7 ft. at east elevation of motor court (Building H2 West).
4. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building— Minimum Primary Façade Materials. Minimum 80% of primary façade materials required; proposed: South Tuller Ridge elevation: 76%; and north courtyard elevation: 79% (Building H1 East); West Mooney elevation: 76% (Building H2 West); and East Dale elevation—76%; and North John Shields elevation—78% (Building H3 East).
5. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Street Façade Transparency—Minimum 20% transparency required; proposed: 1st floor Mooney West: 19% (Building H1 West); proposed: 19% on first floor at Tuller Ridge South (Building H1 East). 3rd floor Larimer North: 19% (Building H2 East).
6. §153.065(4)—Site Development Standards—Off-street parking space and aisle dimensions. Required off-street parking drive aisles for two-way circulation with 90 degree spaces must be 22 feet wide. Provided:
  - H1 motor court: Entrance aisle width from Tuller Ridge  $\pm$ 20.50 ft.
  - H2 motor court: Entrance aisle width from Larimer Street  $\pm$ 20.50 ft.
  - H3 motor court: Entrance aisle width from Larimer Street  $\pm$ 20.50 ft.
  - Drive aisle width between pool building and central island  $\pm$ 20.30 ft.
  - Drive aisle width between the central island and all islands between unit garages  $\pm$ 20 ft.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 18 Waivers as part of the Site Plan Review:

1. §153.062(C)(1)—Building Types—Incompatible Building Types: Incompatible building types are not permitted directly across the street from one another or on the same block face. **Allow incompatible building type.**
2. §153.062 D(1)—Roof Type Requirements—Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet in height. **Allow parapet heights to be between 0-feet and less than 6-feet at elevations shown in submitted materials.**
3. §153062(D)(1)(b)—Roof Type Requirements—Parapets continuous: Parapets shall wrap around all sides of the building. **Allow parapets to not be contiguous as shown on the elevations.**
4. §153.062(D)(4)(a)—Quantity—Only one tower is allowed per building. **Allow multiple towers at elevations referenced in the Planning Report.**
5. §153.062(H)(1)(a)—Projecting sills— Projecting sills are required within siding clad walls. **Allow no projecting sills or trim on Fiber Cement Panel clad elevations.**
6. §153.062(I)(1)(a)—Balcony Size—Balconies shall be a minimum open area of six feet deep and five feet wide. **Allow balconies to be no less than five-feet deep.**
7. §153.062 (O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Maximum impervious lot coverage. Maximum 70% is required. **Allow no more than 80% impervious lot coverage for entire project.**
8. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Permitted Primary Material types. Permitted types include stone, brick. **Allow for the use of thin brick as a primary material.**
9. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Front Property Line Coverage. Minimum front property line coverage to be at least 75%. **Allow front property line coverage to be no less than 55% along Dale Drive on Building H3.**
10. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Occupation of Corner Required—Occupation is required. **No occupation at elevations referenced in the Planning Report.**
11. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Street Façade Transparency. Minimum 20% transparency required. **Not less than 15% transparency on elevations referenced in the Planning Report.**
12. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Non-Street Façade Transparency. Minimum 15% transparency required. **Between 0-15% on elevations referenced in the Planning Report.**
13. §153.062 (O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Blank Wall Limitations: No blank walls on elevations. **Allow blank walls on elevations referenced in the Planning Report.**
14. §153.062 (O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Parking Lot Façade, Number of entrances required. For parking lot or detached garage, 1 per unit. **Allow no entrances on elevations referenced in the Planning Report.**
15. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Permitted Primary Materials. Minimum primary materials must be at least 80%. **No less than 70% on elevations referenced in the Planning Report.**

16. §153.062(O)(2)—Single Family Attached Building—Vertical Increments Required (location on principal structure). Required every two units or no greater than every 40-feet. **No more than 65-feet on elevations referenced in the Planning Report.**
17. §153.062(O)(2) —Single Family Attached Building— Minimum Finished Floor Elevation required 2.5 ft. above the adjacent sidewalk elevation. **Less than 2.5-feet at elevations referenced in the Planning Report.**
18. §153.065(E)(2)—Site Development Standards—Roof Mounted Mechanical Equipment Screening is required; proposed: some areas of the rooftop mechanicals will be partially screened.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Site Plan Review with 3 conditions.

- 1) That the applicant define a portion of the courtyard as Public Open Space in order to comply with the Open Space Node shown on Figure 153.063—Neighborhood Standards (6)(d)(2)—Open Space Network;
- 2) That the applicant submit construction details for the surface parking lot to the satisfaction of staff, prior to building permit approval; and
- 3) That the applicant remove the off-street parking spaces from the parking count on the site plan.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the 6 Administrative Departures, the ART's recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 18 Site Plan Waivers and a Site Plan with 3 conditions.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 2:30 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on Wednesday, November 23, 2016.