



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 24, 2016

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

Other Staff: Jenny Rauch, Planning Manager; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Marie Downie, Planner I; Logan Stang, Planner I; Rachel Ray, Economic Development Administrator; Michael Hendershot, Civil Engineer II; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Greg Briya, Moody Nolan (Case 1); Chris Meyers, Meyers + Associates Architecture; and Bonnie Kyle, Chute Gerdeman (Case 2).

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

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the March 17, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTION

1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, B Block, Building B4/5 16-019MPR

6500 Longshore Street Minor Project Review

Lori Burchett said this is a request for modification to the previously approved Site Plan to allow for first floor commercial/retail use instead of the approved residential units adjacent to Longshore Street in the parking garage of building B 4/5. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented the approved parking garage with residential on the ground floor. She explained commercial/retail is a permitted use for the ground level and there will be minimal changes other than use. In addition, she said the Master Sign Plan will need to be amended to illustrate retail signs for ground floor tenants.

Claudia Husak said architectural modifications to the garage will be requested through a different application.

Donna Goss inquired as to whether there was a development agreement in place and if so, if the agreement would need to be amended to reflect the new commercial/retail use of the space. Ms. Burchett said Staff would do some research and report back to the ART.

Vince Papsidero asked if there would be any parking restrictions. Ms. Burchett indicated she would ensure the application meets the Code for parking.

Colleen Gilger stated the retail component would be more desirable on the ground floor than residential and would create more jobs.

Ms. Burchett presented the previously approved west elevation as residential. She indicated she would present each elevation with the proposed changes, prior to the next meeting.

Aaron Stanford asked if the footprint of the structure would change with the proposed commercial/retail use. Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, said just the lobby at the corner would be reduced. Jeff Tyler indicated a permit had been obtained for the foundation.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He stated this case would be determined on March 31st.

CASE REVIEW

2. 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 highlighted Staff's comments from the initial review: type of building, the requirement for a loft building to contain two stories, building materials, roof types, and parking. Options for shared parking to reduce the number of spaces to be requested she said was also included in the discussion.

Ms. Burchett presented the site and noted that Village Parkway is the principle frontage street. She pointed out the existing building on the parcel and the proposed building, including different views from the street.

Ms. Burchett said the lots and blocks in this proposal do not meet the Code requirements. She said a neighborhood street had been identified on the street network plan and if right-of-way was dedicated, the applicant would meet the block-width requirement. She presented the block width with the proposed right-of-way of 350 feet and 400 feet is the maximum requirement. She presented the elevations facing southwest and northwest.

Ms. Burchett asked the ART if it is better to request a Waiver for a loft building with the additional Waiver for the lack of a second story or to request a Waiver for a commercial building, which is not a permitted building type in this zone. She reiterated Staff's and the ART's previous concern with the issues of height, materials, roof design, and parking. She reported the preliminary review revealed 10 Waivers would be needed for a commercial building and 11 Waivers would be needed for the loft building; 5 additional Waivers would also apply.

Ms. Burchett presented renderings of the east and west exteriors. She explained Waivers would need to be requested addressing the blank wall limitation and materials.

Ms. Burchett presented the interior design layout to help demonstrate why the applicant is requesting 93 spaces for parking when only a maximum of 45 spaces are permitted. She added a loft building would require parking in the rear, which this proposal does not comply with but with a commercial building, parking is permitted on the side. She indicated the applicant would discuss any history of shared parking.

Ms. Burchett said Staff had also identified the following concerns:

- All parking lot islands must be at least 10-feet in width
- Tree survey and replacement schedule is required

- Large gaps in the screening wall along Village Parkway, only 6-feet is needed for passage
- Coordinate tree selection with AEP within the 50-foot electric easement along Village Parkway
- Concerns for fire access with the existing drive width and turn radius at the proposed entrance
- Ensure that the project meets all fire access requirements
- Require a right-of-way agreement for the proposed neighborhood street

Vince Papsidero inquired about the magnitude of the Waivers for a loft building versus a commercial building.

Ms. Burchett said the commercial building type was not permitted in the neighborhood standards. She explained that large scale buildings are excluded from this neighborhood except for the area designated as the shopping corridor and that is limited to businesses on Dublin Center Drive. She said the reason only single-story buildings are permitted in this neighborhood is for the development to fit within and support residential and office uses while providing a pedestrian-friendly area. She added the roundabout at Village Parkway and Shamrock Boulevard serves as the gateway to the neighborhood and development would be highly visible on that corner.

Claudia Husak stated she was concerned about the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) granting a Waiver for a different building type.

Jeff Tyler asked the applicant how they arrived at this design concept and how this design is to fit within this location.

Chris Meyers, Meyers + Associates Architecture, said the applicant originally had a different design but through early conversations with Staff, they were guided to a loft style building. He said the elevations meet the Code requirement for height and façade composition, in his opinion. He explained the nature of the interior design is to accommodate a high volume area at the façade and the perimeter is double the height but not useable for guests/customers. He indicated he was surprised that this proposal would require 11 Waivers as he thought they were meeting the requirements.

Ms. Burchett said a lot of issues can be fixed fairly easily.

Mr. Meyers said the applicant studied a commercial center as an option, but were told to stick to a loft. He indicated he thought they were aligning the proposal with the terms of the Code and that the design lent itself nicely to the use. He reiterated that the appearance of the building is of two stories as the perimeter is 20 feet but inside there is a mezzanine space for salon staff and not a full second story, which is an interesting component.

Mr. Tyler emphasized a good design needs to be proposed as well as one that would meet the requirements of the site.

Bonnie Kyle, Chute Gerdeman, indicated the initial design was very different and contemporary but did not meet the requirements of the Code. She noted there is a vaulted ceiling and three main salon rooms. She said the applicant is happy with the current design.

Mr. Tyler said he struggles with the various roof lines as they do not make sense. He asked if they were trying to achieve a design that was appropriate for the building and their use or if they were just trying to meet the Code. He indicated he viewed the initial concept and thought that was nice. However, he said the initial design fit more of a suburban model. With this proposal, he said he is concerned because there appears to be so much going on. He restated that they are not meeting the objective of the Code. He indicated that as one comes around the corner, there will just be a sea of parking visible but from the gateway, the site would appear acceptable. He stated the huge parking lot distracts from the building.

Mr. Meyers said he struggled with the frontage as this is a unique property dimension. He said the overhead power easement pushes the building to the right. Creating an extension of frontage without more building was his question. He said they provided public access via a pocket park that connects to the pedestrian walkway/bike path. He suggested they draw out the character of the building by providing ample screening to the parking areas, saturating the landscape with plant materials. He indicated they tried false-façade walls but realized it was not the right approach. He stated the quantity of parking was heavily analyzed. He said this data was based on their Grand Salon next door, expecting those same customers to come to the new salon. He said around 90 spaces are required daily. By being permitted only 45 spaces on this site, he said it would hinder the applicant's business. He requested suggestions from the ART to fix this parking issue/layout. He asked if a different material was used instead of all asphalt, if it would make a difference to minimize the appearance of a large parking lot. The ART explained varying materials would not make a difference, the use is still a parking lot.

Mr. Papsidero inquired about the parking.

Mr. Meyers said the current Penzone Salon site is under what they need for parking. He said the Stavroff property has been used for overflow parking. He reported that Penzones asked for the properties (existing and new) to be considered independently to allow for flexibility in the future. He said they could turn the existing salon into the corporate headquarters or sell it to another development and if the parking was shared, their hands would be tied to an agreement. He reported they considered a shuttle service to nearby lots but found it was not a viable option for their type of business. He emphasized that the proposed building would be considered a "Signature Grand Salon" and would bring economic development to the area.

Mr. Papsidero asked if phasing the parking over time could be explored.

Mr. Meyers said the Penzones have great staff and associate events. He said the alternative parking area aesthetic is hardscape public event space. He asked if event space could be defined instead of all parking but they operate it now by parking on it daily. He reiterated that parking has already been heavily analyzed. He said all associates can park on the current lot leaving this for guests only but they need 90 spaces. He said in the short term, the current site parking could be utilized but the future will depend on what happens on that property.

Aaron Stanford pointed out this area is on a grid street pattern in the street network plan and a smaller neighborhood street will connect to Greystone Mews on the west. He asked them to consider where the potential road will be, which could be an amenity to the site by providing on-street parking.

Mr. Meyers agreed that preparing for a potential road makes sense and they will consider it. He said there are a lot of ideas being considered for the existing building. He said the proposed salon is a big stylistic change while the company transforms for a new brand and identity.

Ms. Burchett asked if sub dividing the parcel could be considered. Mr. Meyers said that is an option and asked how it would impact the parking issue.

Jenny Rauch said the applicant will need to submit a Parking Plan, regardless.

Ms. Husak said providing right-of-way for the neighborhood street would require platting.

Mr. Tyler asked if the salon had a written agreement with the Stavroffs for parking to which Mr. Meyers said it was only a verbal agreement.

Dan Phillabaum, Landplan Studios, LLC, indicated he was surprised to hear the applicant say today he did not think the application needed a number of Waivers since it was his understanding the applicant had completed an analysis of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Meyers pointed out where he thought they were meeting the Code on pages 44 & 45. He said they studied both the Zoning Code and the requirements for the Bridge Street District to be overly thorough.

Ms. Rauch recalled earlier discussions with the applicant weighing the options of a loft type building versus a commercial building. She said Staff considered a loft building would be better as this application would be setting a precedent for all future development in this area.

Mr. Meyers said after analysis, the Penzones would rather have a taller two-story building than a one-story commercial type building. He said the cost would be greater but it presents a better statement of the new brand. He said they did not just check the boxes to meet the Code but designed cohesive architecture. He said their intent is for the appearance of a two-story building without an actual second floor inside (a mezzanine alternative).

Ms. Rauch inquired about the mezzanine.

Mr. Meyers presented the interior layout and pointed out the reception/hospitality area located in the center used as an interior courtyard as a waiting space for guests. He clarified this is a clear story. He pointed out the service in the back and the entry to the stair that leads to the second floor platform. He explained the mechanicals are housed internally within the mezzanine because the roof will permit distant visibility. He said part of the mezzanine will provide function for staff and storage. He emphasized this is not a second level that: would be permitted for customers; could include a different use; or allow for another tenant and it covers just over 10% of the footprint.

Ms. Husak said the PZC has never approved a parking plan that doubles the amount of parking permitted. She said extra parking has been granted but for high visibility areas that could also share parking through future developments. She indicated that requesting so much parking is going to be a tough conversation given the vision for the district.

Mr. Papsidero suggested that the applicant request an Informal Review with the PZC to gain feedback about the parking, the height, and the two-story function issue.

Ms. Husak reported internal staff has struggled with these issues and were concerned about the potential for moving this application forward to the PZC meeting on April 7th. She agrees the informal is a good suggestion for that first meeting with the PZC.

Mr. Meyers said he would need to consult with his client but knows they are very anxious to get this project going. He explained this is a seasonal business and the intent is to hit the peak season with the new brand. He indicated the Penzones have been surprised by the process thus far and how it has taken longer than they had hoped. He said we need to find the best path to move this quickly and requested a strong recommendation to achieve that.

Mr. Tyler said he is hearing strong concern about parking and not seeing any relief to that issue is a big concern. He said the building type and perceived two-story nature affects the architecture. He indicated the site issues are not major but with all the issues combined, 11 Waivers are being sought. He recommended obtaining direction from the body that in the end will decide if this application should be approved, concluding that would be the fastest route. Otherwise, he said if there is not room for approval, the applicant would need to start all over. Mr. Papsidero added that if the application would be approved, it would be precedent setting.

Mr. Meyers clarified that if the applicant bypasses the formal ART, obtains a preliminary read from the PZC, they would come back to the ART giving comfort to the process so going through the PZC in the end will be easier and smoother.

Mr. Meyers noted there are three areas proposed for alternative surfaces; he clarified this helps the design layout but does not minimize the Waiver for parking. He asked that if the parking on the existing site were used to minimize parking on this site, if the current building would also have to be redesigned. The ART replied the current building would not have to be redesigned to meet current standards to provide shared parking.

Mr. Papsidero clarified the use of the existing building does not impact shared parking agreements.

Mr. Meyers stated the applicant would review the architecture. However, he said the big question is if they should go in the direction of a loft building or commercial and why aligning with the loft type is appropriate. Mr. Papsidero said the consensus of Staff and the ART is for a loft type building. Ms. Burchett reiterated that the commercial type is prohibited in this area.

Mr. Meyers indicated the applicant will go through the Waivers and seek alignment with the Code, continuing with the loft building type.

Mr. Papsidero instructed the applicant to let Staff know what the client decides.

Donna Goss asked if the applicant plans to reach out to the Greystone Mews neighbors. She said if the applicant can get a strong positive response about their proposal from the neighbors it would go a long way to gaining support of the PZC.

Mr. Meyers indicated the Penzones intend on connectivity to the neighbors to the west. He said they plan to host an event to invite the neighborhood to present what is planned but not until they have a clear direction; they do not want to be premature.

Ms. Rauch suggested at least reaching out to the HOA president at this point. Ms. Goss agreed that getting out in front of that, indicating what they are considering, would be a benefit.

Ms. Husak requested that the applicant let Staff know tomorrow morning about the client's decision as an agenda and notices for the April 7th meeting need to be distributed Friday, March 25, 2016.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. Colleen Gilger asked that the following statement be corrected in the Approved Minutes dated March 10, 2016:

"Ms. Gilger indicated that when the new spa is built, the current spa will become Penzone's corporate headquarters, which will bring 60 extra jobs to Dublin."

The ART agreed that changing the "60 extra jobs" to "30" as Ms. Gilger requested was acceptable.

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on March 31, 2016.