



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 2, 2016

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Alan Perkins, Fire Plans Examiner.

Other Staff: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Lia Yakumithis, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Chris Meyers, Meyers + Associates Architecture; Matt Dunlap, Charles Penzone (Case 1); and Kevin McCauley and Matt Stavroff, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc. and Robert Gamperl, Goodwill (Cases 3 & 4).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the May 26, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATION

**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 §153.066.

Ms. Burchett focused on the Waivers and the conditions. She explained there were 10 Waivers altogether but they could be grouped because one would lead into the other. She said three Waivers were needed to address the single story for a loft type building; four Waivers addressed the conflicts of the easement and building outside the RBZ due to the constrictions of the site; and three different individual Waivers were left. She referred to the Waivers as listed in the Planning Report as follows:

1. Building Type – §153.062(O)(4) – Minimum Building Height – 2 stories (required); ±31-foot high, one-story building (requested).
2. Building Type – §153.062(G) – Articulation of Stories on Street Façades – The building façades have been articulated to create the impression of a one- and one-half or two-story building on a one-story building.
3. Building Type – §153.062(O)(4) – Ground Story Height – 12 feet to 18 feet ground story height (required); ±31-foot ground story height (requested).
4. Building Type – §153.062(O)(4) – Front Required Building Zone – The structure is required to be located between 0-15 feet from the front property line. The southeast corner of the building is at approximately 23 feet at the edge of the easement boundary. The public space has been designed to give the appearance of a closer setback through plaza areas, walls, and landscaping.

5. Building Type – §153.062(O)(4) – Front Property Line Coverage – The structure is required to cover a minimum of 75% of the front property line. Due to the building's location outside of the Required Building Zone (RBZ) as dictated by the site constraints, there is no Front Property Line Coverage. The public space has been designed to give the appearance of more coverage through plaza areas, walls, and landscaping.
6. Building Type – §153.062(O) (4) – Right-of-Way Encroachments – Awnings, canopies, eaves, patios, and projecting signs may encroach. The site has been designed with a street wall to meet the intent of other Code requirements.
7. Building Type – §153.062(O) (4) – Parking Location – The parking area is required to be located in the rear yard or within the building. The applicant has designed the parking area to accommodate their projected need that includes parking to the rear and the side.
8. Building Type – §153.062(O)(4) – Principal Entrance Location – Primary Street Façade (required); North Elevation (requested).
9. Site Development Standards – §153.065(B)(4) – Off-Street Parking Space and Aisle Dimensions – Maximum width 22 feet (required); ±24 feet off-street parking drive aisles (requested).
10. Building Type – §153.065(E)(2)(j) – Street Wall Standards – Street Walls are intended to be located within Required Building Zone. If an RBZ is occupied by a building, the street wall shall be installed along the same plane as the nearest building façade. Proposed street wall is approximately 27-feet to the east of the nearest building façade.

Ms. Burchett stated there were three conditions for the Site Plan approval:

- 1) That the applicant submit a Parking Plan application with the Development Plan/Site Plan application;
- 2) That the applicant submit a Preliminary and Final Plat application; and
- 3) That the applicant work with staff to determine the location of the neighborhood street right-of-way.

Vince Papsidero indicated the ART was supportive of the revisions that had been presented last week.

Chris Meyers, Meyers + Associates Architecture, provided additional options to the ART to address some outstanding concerns from last week. He presented some exhibits showing the potential 50-foot right-of-way for the future neighborhood street. He explained that due to the existing salon location along with this proposal that there was a limited amount of space available for the future street. He asked if the City would support a private drive designed as a public street because the applicant believes it meets the intent of a neighborhood street. He said they are considering a (future) neighborhood street as a hybrid street that would meet the Code's requirement for aesthetic character that is pedestrian oriented but would also be appropriate for Penzone facilities on a campus setting. He said the proposed connector street between Hobbs Landing and Penzone would not be built for vehicular traffic but rather pedestrians and cyclists. He said the idea culminated from the commentary received from the neighboring Greystone Mews residents during the Informal Review at the Planning and Zoning Commission. He indicated the client has concerns with through-traffic bisecting the campus and the operation identity.

Mr. Meyers indicated the PZC also requested a Master Plan for the possible future "campus" and how it would enhance the Bridge Street District. He presented a tentative Master Plan that showed possible additional future buildings. He said one building might be used as a Yoga studio and the other might be a Penzone Academy to further staff education. He noted the plan also extends the plaza parks, which the

PZC desired. He explained the existing parking is on land that Charles Penzone does not own but shares a parking agreement with the adjacent owner.

Claudia Husak said if the applicant planned to share their Master Plan with the PZC they would need to submit the plans by tomorrow because no additional materials would be accepted at the PZC meeting.

Matt Dunlap, Charles Penzone, explained the Master Plan does not reflect immediate plans but could evolve with time, expansion, and growth. Mr. Meyers said the existing building is slated for façade modifications as well.

Aaron Stanford agreed that the first exhibit showing the existing building in the right-of-way would not work for the City. He said that they would need to work with the property owner to address the location of the right-of-way and future street. He explained that the City would still want 50-feet of right-of-way given the need to provide a multi-use path, utilities, and potentially on-street parking.

Mr. Stanford and the applicant discussed the (future) neighborhood street and how they might work this out to move forward with the proposed building as submitted. Mr. Stanford explained that Engineering is tasked with making decisions now for something that might happen many years into the future. Mr. Meyers emphasized the same owner – Penzone owns both sides of that proposed street and it will be heavily traveled by pedestrian staff and guests.

Mr. Dunlap said the through-street gives the client pause because their location at Polaris is used as a cut-through during heavy traffic periods and they do not want to replicate that.

Ms. Burchett stated the design character for neighborhood streets in the BSD is to slow traffic. She said the plan would not generate cut-through traffic by the neighbors in Greystone Mews.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for the 10 Site Plan Waivers. She said approval is recommended for a Basic Site Plan Review with three conditions.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the 10 Site Plan Waivers and a Basic Site Plan Review with three conditions.

INTRODUCTION & DETERMINATION

2. BSD SCN – Dublin Village Center – Marcy's Clayground – Sign

16-037MPR

**6685 Dublin Center Drive
Minor Project Review**

Lia Yakumithis said this is a request for the installation of a new wall mounted sign for an existing tenant space in the Dublin Village Center approximately 1400 feet west of the intersection of Dublin Center Drive and Sawmill Road. She said the request is for a review and approval for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.065(H) and §153.066.

Ms. Yakumithis said the applicant was not present. She presented the proposed wall sign to be installed above the main entrance. She said it meets the Code for number, size, and color at 22.5 square feet and two colors of white and yellow. She said the height had not been clearly identified so a condition was added for approval.

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

- 1) That the applicant provide revised drawings indicating the exact height of the sign not to exceed 15 feet, subject to staff approval.

Jeff Tyler said he thought the script design of the sign was hard to read. Ms. Yakumithis said that is the logo and it is used like that at their Powell location.

Donna Goss asked if the sign is illuminated. Ms. Yakumithis answered it is internally illuminated with LED lighting.

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 Minor Project Review with one condition.

INTRODUCTIONS

3. 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 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 §153.066 and review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §154.066.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site. She noted this is a multi-tenant building that includes Goodwill (formerly Billiards Plus), Toys R Us, and Big Lots. She presented a close-up view of the site and noted the three separate parcels. She said Goodwill is on the end, Toys R Us is in the middle, and Big Lots is on the other end.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed vehicular canopy awning as part of the Minor Project Review. She said this will provide an area for merchandise loading and unloading. She presented a rendering of the canopy and drive-through pointing out the proposed brick veneer columns supporting a metal canopy approximately 10 – 11 feet in height with a double-sided drive aisle. She explained this will eliminate 24 parking spaces but will add ADA spaces. She said landscape changes were proposed that were reviewed and approved by Michael Hiatt. She stated staff has requested the applicant restripe the parking lot. In addition, she said the applicant is requesting new awnings for the building. She said the applicant will use the prior tenants metal awning frames but the new awnings will be a shade of blue.

Ms. Martin said the Master Sign Plan will need to go to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval after the ART makes a recommendation. She said the MSP includes two wall signs for Goodwill and four multi-tenant ground signs. She noted one wall sign will face Sawmill Road in the same location as the former Billiard's Plus sign. She said it is 80 square feet in size at 20.9 feet wide and the height is ±18 feet. She said the three-inch deep fabricated letters for text "goodwill" and separate logo are mounted flush to the brick and in the same location as the former Billiard's Plus sign, centered over the middle archway in the sign band. She stated only 50 square feet is permitted per the BSD Code, which is different than the previous Code and each of the tenants received previous variances for height. She said the other proposed wall sign will face Banker Drive, centered over that archway and is 37 square feet in size but the Code does not permit two signs of the same type. She noted this is an internally illuminated, three-inch deep logo cabinet mounted flush to the brick façade and the colors are dark blue, teal, and white. She said four multi-tenant ground signs are proposed and only two are permitted per Code. She pointed out the signs would be located on Sawmill Road, Banker Drive, Village Parkway, and Dublin Center Drive. She said the internally illuminated sign cabinet is built atop a brick veneer base, meeting the Code's height requirements. Ms. Martin concluded the type and the height of the wall signs does not meet the Code but are architecturally integrated.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc., said he understands they exceed the Code for the number of ground signs permitted but they are requesting a total of four, one for each street location

instead of requesting a total of six signs, two for each tenant of the building, which could conflict with each other. Robert Gamperl, Goodwill, added this is a four-sided building with three tenants and they are proposing a cohesive sign package.

Claudia Husak asked the applicant to consider different signs like perhaps one wall sign and one projecting sign or signs on the blue awnings so they could meet the Code on that aspect. Mr. Gamperl said the awnings do not protrude out beyond the brick façade and a projecting sign would not be effective in this instance.

Ms. Husak asked if there would be any directional signs. The applicant said there would be directional signs on site but they would be generic like "Do not enter" and "Stop" signs so they would not include any of the tenants' names. Jennifer Rauch confirmed that would be acceptable and are not required to be part of a MSP.

Mr. McCauley said the BSD Code for signs is pedestrian oriented and Sawmill Road is auto-oriented. He referred to Rite Rug down the street who has not been successful and Goodwill would like a chance to succeed who has to compete with Columbus signs in the area. He noted the building is 300 feet back from Sawmill Road with Boston Market and KFC on each corner in between the road and these tenants. He said even with access off Banker Drive, this location is a tough sell.

Jeff Tyler asked if they considered their MSP in context with the other wall signs existing on this building. Ms. Martin answered they are. Mr. Tyler said he wanted to see the other wall signs on this building at the next meeting for context. Mr. McCauley said Toys R Us, located right next door, has a bigger sign on both the front and the back of the building.

Vince Papsidero said the existing signs should be part of the sign package. Ms. Rauch added this could be to the applicant's benefit.

Ms. Husak said assuming the Toys R Us signs and the Big Lots signs are in the 80-square-foot range, a larger sign for Goodwill would bring consistency but there has to be a high level of quality.

Mr. McCauley said he would return with a cohesive package but emphasized the three tenants are under different ownership.

Mr. Tyler stated he is simply looking for reference and not asking for the other tenants to be part of this application. Ms. Goss indicated presenting the existing signs that were approved under the previous Code for reference purposes could be a benefit to the applicant in this instance.

Ms. Husak inquired about the vehicular canopy circulation.

Mr. Stanford requested more detail on the Site Plan because the existing Site Plan did not show circulation maneuverability and the private utility information.

Mr. Gamperl said Goodwill has used this same dual-lane model seven times before and it is successful. He said on a busy Saturday morning, traffic can get backed up in the canopy area.

Ms. Husak asked why the masonry on the columns did not go to the top. Mr. Gamperl replied that architecturally the proposed column design looks better. He said the canopy metal is a champagne color and the masonry will match.

Matt Stavroff, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc., explained the other tenants are not interested in making any changes to the signs or the landscaping. He said he has been working with the City's Code

Enforcement Department to force landscaping improvements from the other tenants but has been unsuccessful.

Mr. Papsidero inquired about the commitment for parking lot re-striping from the other tenants. Mr. McCauley said the parking lot is being replaced across the board. He said everything on the south side and front of Goodwill will be resurfaced and the rest will be completed as needed since Stavroff is paying for it.

Mr. Stavroff said they would comply with whatever was requested by the ART.

Ms. Martin explained the next steps.

**4. BSD SCN – Party City
16-042MSP**

**6655 Sawmill Road
Master Sign Plan**

Nichole Martin said this is a request for the installation of two monument signs 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 to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed monument signs that are in the same style as the ground signs just to the south in the Goodwill/Toys R Us/Big Lots plaza but the six colors proposed exceed the Code as just five colors are permitted, including the background color. She said the internally illuminated sign cabinet is built over a brick veneer base, meeting the Code's height requirements. She noted they have proposed additional landscaping to surround the signs. She said one monument sign would be placed on Sawmill Road and the other would be on Village Parkway but the proposed locations conflict with the utility easement.

Ms. Martin reported that Party City received approval for the installation of a wall sign on May 5, 2016, but it was one color – red. The ART recommended the monument signs should match the wall sign with the text in red on a white background.

Proposing a Master Sign Plan for the whole building was discussed. Ms. Martin explained the applicant could determine standards and every tenant would then have to comply with what was approved or they would have to return with a new proposal. She said this could address anything that could potentially appear, having various tenants move in and out.

Matt Stavroff, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc., said honoring a brand is important and he plans to bring better brands. He said they could consider a MSP for the building or if they chose to just use red and white, they would not need a MSP at all.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc., asked the ART what they recommended. Ms. Martin said it would make sense to pull this application and create a MSP for the entire building to provide the applicant with more control.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:38 pm.