



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 10, 2016

ART Members and Designees: Jenny Rauch, Planning Manager; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Donna Goss, Development Director; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; and Mike Altomare, Deputy Fire Marshall.

Other Staff: Marie Downie, Planner I; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: None were present.

Jenny Rauch called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. She asked if there were any amendments to the February 25, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTION

**1. BSD SCN - Charles Penzone Salons
16-015BPR**

**6671 Village Parkway
Basic Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for the construction of a 12,000-square-foot building and associated site improvements for a salon on the west side of Village Parkway at the roundabout with Shamrock Crossing. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site. She explained the site is part of the Village Center Corridor and gateway at the roundabout. She said there are two Waivers that have been identified:

1. Additional parking exceeds the maximum per the Code
2. Frontage requirements

Ms. Burchett said the proposal includes a pocket park that would run along Village Parkway and include a small stone wall. She presented the east elevation that faces Village Parkway as the primary frontage but the main entrance is on the north elevation that fronts the parking lot. She explained the proposal does not appear to meet the primary materials requirement on the north side and does not appear to meet the requirement for total percentage of materials. She indicated the applicant might introduce another material to meet the requirement. She said it is a one-story building that includes a mezzanine to appear as a two-story building.

Colleen Gilger asked how much the parking exceeded requirements. Ms. Burchett replied the maximum number of spaces permitted is 45 and the applicant is requesting 93 spaces.

Jenny Rauch clarified that a Waiver would not be part of this process but rather the applicant would need to submit a Parking Plan to request the additional parking and demonstrate why they need so much parking.

Claudia Husak presented the portion of the parcel that is vacant and the existing parking. She added that the pond serves as stormwater management for Dublin Village Center.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the parking for the existing facility and the possibility of a shared agreement. Ms. Rauch indicated she thought the current parking probably exceeds the maximum permitted. She said part of it is not on site.

Ms. Husak presented the parking layout. Ms. Rauch stated parking is supposed to be positioned at the side and rear of the building in the BSD, not in front. She noted the overflow parking and indicated the applicant is considering alternatives.

Ms. Husak pointed out there is no frontage on Shamrock Boulevard. She said the graphic in the Code requires more than one story for Loft Buildings.

Matt Earman inquired about how the stories were measured per Code as it appears the applicant is trying to meet the height of a two-story building without actually having a two-story building.

Ms. Husak added the height proposed is an issue because very few building types have a one-story allowance and a Commercial Center building is not permitted on this site. She said the applicant selected a Loft building but the minimum height is two stories. She indicated that Code stipulates it must contain a habitable level and a mezzanine would not count. She questioned why one-story buildings like Piada are permitted on Sawmill Road and not Village Parkway. Ms. Rauch added there is residential to the west of this site and a substation to the south so the two-story seem out of place here.

Ms. Rauch suggested getting more information on what the reasoning was for the height limitation.

Mr. Tyler indicated he struggles with that location and the architectural proportions.

Ms. Burchett questioned whether the appearance meets the intent of the BSD and if the applicant considered the longevity of the building. Mr. Tyler indicated the applicant is limiting themselves and they could get a much better building. Ms. Rauch said this is a missed opportunity by constructing such a small building.

Ms. Burchett presented the exterior renderings and noted the primary materials are stone, brick, and glass with wood as a secondary material. She said the large blank wall on the west elevation was a concern but the façade does not front a street. She also questioned the variety of roof types/lines proposed.

Ms. Rauch said the renderings have evolved as the first versions appeared very suburban and now the elevations are more contemporary. Donna Goss said she understands that the applicant has been working on this design for a while but it still has a long way to go.

Mr. Tyler said he thought the proportions were not desirable. Ms. Goss said she does not like the proposed appearance very much. Mr. Earman indicated it looked too much like a school. Ms. Burchett agreed the proportions of the design need to be discussed further with the applicant.

Mr. Tyler suggested if the applicant pursued a building design on the merit of providing the 'best architecture possible', then maybe it would be easier to obtain the Waiver regarding frontage and the additional parking.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant's plan for open space is a pocket plaza with a connection to the asphalt parking but needs additional calculations to ensure they meet the minimum requirements along with suitability and usability.

Ms. Goss inquired about the pond and stormwater management. Aaron Stanford pointed out the proposed pervious pavers and the pond behind the site. He said the applicant would connect to the southern sanitary and storm sewers.

Mr. Earman asked if there were a lot of trees on-site. Ms. Burchett illustrated the grove of trees along Shamrock Boulevard and the pond to the west.

Mr. Stanford asked if there is a requirement for a certain amount of the building had to be on street frontage. Ms. Rauch answered 75% is the requirement for street frontages, therefore in this case the applicant may need a Waiver. She added they are supposed to have 25% fronting Shamrock Boulevard for corner occupancy.

Ms. Gilger said if a bridge over I-270 were to be built, Village Parkway will become a major road.

Ms. Gilger indicated the current spa layout is not working for the applicant. She questions whether the cost of elevator maintenance to have a true second story is an issue. Ms. Husak commented that if they cannot meet regulations then this might not be the site to have this use to which Ms. Goss agreed.

Ms. Gilger indicated that when the new spa is built, the current spa will become Penzone's corporate headquarters, which will bring 30 extra jobs to Dublin.

Alan Perkins said the existing drive aisle to the building is a 24-foot drive aisle but he saw issues with the geometry. He said the fire hydrant is on the opposite side of the street. He said they may have a sprinkler system but the FDC will need to be close to the building. He said the pocket plaza proposed is nice but it pushes the building back. Ms. Rauch suggested obtaining more specific information from the applicant.

Ms. Burchett questions the usability of their pocket plaza, if they need to make changes to meet the fire code. She said with so much of the site taken up with parking there is not much room left for public green space.

Mr. Earman asked for the justification for so much additional parking. Ms. Husak noted it is retail and the interior space includes a lot of chairs to accommodate multiple clients at once.

Ms. Burchett presented the applicant's parking summary:

A. Dublin Grand Salon (existing location):

Non Peak = 93 spaces	} <i>The average number of cars parked between 8/21/15 – 12/17/15</i>
Peak = 143 spaces	

- o Peak days consist of Thursday, Friday, and Saturday
- o Non-peak days consist of Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday

B. New Salon/Existing Building

Employees	75 (professionals plus 4 associates)
Guests	84 (64 guests plus 20 double booking/overlapping appointments)
Home Office	30

Total: 189 (visitors/employees per day)

Ms. Rauch suggested encouraging the applicant to find parking options that could possibly include shared parking with adjacent lots. She also suggested using the maximum required spaces permitted now and adding more parking later if the need arise. Ms. Burchett indicated it might be more difficult for the applicant to request more parking later rather than all at once, now.

Ms. Rauch said the proposal would be sent to the City's consultant, Dan Phillabaum to review the architecture and provide feedback.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] She stated this case would be reviewed on March 24th and a recommendation of approval is scheduled for March 31st to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

Ms. Rauch adjourned the meeting at 2:38 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on March 17, 2016.
As amended by the Administrative Review Team on March 24, 2016.