



## ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

### MEETING MINUTES

**JUNE 16, 2016**

**ART Members and Designees:** Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshall; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

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

**Applicants:** Kevin McCauley and Matt Stavroff, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc., Greg Chillog, EDGE Group, and Adam Welker, Ford & Associates (Cases 1 & 2); Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Miguel Gonzalez and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan; John Woods, MKSK; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; and David Keyser, DKB Architects (Cases 3 & 4).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the June 9, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

#### DETERMINATION

**1. BSD SCN – Goodwill  
16-041MSP-MPR**

**6525 Sawmill Road  
Master Sign Plan/Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this is a request for the installation of a comprehensive sign package, modifications to an existing building, and associated site improvements for an existing tenant space located within a retail center at the intersection of Banker Drive and Dublin Center Drive. She said today's request is for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §154.066 and June 23, 2016, is the target date for the Administrative Review Team review and recommendation of approval for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Martin explained this has become a request for exterior modifications including the addition of a vehicular canopy and awnings as well as site improvements including repaving and landscaping for the (future) Goodwill site located at 6525 Sawmill Road. Additionally, she said this is a request for new landscaping for 6547 and 6569 Sawmill Road to coordinate with the adjacent parcel. She explained the existing one-story, multi-tenant building is located on three separate parcels: 6525, 6547 and 6569 Sawmill Road.

Ms. Martin said there are two distinct components of the applicant's request: the exterior and site modification for the (future) Goodwill site located at 6525 Sawmill Road; and the landscape modifications for the entire shopping center that includes 6525, 6547, and 6559 Sawmill Road. She reported the property owners have a private cross-access and shared-parking agreement, which allow the separate parcels to function as a single shopping center.

Ms. Martin described the proposed canopy as subordinate to the principle structure at 17 feet, 10 inches tall in a champagne color metal canopy affixed to metal pilasters, which adjoin the masonry columns. She said this contains two, 12-foot drive aisles accessible from the Banker Drive and Dublin Center Drive entrances. She reported Staff recommends the applicant further visually integrate the columns with the canopy so the column design should be amended to extend the brick pillar veneer from grade to the canopy that matches the existing building. With the addition of the vehicular canopy, she said 24 existing parking

spaces will be removed and 9 parking spaces will be replaced - 3 of which will be handicap spaces adjacent to the main entrance.

Ms. Martin said the applicant has indicated that there will be directional signs to ease the circulation of the parking lot and these will be reviewed as part of the Master Sign Plan. She said Staff has requested directional pavement striping be included and finalized prior to Building Permitting.

Ms. Martin said the proposal includes the addition of 5 new standing-seem metal awnings. She said the proposed awnings are Award Blue to coordinate with the tenant's corporate branding. Four of the awnings proposed she said are to be located above the primary entrance and are not consistent with adjacent tenant spaces, which have no awnings in the colonnade. She explained it is a requirement that the awnings be consistent with the architecture of the building and other existing awnings and canopies. As such, she said the four awnings above the primary entrance should be eliminated from the proposal. She said the awning proposed along the Banker Drive façade is designed to provide employee's protection from the elements as the entrance provides access to the employee break room and is appropriate to the design of the structure.

Ms. Martin said the site contains 121 parking spaces and with the addition of the vehicular canopy the site will retain 97 parking spaces. She reported that striping details have been received from the applicant. She explained the parking lot will be milled and repaved with an asphalt overlay at 6525 Sawmill Road. She said at 6547 Sawmill Road, south of the façade, the applicant plans an asphalt overlay and additional striping. She said they will stripe the remainder of Toys R Us but no improvements are planned for the site at Big Lots.

Ms. Martin stated the Bridge Street District Code requires surface parking and circulation area landscaping, street trees, foundation plantings, and interior landscaping for this site. She said the applicant is requesting to add 13 street trees just along Banker Drive, which the City Forester agreed to and suggested Silver Linden Trees.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for a Minor Project Review with nine conditions:

- 1) That the applicant amend the vehicular canopy column design to extend the masonry from grade to the canopy prior to building permitting, subject to Staff approval;
- 2) That the applicant confirm that all proposed improvements are not in conflict with the existing utilities on the site at building permitting;
- 3) That the four awnings located above the primary entrance be eliminated;
- 4) That the applicant confirm the number of parking spaces and update the plans accordingly prior to issuance of a Building Permit;
- 5) That one additional interior tree be located on 6547 Sawmill Road, west of the entrance off Banker Drive in accordance with 153.065(D)(5);
- 6) That street trees be provided in accordance with 153.065(D)(7);
- 7) That the plans be updated to reflect the required 42-inch minimum depth required for foundation plantings proposed adjacent to the south elevation of 6525 Sawmill Road;
- 8) That the existing Spruce Trees located on 6547 Sawmill Road adjacent to the southeast property line be preserved and the proposed Crabapple and Pear tree species be substituted with trees from the City of Dublin preferred tree list; and
- 9) That the applicant obtain approval of a Master Sign Plan for the proposed ground signs included in the landscape plans.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc., questioned the first condition about the canopy column. His architect said they could comply with that condition and extend the brick to meet the canopy.

Mr. McCauley addressed the third condition about the awnings proposed. He said there is no variation to the building between the three separate tenants so Goodwill is trying to set themselves apart and

differentiate themselves. He said these awnings across the front façade create a 'store front' for Goodwill and this is important to them. He asked if the ART would reconsider the elimination of the four awnings in the colonnade.

Mr. McCauley said he did not agree with the 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> conditions all regarding the landscape plan. He indicated that street trees were not required at previous meetings with staff. He said not only are they now required but the applicant is being asked to plant a dense Linden Tree when they are trying to accomplish the opposite by opening up the view for better visibility. He said it is not the number of trees that he has a problem with it is visibility. He explained that 119 trees are required by the Code and they go well above and beyond those numbers. He indicated they plan to meet the other five conditions.

Ms. Martin restated that street trees are required by Code but this was identified late in the game as circulation landscaping was the emphasis early on. She indicated the intent of redevelopment in the BSD is for street trees to be required.

Donna Goss inquired about the Spruce Trees in question. Mr. McCauley said he wants to remove them to provide visibility. He said the Honey Locust trees can remain because those are not large and can be pruned so the site would be visible underneath them. Adversely, he said the evergreens block the view.

Mr. McCauley inquired about the landscaping on Banker Drive. He said they already have 34 trees above what is required by the Code. He said if they are required to add street trees, he wanted to know if other trees could be removed to improve visibility.

Vince Papsidero said the City Forester makes the decisions about the street trees.

Claudia Husak indicated that the City Forester makes the decisions about the location and spacing of the street trees. A discussion ensued about who has the decision making ability about trees and if the applicant would need to make an appeal to the City Forester.

Matt Stavroff, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc., said he did not envision any city forester willing to permit the removal of trees if in good condition for visibility. He asked if the forester was part of the ART. Mr. Papsidero said the City Forester was not part of the ART but has the decision making power when it involves street trees. The ART determined that the Spruce Trees could be removed in this case.

Greg Chillog, EDGE Group, inquired about the foundation planting zone. He said theirs is six feet from the building.

Ms. Martin said the plans indicated a shorter depth in the notes section of the landscape plan. Mr. Chillog said that the note outlined refers to another requirement and that if scaled and measured the plans would show a distance of six feet from the building. Mr. McCauley said they agree to that condition since they are already meeting the requirement.

Mr. Papsidero asked the ART for their feedback about the four awnings in question. Jeff Tyler asked if there were awnings anywhere else on the building and if this would be setting a precedent. Ms. Martin presented the brick awnings built into the colonnade at Toys R Us.

Adam Welker, Ford & Associates, explained all three entrances are quite spread out. Ms. Martin clarified that from the Code perspective, this is a multi-tenant building but she noted that there are now separate parcels. She said the Code states the awnings need to be functional and in this case, the benefit is minimal.

Mr. Papsidero suggested that if the ART would support awnings, perhaps the applicant could get the other tenants to add awnings. Mr. Papsidero confirmed the awning condition be eliminated from the list as the ART could support it.

Mr. McCauley asked if small ornamental trees could be used instead of the evergreen trees. Mr. Papsidero said the ART could support that condition modification.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the water service on the south side of the building. Mr. McCauley said he thought it would be alright and would send the documentation to Mr. Stanford.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for a Minor Project Review with seven conditions as amended:

- 1) That the applicant amend the vehicular canopy column design to extend the masonry from grade to the canopy prior to building permitting, subject to Staff approval;
- 2) That the applicant confirm that all proposed improvements are not in conflict with the existing utilities on the site at Building Permitting
- 3) The applicant confirm the number of parking spaces and update the plans accordingly prior to issuance of a Building Permit;
- 4) That the applicant work in coordination with the City Forester and Landscape Inspector to resolve the Code requirement to provide street trees, and surface parking and circulation area landscaping;
- 5) That the plans be updated to reflect the required 42-inch minimum depth required for foundation plantings proposed adjacent to the south elevation of 6525 Sawmill Road;
- 6) That the proposed Crabapple and Pear tree species be substituted with ornamental trees from the City of Dublin preferred tree list; and
- 7) That the applicant obtain approval of a Master Sign Plan for the proposed ground signs included in the landscape plans.

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

Ms. Martin reiterated that June 23, 2016, is the target date for the Administrative Review Team review and recommendation of approval for a Master Sign Plan as part of this application. The applicant asked to review it today.

Ms. Martin said the following tenants would be included in the applicant's request for a Master Sign Plan: Goodwill, Toys R Us, and Big Lots. She presented the wall signs proposed for each tenant for context. She said the applicant submitted the text for an MSP, which is generally consistent with the Bridge Street Code but pointed out that the wall sign size was increased to a maximum size of 80 square feet for each tenant. In addition she said the MSP text states: one ground monument sign shall be permitted on each public right-of-way but shall be limited to a maximum of three ground monument signs for the center and must be located on different street frontages.

Ms. Martin asked the ART to consider the definition for "center". She asked if the logo and tenant name should be permitted on the ground sign. She asked if the ART thought it was too much visual clutter. She inquired about changeable copy signs. She asked about permitting 3 ground signs instead of 4 with one to be located on Village Parkway, Banker Drive, and Sawmill Road.

Ms. Martin said three tenant panels were proposed on the ground signs and the issue with the fourth tenant needed to be resolved. She noted that the applicant was requesting larger wall signs than permitted by the BSD Code.

Mr. Papsidero confirmed the larger signs were consistent with the previous Code requirements.

Mr. McCauley said he understands the smaller sizes in the BSD Code from a pedestrian scale experience but while their building is in the BSD, it is 425 feet from Sawmill Road and not a pedestrian friendly area where a sign would be 10 – 15 feet from the street.

Mr. McCauley added there are three tenants but three owners as well. He explained that Stavroff Land and Development, Inc. is paying for all the signs, trying to be a good neighbor and that all three parcels are included in the MSP.

Ms. Husak asked if the ground signs meet the BSD Code and where they would be located. Ms. Martin said the MSP is being requested because the applicant would exceed the requirements in the BSD for size, colors, and logos. Ms. Husak indicated the PZC would not approve of all of these requests given they adopted the BSD Sign Guidelines. The ART encouraged the applicant to read through the BSD Sign Guidelines as the square brick base with the metal cabinet on top as proposed for a ground sign is not creative enough. Ms. Husak indicated that the PZC might grant some leeway on a proposal if they were presented with a unique, dynamic, creative, memorable, and interesting product. Mr. Stavroff asked for more specifics on design and was referred to the sign guidelines.

Mr. McCauley inquired about options for next steps. Mr. Papsidero said the ground sign would need to be redesigned before the ART could make a recommendation. Mr. Stavroff said he will design a crazy sign and present it to the PZC. The ART emphasized that the sign needs to be creative, not crazy.

## **CASE REVIEWS**

### **2. BSD SCN – Party City 16-042MSP**

### **6655 Sawmill Road Master Sign Plan**

Nichole Martin said this is a request for the installation of a monument sign for an existing multi-tenant building located at the intersection of Sawmill Road and Village Parkway. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Martin said this is identical to the Goodwill MSP proposal as it is the same applicants so she suggested the detailed review did not need to be repeated today. She said a Party City wall sign was approved by the ART on May 5, 2016, for a different applicant because it met the BSD Code and therefore, the applicant was able to submit the proposal under a Minor Project Review.

Ms. Martin asked the applicant to consider meeting Code for a ground sign by using the single color red letters to match the recently approved wall sign and the bottom panel would be blank for future tenants.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc., indicated Party City accepted that sign because they had to due to the store grand opening and the need for a quick sign. He said they would prefer to have a much different sign despite the high cost they put into that one.

Ms. Martin said this application is scheduled for a determination on June 23, 2016, to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

### **3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, G Block 16-038BPR**

### **Mooney Street Basic Plan Review**

Nichole Martin said this is a request for a mixed-use development, including two buildings containing 179 residential dwelling units, approximately 12,000-square-feet of office use, 11,000-square-feet of retail use, and a parking structure. She said the site is surrounded by Tuller Ridge Drive to the north, Dale Drive to the east, Mooney Street to the west, and Bridge Park Avenue to the south. She said this is a request for

review and recommendation of an approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and the proposed Site Plan, open space, and the mid-block crossing. For comparison, she presented the previously submitted illustrations for the south elevation of building G1 and then the revised illustration proposed.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, pointed out further refinement and described the streamlined design of the three bays and the small change in plane. He said the accent on the corners were the same but the materials changed at the sixth level.

Ms. Burchett asked Ms. Martin to recall the comments from the PZC Informal Review on June 9<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Martin said the PZC understood how this was a transitional building and said it was important because it prominently fronts Bridge Park Avenue. She recalled their willingness to support Waivers for architectural elements.

Claudia Husak added the PZC requested brick to reach the top of the building and that they seemed excited about the tile introduced. She said they had inquired about the colors used.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, recalled the Commissions' requests for relief from all the pattern and wanted the brick to read as one. He said the applicant still wants to have the weaving effect at least minimally.

Vince Papsidero inquired about the tile that was reflective. Mr. Gonzalez said a wide range of reflectivity can be achieved and the revised version is the simpler expression.

Ms. Burchett confirmed there has been no real changes made to the square footage or stories with the revised plans. She noted how the upper element had changed. Mr. Gonzalez affirmed they used more brick.

Ms. Martin recalled the Commission was concerned with the use of color and its appropriateness. She said they tried to get a read on the red color used but the applicant had said the exact color had not been determined.

Jeff Tyler suggested a complimentary color palette between the two buildings. Mr. Gonzalez said materials can still be changed but they will refine their choices. Mr. Hunter said the hue is timeless.

Mr. Hunter said the applicant wants contrast to weave through the design and chrome provides a punch that is appropriate.

Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, asked the ART if the Waivers for the open space access would be appropriate considering the distance to the park. Ms. Martin indicated the distance to the park to use it as part of their open space requirement did not seem to be an issue with the PZC and Staff is supportive of it also.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [There were none.]

**4. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, H Block  
16-039BPR**

**Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street  
Basic Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for a residential condominium development consisting of approximately 75 townhome units with parking below each unit. She said the site is surrounded by John Shields Parkway to the north, Dale Drive to the east, Mooney Street to the west, and Tuller Ridge Drive to the south. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of an approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the 5.02-acre site. She presented the revised open space plans noting the private open space. She explained there is an additional connection to it in the revised plans.

Ms. Martin said the private open space proposed originally included a pool but reported that it was found to not be currently permitted in the BSD. After further research, it was determined that when the BSD Code was edited, pools being permitted was omitted by mistake; she emphasized that pools are permitted. She recalled the Commission had an issue with privacy and it not meeting the intent of the Code.

Ms. Burchett said the new proposal includes a pool but it is in the center with better access.

John Woods, MKSK, explained the public can now move through the area. He said they removed two of the smaller units to reposition the pool and it now has an infinity edge. He indicated they are still studying the grade changes, trying to lift it up to reduce overall grade change because Mooney Street is not set yet and Dale Drive might change too. He said they intend for this to be a casual space and they intend to include turf, trees, and Adirondack chairs.

Vince Papsidero said he thought the applicant responded well to what the Commission wanted.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, indicated they can appreciate the process because it prompted them to come up with a better product and they like this better. Jeff Tyler stated it is more creative.

Mike Altomare asked if the Fire Department will be able to access the pool. Larimer Street leading to the auto court was suggested for access but he said a fire truck cannot maneuver in the auto court. Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, said Fire could pull off on Dale Drive. Mr. Wood said there could possibly be a gate there.

Ms. Burchett asked if this private open space could still be accessed by the public. For example, she asked if bicycles could go through there to which the applicant answered affirmatively.

Ms. Burchett said the Commission and Staff have had concerns about maneuverability in the corners of the auto courts. Mr. Quackenbush said they have improved the plans to better show how vehicles could maneuver.

Ms. Burchett confirmed that no changes have been made to the architecture on the buildings in Block H.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [There were none.]

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:40 pm.