



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 11, 2016

ART Members and Designees: Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Matt Earman, Parks and Recreational Department Director; Jeremiah Gracia, Economic Development Administrator; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal.

Other Staff: Marie Downie, Planner I; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Jim Dooley, Morrison Sign Company (Case 1); Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Case 3); and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Miguel Gonzalez and Greg Briya, Moody Nolan; and Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T (Case 4).

Others Present: Dan Phillabaum, Landplan Studios, LLC, consultant to the ART.

Jeff Tyler called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the February 4, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTION

**1. BSD HC – Nationwide – Sign
16-021ARB-MSP**

**114 South High Street
Master Sign Plan**

Nicki Martin said this is a request for the installation of a new ground sign for an existing building on the east side of South High Street approximately 90 feet south of the intersection with Pinney Hill Lane. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin said the applicant is proposing to update their existing sign to include Nationwide's new logo. She presented the existing sign that is mounted on a wooden post and has the Nationwide information on the top portion of the sign with a second sign for the spa tenant hanging below by chain links. She explained that the Nationwide Agent and Akossage Healing Spa share the same building.

Ms. Martin said the proposal include two options. Option A is shown with 4 colors, which exceeds the number permitted by Code. This option has a gray background, blue and white logo, black text "Nationwide", and the secondary image including the black tag line "is on your side", a black half-moon shape around the address numbers, and the Agents name in white in front of a band of blue. She said Option B is similar but by having a white background, the sign would meet the color requirements.

Ms. Martin noted that dimensions for secondary images are needed to complete the review and requested feedback for color options from the ART. She said Staff suggests coordinating the upper and lower signs with the softer tan background since the white background would not coordinate with the lower spa sign.

Jim Dooley, Morrison Sign Company said the Nationwide agent owns the spa sign as well. He said the current softer tan color fits better into the context of the neighborhood whereas a white background would stand out too much. He stated Nationwide's brand colors are black, white, and blue and the additional background color is used to blend within neighborhood.

Ms. Martin questioned the color proposed as it appears light gray in the image. Mr. Dooley said the applicant wants the softer tan color to be consistent with the spa's sign panel and that the rendered image did not appear as intended.

The ART discussed various options, including making the logo larger than 20% to qualify for up to five colors.

Claudia Husak asked if the half-moon secondary image around the address numerals could be removed to simplify the appearance of the sign and provide a cleaner look.

Ms. Martin clarified that address numerals are not considered secondary images, but that the half-moon, the tag line "is on your side" and the Agent's name "Alan D Staub, CLU, ChFC" were considered secondary images.

Jeff Tyler said he supported the allowance of four colors as a recommendation of approval to the ARB since the ARB would be the final authority on the decision. He requested the applicant provide a picture of the spa sign to ensure that the Nationwide sign would match.

Mr. Dooley agreed to provide better images to reflect the accurate color of the softer tan and specific dimensions for the next review of the ART. He restated that he did not want to have white as the background as it would appear too stark in this environment. He said while the capital N behind the eagle were the brand's logo, they also consider the tag line "is on your side" as part of their brand.

Mr. Tyler said he is okay with the softer tan as the background color. He said if there were no further questions or concerns regarding this case [There were none], the ART would make their recommendation to the Architectural Review Board next week for a Master Sign Plan for the ARB meeting on February 24, 2016.

DETERMINATIONS

2. BSD SRN – Capitol Cadillac – Sign 15-096MSP

4300 W. Dublin-Granville Road Master Sign Plan

Claudia Husak said this is a request for an installation of a new wall sign for a car dealership at the northeast corner of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066.

Ms. Husak said the proposed wall sign would be installed above the main entrance, which is a glass storefront on the west elevation. She explained the proposed sign meets Code for size, color, number, and location but exceeds the permitted height of 15 feet. She said the proposed plans indicate a maximum sign height of 17.5 feet as measured from the established grade, which is appropriate above the main entrance as the design of the building entrance does not provide an alternative location.

Ms. Husak said a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval is recommended with no conditions based on the criteria identified for one wall sign that exceeds the permitted height due to the conditions on the site.

Jeff Tyler asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Master Sign Plan for their meeting on February 18, 2016.

**3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B&C
15-099MSP**

**Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Master Sign Plan**

Nicki Martin said this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for a new 8.2-acre mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south 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 a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin presented the aerial view of the site and explained each of the updates that the applicant has made to the MSP:

- Added conceptual rendered elevations and replaced some illustrative images
- Added New Leasing Window Cover to permitted sign types
- Eliminated 'Anchor Tenant' provision, umbrella signs/graphics, and Building Directory signs
- Finalized sign details for Address Numerals and Parking Marquee signs
- Clarified Canopy Edge sign and Placemaking Art sign locations
- Addressed Wall sign size with context sensitive approach by Level
 - Level 1 – 50 square feet maximum
 - Level 2 – 60 square feet maximum
 - Level 3 – 80 square feet maximum (new addition to this application/only permitted on building C2)

Ms. Martin reviewed the proposed number of signs per tenant. She said the proposed sign size, height, and location were regulated by: Use – Retail versus Office; Level; and Graphics.

Ms. Martin noted lighting for signs:

- External, internal, and indirect illumination permitted
- Illumination should be architecturally appropriate
- Awnings, umbrellas, and sandwich board signs are not permitted to be illuminated

Ms. Martin noted the additional details:

- Review Process
- Size Computation
- Prohibited Sign Designs

Ms. Martin presented examples for tenant signs: rendering of the West Elevation (Riverside Drive) of building C2; parking garage exterior signs – marquee; and address numerals.

Ms. Martin asked the applicant to address the issue of the letter height constraint. Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the three-foot letters can be changed to meet appropriateness of architecture. He presented the IGS sign that has four-foot letters, and the Ernst & Young sign that is just under four feet in height at Grandview Yard where it is much lower than in Bridge Park which will be closer in height to 80 square feet. He presented examples of signs from Easton to show the small signs are illegible (Dental Center) and how the letters in a small area do not read well to give context. He emphasized these were not the best signs, he was presenting them to show scale.

Ms. Martin indicated that there needs to be further clarification in the MSP and Mr. Starr said he could complete the revisions by the end of the day, most notably the clarification for Leasing Window Covers used during vacancies. He explained the covers will be opaque from the outside but transparent from the inside and the logo and text will only cover 30% of the entire window.

Ms. Martin said a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval is recommended for the Master Sign Plan to permit for a consistent sign package of an appropriate design and scale of the Bridge Park development, and the approved shopping corridor along Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive, with two conditions:

- 1) That the MSP be updated to reflect that a Leasing Window Covering is a sign type not requiring a permit; and
- 2) That the applicant corrects all page references and provide the revised approved MSP to Planning, prior to sign permitting.

Jeff Tyler asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Master Sign Plan for their meeting on February 18, 2016.

**4. BSD SCN – Bridge Park, Block A Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road
16-001DP-SP Development Plan/Site Plan**

Marie Downie said this is a request for the third phase of development within Block A of the Bridge Park development, including a 107,043-square-foot hotel, 19,104-square-foot event center, a 468-space parking garage, privately owned/maintained reserves for private drives, and 2,570 square feet of open space. She said the site is located at the northeast corner of the Riverside Drive and Dublin-Granville Road intersection. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for Development Plan, Site Plan, and Waiver Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Downie discussed the Development Plan request with three conditions:

- 1) That a mid-block pedestrianway between the event center and office be provided with the development of Lot 7;
- 2) That signs be posted indicating Mooney Way as a fire lane meeting the requirements of Dublin Fire Code Section D103.3; and
- 3) That any inconsistencies on the plans be revised and a final version be submitted for final Staff review and approval.

Jeff Tyler asked if there were any questions or concerns of the Development Plan conditions. [There were none.] Ms. Downie said a recommendation of approval of the Development Plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the three conditions above is recommended.

Ms. Downie discussed the 18 conditions for the Site Plan Review:

- 1) That any inconsistencies on the plans be revised and a final version be submitted for final Staff review and approval;
- 2) That Conditional Use applications be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the proposed parking structure and event center;
- 3) That patio and outdoor dining details be reviewed and approved by Staff. Any modifications to the site or building will require Minor Project Review prior to installation;

- 4) That a Master Sign Plan be submitted for separate review and approval;
- 5) That additional details be reviewed and approved as part of the building permit and Master Sign Plan regarding the building entrances on building A4 including but not limited to illumination and mounting details of the canopy;
- 6) That any additional required open space be provided with the development of Lot 7;
- 7) That a comprehensive Parking Plan be submitted indicating opportunities for shared parking;
- 8) That details of the proposed bicycle racks be provided for Staff review and approval;
- 9) That a detailed outline of delivery times and passenger pick-up/drop-off be submitted for Staff review and approval;
- 10) That the retaining walls along Riverside Drive/SR 161 be softened with plant materials as outlined in this report;
- 11) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to improve the percentage of pervious hardscape in the open spaces;
- 12) That a revised Photometric Plan should be resubmitted with Building Permits;
- 13) That the applicant verify whether cameras will monitor pedestrian activity from a remote location, or if other security measures will be take, at building permitting;
- 14) That the applicant provide a more detailed description of the exterior cladding materials in the areas identified as exceeding the blank wall limitations to verify that these materials provide adequate visual interest and are architecturally appropriate to the proposed building design;
- 15) That the applicant provide additional information regarding the use of irrigation systems for Staff approval;
- 16) That a final landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Forester and the Director of Parks and Open Space prior to permit approval;
- 17) That the FDC/hydrant locations be approved by the Fire Marshall prior to permitting; and
- 18) That the applicant work with Staff to provide increased access to the open space along Banker Drive.

Ms. Downie asked if there were any questions on the conditions listed above.

Matt Earman inquired about condition #11. He asked if there was a target percentage for pervious hardscape. Ms. Downie replied that Engineering has approved the stormwater management plan, but asked that we ensure the maximum percentage possible is achieved.

Mr. Tyler asked if some of the conditions should be more specific, specifically condition #10 and the deadline for completion. Ms. Downie indicated the issues can be completed prior to building permitting. Mr. Tyler confirmed this list is really for the benefit of Staff review to which Ms. Downie affirmed.

Mr. Tyler asked if there were any further questions or concerns of the Site Plan conditions. [There were none.] Ms. Downie said a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Site Plan with the 18 conditions is recommended.

Ms. Downie discussed the Parking Plan with four conditions:

- 1) That the required number of ADA spaces be provided (1 per every 25 parking spaces must be ADA accessible);
- 2) That incorrect square footage is shown for the accessory bar use. Plans and parking calculations should be updated to include the correct square footage;
- 3) That a detailed outline of delivery times shall be submitted for Staff review to confirm that no deliveries will be made during peak pick-up/drop-off areas; and
- 4) That the locations of the proposed loading spaces will require further review and approval by Staff.

Ms. Downie indicated that the proposal is over parked as the Office Building is not included in this proposal but the excess parking will be able to be used to meet parking requirements of Lot 7 when it is developed.

Mr. Tyler requested that the number of required ADA spaces in condition #1 be revised to refer to Chapter 11 of the Ohio Building Code. Condition 1 was revised to state:

- 1) The required number of ADA spaces be provided (As per Chapter 11 of the Ohio Building Code, current edition).

Mr. Tyler asked if there were any questions or concerns of the Parking Plan conditions. [There were none.] Ms. Downie said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Parking Plan with four conditions that allows for deviations from the Code requirements. These deviations include an excess of 128 parking spaces, and a total of 7 loading spaces located on a service street.

Ms. Downie discussed the Administrative Departures requested. She said the report indicates six administrative departures, but has removed the first as it is covered within a proposed waiver:

1. §153.062(O)(5)(d)1 Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency, Transparency - A minimum of 30% transparency is required on upper stories along street façades; A request to permit 28% transparency on the 7th story along the north elevation (Banker Drive), 29% transparency on the 2nd and 7th stories along the east elevation on building A3.
2. §153.062(O)(5)(d)2 Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Non-Street Façade Transparency, Transparency - A minimum of 15% transparency is required on non-street facades; A request to permit 14% transparency on the 2nd story along the south elevation of building A3.
3. §153.062(E)(1)(a) Building Types, Materials, Façade Materials - A minimum of 80% of each building façade must be constructed of permitted primary materials; A request to permit 79% primary materials on the north elevation of building A4. These calculations are based on the approval of thin brick and metal panels as primary materials.
4. §153.062(E)(1)(a) Building Types, Material, Façade Materials - A minimum of 80% of facades shall be primary materials; A request to permit the south elevation on building A2 to be 74% primary material.

5. §153.062(E)(1)(a) Building Types, Material, Façade Materials - A maximum of 20% of facades may be secondary materials; A request for the north elevation of building A4 to consist of 21% secondary materials.

Mr. Tyler asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding the five Administrative Departures. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the five Administrative Departures.

Ms. Downie explained each of the 34 Site Plan Waivers whereas Staff is recommending approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 32 of the 34 Site Plan Waivers and 2 were recommended for disapproval (#25 and #26).

1. §153.062(B)(3)(e) – Accessory Structures – 5-foot setback required; 0-foot setback with encroachment onto Lot 5 requested.
2. §153.062(D)(1)(a)2 – Parapet Roof Height – Parapet roofs with a height between 2 ft. and 6 ft. required; 10-inch parapet over the pre-function area/restroom on building A2, 7.45 ft. – 8.75 ft. parapet over the rooftop mechanical equipment on building A2, and a 9 ft. parapet on building A3 requested.
3. §153.062(E)(1) – Façade Materials – stone, brick and glass permitted primary materials and glass fiber reinforced gypsum, wood siding, fiber cement siding metal and exterior architectural metal panels and cladding permitted secondary materials; aluminum composite metal panels proposed as a primary material for the block, thin brick and ultra-high performance concrete proposed as secondary materials for the block, and concrete panels proposed as secondary material for building A4.
4. §153.062(O)(5)(a)1 – Front Property Line Coverage – minimum of 75% front property line coverage; front property line coverage for one story for building A2 proposed, 51.62% front property line coverage for building A3 along Banker Drive proposed.
5. §153.062(O)(5)(a)1 – Building Types, Corridor Buildings, Building Siting, Street Frontage, Occupation of Corner - Occupation of corner is required; a private patio to meet the corner occupation requirement at the corner of Riverside Drive and Banker Drive for building A3 requested.
6. §153.062(O)(5)(a)2 – Building Types, Corridor Buildings, Buildable Area, Rear Yard Setback – Rear Yard Setback, 5 ft.; A request to allow building A2 and A3 to have the following rear yard setbacks:
 - Building A2: 0 ft. rear yard setback
 - Building A3: 2.89 ft. building rear yard setback and encroachment of vehicular canopy.
7. §153.062(O)(5)(a)2 – Building Types, Corridor Buildings, Building Siting, Buildable Area, Semi-Pervious Lot Coverage – Lots are permitted 80% Impervious Coverage. Once the 80% is reached, an additional 10% of Semi-Pervious Lot Coverage is permitted; request to allow building A2 to have an additional 27% of Semi-Pervious lot coverage.
8. §153.062(O)(5)(b) – Building Types, Corridor Buildings, Height, Minimum Building Height Minimum of 3 stories;
 - Building A2: A request to permit one story.
 - Building A3: A request to permit one story along Longshore Loop.

9. §153.062(O)(5)(d)1 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency, Ground Story Street Facing Transparency – A minimum of 60% transparency is required on ground story street facing façades;
 - Building A2: A request to permit 15% transparency along the west elevation (Riverside Drive), and 26% transparency along the east elevation (Longshore Loop).
 - Building A3: A request to permit 52% transparency along the west elevation (Riverside Drive), 48% transparency along the north elevation (Banker Drive) and 31% transparency along the east elevation (Longshore Loop).

10. §153.062(O)(5)(d)1 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency, Transparency – A minimum of 30% transparency is required on upper stories along street façades; A request to permit 13% transparency on the 8th story along the east elevation (Longshore Loop) on building A3.

11. §153.062(O)(5)(d)2 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Non-Street Façade Transparency, Transparency – A minimum of 15% transparency required on non-street facades;
 - Building A2: A request to permit 11% transparency along the south elevation.
 - Building A3: A request to permit 4% transparency on the 8th story along the south elevation.

12. §153.062(O)(5)(d)1-2 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations – Blank walls are prohibited on both street facing and non-street facing facades;
 - Building A2: A request to permit a blank wall on the southern portion of the west elevation and the middle portion of the south elevation.
 - Building A3: A request to permit blank walls on the west elevation of the 8th story, north elevation of the 2nd – 7th stories, south elevation on the 1st – 8th stories and the east elevation on the 3rd – 8th stories.

13. §153.062(O)(5)(d)3 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Building Entrance, Principal Entrance Location –The Principal Entrance is required along a Primary Street Façade;
 - Building A2: A request to permit the principal entrance to be located along Longshore Loop.
 - Building A3: A request to permit the principal entrance to be located along Longshore Loop.

14. §153.062(O)(5)(d)3 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Building Entrance, Street Facades: Number of Entrances – Street Façade Entrances are required once every 75 feet;
 - Building A2: A request to permit one entrance located along Longshore Loop while three are required.
 - Building A3: A request to permit 1 entrance along the west elevation while 3 are required, 1 entrance along the north elevation while 2 are required, and 2 entrances along the east elevation while 3 are required.

15. §153.062(O)(5)(d)4 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Façade Divisions, Vertical Increments – Vertical Increments are required every 45 feet;
 - Building A2: A request to allow the following vertical increments:
 - South Elevation: ±73 ft., ±90 ft.
 - East Elevation: ±55 ft., ±78 ft.
 - North Elevation: ±98 ft., ±113 ft.
 - Building A3: A request to allow no vertical increments.

16. §153.062(O)(5)(d)4 – Building Types, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Façade Divisions, Horizontal Façade Divisions – Horizontal Façade Divisions are required on buildings 3 stories and taller, within 3 ft. of the top of the ground story & required at any building step-back; A request to permit Building A3 a partial (non-continuous) horizontal façade division along the north, south and west elevations and no divisions at the step-back along the east elevation.

17. §153.062(E)(1)(a) – Building Types, Material, Façade Materials – A minimum of 80% of facades shall be primary materials;
 - Building A2: A request to allow the following percentages of primary materials:
 - West Elevation: 59%/*96%
 - North Elevation: 66%/*93%
 - East Elevation: 54%/*96%
 - South Elevation: 74%/*97%
 - Building A3: A request to allow the following percentages of primary materials:
 - West Elevation: 64%/*88%
 - North Elevation: 41%/*80%
 - East Elevation: 31%/*86%
 - South Elevation: 22%/*46%

**Including ACM as Primary Material*

18. §153.062(E)(1)(a) – Building Types, Material, Façade Materials – A maximum of 20% of facades may be secondary materials; A request for the south elevation of building A3 to consist of 54% secondary materials.

19. §153.062(O)(5)(d)6 – Building Type, Corridor Building, Façade Requirements, Roof Types, Permitted Types – Permitted roof types include parapet, pitched and flat; A request to permit a shed roof on building A2.

20. §153.062(O)(12)(a)1 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Building Siting, Street Frontage, ROW Encroachment – ROW encroachments are not permitted; A request to allow the canopy along the retail portion of building A4 to encroach over the Banker Drive ROW.

21. §153.062(O)(12)(a)2 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Building Siting, Buildable Area, Rear Yard Setback–Rear yard setback, 5ft; A request to allow the rear yard setback for building A4 to vary from 0-4.33 ft. along Longshore Loop.

22. §153.062(O)(12)(a)2 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Building Siting, Buildable Area, Impervious Coverage – Lots are permitted 80% Impervious Coverage; A request to allow building A4 to have 95% impervious coverage.

23. §153.062(O)(12)(d)3 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Façade Requirements, Building Entrance, Street Facades: Number of Entrances – Street Façade Entrances are required once every 75 feet; A request to permit building A4 1 entrance along the north elevation while 4 are required, 1 entrance along the east elevation while 3 are required, 0 entrances along the south elevation while 3 are required and 2 along the west elevation while 3 are required.
24. §153.062(O)(12)(d)4 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Façade Requirements, Façade Divisions, Vertical Increments – Vertical Increments are required every 30ft.; A request to allow vertical increments at 35.39ft apart along the east elevation and 39.27ft apart along the west elevation of building A4.
25. §153.062(O)(12)(d)5 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Façade Requirements, Façade Materials, Permitted Primary Materials – Permitted primary materials include brick, stone and glass; A request to permit thin brick and metal panels as primary materials for building A4.
26. §153.062(E)(1)(a) – Building Types, Materials, Façade Materials Minimum of 80% primary façade materials; – A request to allow the following percentages of primary materials on building A4:
 - North Elevation: 24%/*79%
 - South Elevation: 13%/*71%
 - West Elevation: 21%/*97%
 - East Elevation: 16%/*92%

**Including Thin Brick and ACM as Primary Materials*
27. §153.062(E)(1)(a) – Building Types, Material, Façade Materials – A maximum of 20% of facades may be secondary materials; A request for following percentage of secondary materials on building A4:
 - North Elevation: 76%/*21%
 - South Elevation: 87%/*29%
 - West Elevation: 79%/*3%
 - East Elevation: 84%/*8%

**Including Thin Brick and ACM as Primary Materials*
28. §153.062(O)(12)(b)6 – Building Type, Parking Structure, Façade Requirements, Roof Type, Tower – Towers are permitted on facades only at terminal vistas, corners at two PFS, and/or adjacent to an open space type; A request to permit towers on building A4 at the SE corner of Longshore Loop and Mooney Way and at Longshore Loop at the terminal vista across from the proposed private open space for.
29. §153.062(D)(4) – Building Type, Roof Type Requirements, Towers – One tower is permitted per building. A request to permit two towers on building A4. – Maximum height of towers may not exceed the height of one additional upper story and the width should not exceed the height. A request to permit the following tower dimensions on building A4:
 - SE tower: 15.75ft high, 27.57ft wide
 - West tower: ±17.70ft high and 39.27ft wide
30. §153.064(F)(2) – Open Space Types, Refer to Table 153.064-A. – Pocket Parks are required to be between .10- and .50-acre; A request to permit the proposed pocket park located at the SW corner of Banker Drive and Longshore Loop to be .06-acre.

31. §153.065(B)(5)(a)1 – Site Development Standards, Parking and Loading, Parking Structure Design, Entrance/Exit Lanes. – Parking structures are required an exit lane for every 200 parking spaces; A request to permit 2 exit lanes, while 3 are required.
32. §153.065(B)(5)(c)3 – Site Development Standards, Parking and Loading, Parking Structure Design, Interior Circulation. –A minimum ceiling clearance height of 12ft is required where parking structures have frontage; A request to permit a ceiling clearance of 9ft along Banker Drive.
33. §153.065(E)(1)(b) – 4 Site Development Standards, Fencing, Walls and Screening, Fence and Wall Height and Opacity. – Retaining walls extending above grade are limited in height to 4ft or be more than 50% opaque; A request to permit retaining walls along Riverside Drive/SR 161 varying in height up to 7ft with one.
34. §153.065(E)(3)(b)2 – Site Development Standards, Fencing, Walls and Screening, Rooftop Mounted Mechanical Equipment. – All roof mounted mechanical units are required to be screened to the full height of the proposed unit; A request to permit the parapet height on Building A3 (36 inches) to be less than the height of the proposed Utility and Exhaust Fans (46 inches and ±63 inches).

The ART discussed the disapproval recommendation for Waivers 25 & 26. Mr. Tyler inquired about rulings for previous cases involving primary material requests for thin brick and metal panels. Ms. Downie stated it was appropriate for the Home2 Hotel case where the issue was the weight of cantilevered elements and the corresponding structural impacts.

Ms. Downie asked the applicant for their reason for using thin brick, beyond the financial aspects. Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said thin brick is easier to install and in the end will likely be more expensive than traditional masonry, but results in a better looking product. Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, emphasized that the thin brick is cut from the same full size brick so the color, texture, and material will be identical.

Dan Phillabaum, Landplan Studios, LLC, said the installation method is key for thin brick. He said for Block C, it was used for a variety of depth across the façade. He indicated thin brick has been approved for very specific circumstances such as structural elements and aesthetics. He said past concerns have been for the use of thin brick around windows and doors for bricks that do not turn the corners.

Mr. Hunter explained that if full brick was used, steel would be required to maintain the load and would be visible in the garage openings. He said there is a parking garage in Worthington that is made of all thin brick, and when installed correctly the finished product can look great. He stated he would take pictures for reference prior to the PZC meeting.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said they can show examples of quality structures and the differences between finished products.

Mr. Tyler suggested the ART recommend approval rather than disapproval as long as the applicant can provide more detail and pictures for the PZC since they have the final authority. Mr. Earman said he agreed with that logic.

Ms. Downie said Waiver 26 is for primary façade materials and not meeting the Code on the south elevation. She indicated that this is recommended for disapproval for the same situation as discussed with Waiver 25.

Mr. Tyler suggested the ART recommend approval for Waivers 25 & 26 with the expectation that pictures of successful installment will be provided.

Mr. Tyler inquired about Waiver 34. Mr. Phillabaum explained Code requires a parapet not to exceed six feet, but should be as tall as the mechanical unit. He explained the mechanicals on the roof will only have a 3-foot parapet, which is less than Code requires since the mechanical units are 46 and 63 inches respectively. However, he said the placement of these units and the overall height of the building prevent these units from being visible from adjacent properties. He stated the sight lines from the top floor of adjacent buildings will preclude anyone from seeing the units since no adjacent buildings reach a height of eight stories. He indicated the Waiver is appropriate since the architecture adds to the screening of the rooftop units.

Ms. Husak said this may seem like a lot of Waivers but they are needed for architectural reasons. Mr. Tyler said he encouraged Waivers when requested for architectural appropriateness and character.

Mr. Tyler asked if there were further questions or concerns regarding the Site Plan Waivers. [There were none.] He concluded all the 34 Waivers should be recommended for approval. He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Development Plan, Site Plan, Waivers, and a Parking Plan.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

Mr. Tyler adjourned the meeting at 3:13 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on February 18, 2016.