



## ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

### MEETING MINUTES

**AUGUST 18, 2016**

**ART Members and Designees:** Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Aaron Stanford, Sr. Civil Engineer; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshall; Alan Perkins, Fire Plans Examiner; and Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect.

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

**Applicants:** Randy Roberty and Brent LaCount, Design Collective; and Steve Weis, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants (case 1); Steven Roberts, SRA Architects; Subhas Patel, Towneplace Suites (Case 2); and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; and Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, (Case 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the August 11, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

#### DETERMINATION

**1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building C2 - Cap City  
16-063MPR**

**6640 Riverside Drive  
Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for a tenant space fitting for the first floor of building C2 within the Bridge Park Development on the east side of Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Burchett reported the ART reviewed the application on August 11, 2016, and were generally supportive of the overall design; however, they were not in support of the use of vinyl screens along the patio as this is not an approved primary or secondary material. She said in order to gain approval for the vinyl screens, it would require a Waiver from the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said Staff conducted a thorough internal review and found everything else to be in compliance. She explained the applicant will need to return with a separate application for sign review and approval.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the tree grates. Ms. Burchett answered the grates are part of the streetscape. She said she was not certain of the tree type proposed for that specific area but it would be a size where it could be pruned as it grew to prevent as much pedestrian conflict as possible. She said this scenario is no different than anywhere else in the BSD.

Donna Goss asked about the space between the tree pit and the front door as it appeared tight. Randy Roberty, Design Collective, answered there is about seven or eight feet between the pit and the revolving door. He asked if the tree could be eliminated. Ms. Burchett reiterated it is part of the planned streetscape and it is already in the process of being planted.

Ms. Burchett said inquiries were made concerning any possible encroachment conflicts. She presented the approved site plan and explained the patio is in the same location that was approved.

Mr. Roberty indicated he would need to go in front of the PZC for any possible chance of having the vinyl screens. Vince Papsidero said the ART has to follow the Code and if it does not allow it then they cannot support it.

Mr. Roberty explained the vinyl screens would act as blinds or curtains to provide shade from sun or rain. He added the element would be detachable and not permanent.

Jeff Tyler asked if the vinyl screens were to provide protection during the winter so the patio could be used year round. Brent LaCount, Design Collective, answered the intent was not for winter but possibly in the fall and spring when the weather was not extreme. He explained the operational intent is to be able to fill the patio full of guests but if it began to rain and there was already a restaurant full of guests, there would be no place to move them. He said the screens would serve like an umbrella, providing a weather guard; the patio would be too cold for mid-winter use in Ohio.

Mr. Roberty distributed additional graphic examples of vinyl screens.

Mr. Papsidero indicated some members had the impression the vinyl screens were for use in the winter before today's clarification.

Mr. Tyler asked if heat would be provided in the patio area. Mr. Roberty said there will be small heat elements for the spring and fall but no HVAC systems.

Claudia Husak said vinyl screens have never been approved for use anywhere in Dublin.

Mr. Papsidero restated a Waiver would need to be requested from the Commission. Mr. Roberty asked if the Waiver could be sought after this MPR was reviewed and approved to which Mr. Papsidero answered affirmatively.

Mr. Papsidero asked the applicant if they had considered an alternative material. Ms. Husak said if they were interested in something of more of a permanent nature, she suggested the Rusty Bucket utilizes garage doors for their patio space.

Mr. Roberty said an alternative could be canvas but then it is not clear. Steve Weis, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants, said they would like a product that is as transparent as possible.

Mr. Roberty said they had really hoped to extend the dining experience outside.

Mr. Tyler asked what the solution is if the vinyl screens are not approved. Mr. LaCount answered there is no plan B. He said the patio faces west but the prevailing winds and storms come from that direction. He said they could not seat patrons with confidence in the patio area if there was no protection to offer. Mr. Weis said if they cannot get approval for vinyl screens, they would have to rethink their strategy. Mr. Papsidero suggested bringing in a sample vinyl so the ART could inspect it. He added the vinyl screens could certainly set a precedent in the area. Ms. Husak stated there are plenty of restaurants in the City that have patios that do not offer protection from the weather.

Mr. Tyler said he is not comfortable with supporting a Waiver request at the ART level; he encouraged the applicants to seek other solutions.

Mr. Papsidero asked if the case should be tabled to permit the applicant time to obtain and present an actual sample of the vinyl screening.

Shawn Krawetzki said there is no guarantee there will be clarity with the material and he has seen similar materials that work for a while but then crack and become less than desirable. Mr. Roberty said Cameron Mitchell is quite meticulous and would ensure the screens be maintained at a high quality.

Mr. Tyler indicated the ART likes everything else proposed.

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

- 1) That the applicant submit a revised plan showing a primary or secondary material for the patio screening.

She asked the ART if they would like the case tabled or whether the MPR could be approved with the amended condition as follows:

- 1) That should the applicant pursue enclosure of the patio space, they would submit more details of the materials for review and approval by the ART.

Mr. Roberty indicated that he would like a recommendation for the MPR and move forward. He said if they decide on an alternative for the vinyl screening or change their plan, they would submit a new application.

Donna Goss said she understands the intent and why the applicant would want a screen but the material is an issue and it cannot be supported without some precedence.

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 the revised condition.

## **PRE-APPLICATION**

### **2. BSD C – Upper Metro Hotel**

### **5155 Upper Metro Place Pre-Application Review**

Logan Stang said this is a request for the construction of a five-story hotel and associated site improvements for an undeveloped parcel on the south side of Upper Metro Place approximately 800 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. He said this is a request for a review and feedback for a future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Mr. Stang explained the site runs along the border of the Bridge Street District and is zoned BSD Commercial where a hotel use is permitted. He presented the proposed site layout. He said the hotel would be along the curve and it sits back due to an existing easement on the property. He said a Waiver would be required for the front RBZ due to the easement. He said landscaping would make the frontage pedestrian friendly. He said there are two access points; one is existing and the other would line up with the office across the street. He said 102 guest rooms are proposed so they are requesting 102 parking spaces that exceeds the code permitted number of spaces. He said the building is five stories and can either be considered a commercial mixed-use building or a large format commercial building. He indicated that another recent hotel in the area (Home2 Hotel) was granted a Waiver for a corridor building type and the applicants were wondering if that is applicable to this site.

Mr. Stang presented the submitted architecture showing various styles of similar sized hotels.

Steven Roberts, SRA Architects, referred to the enlarged plan. He explained that the Marriot brand requires 1 parking space per guest room and they are showing that requirement. He indicated the intention is to develop the site as a whole with daytime use of the parking spaces primarily for office or retail that could be shared with the hotel leaving enough spaces available at night for the hotel. He said the brand considers what is best for the hotel guests and the Hilton has a 100% guarantee for parking.

Vince Papsidero asked if construction of the parking lot could be completed in phases. He said the City is not a proponent for over parking. Mr. Roberts indicated that could be a consideration since they are planning hotels at each end of the site and the office on the out lot, in between to optimize frontage. He said eventually they would utilize 95% of the RBZ.

Mr. Roberts stated they are planning a quality product for the site similar to what is found on Lane Avenue and their product in Lawrence, Kansas.

Mr. Papsidero agreed the contemporary architecture would be more appropriate for the site and the use intended for the site is appropriate.

Donna Goss asked if any other use is being considered. Mr. Roberts said there could be a conference center or a meeting space. He said they would need options to determine whether they would develop to the east or sell to someone else. He indicated it might be a perfect location for someone else to develop apartments there, like the Hudson project.

Jeff Tyler asked the applicant if he would consider mixed-use on the first floor of the hotel. Mr. Roberts responded a dining establishment could be a possibility. He said the current plan is to have the first floor primarily dedicated to guest use. He said they provided a conceptual floor plan simply for feasibility. He said they could use the outer area for utilities, open space, and outdoor seating.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there would be access to those areas full time to which Mr. Roberts answered affirmatively.

Mr. Papsidero asked the applicant if they had a master plan for the site with options. Mr. Roberts distributed hard copies to the group.

Aaron Stanford said it appears that stormwater management had yet to be developed. He said he has been encouraging developers to consider underground and more natural solutions. He indicated he would review the proposed access points with the transportation department. He noted the other challenge would be the streetscape between the roadway and the building. Mr. Roberts said he sees that as a great opportunity.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the keyhole parking location as it detracts from the site. He encouraged the applicant to better define the space and not just show a surface lot.

Mr. Stanford asked if the applicant might consider splitting the lot into three parcels. Mr. Roberts said it could be three or all could be merged into one.

Claudia Husak suggested the applicant design the building and vet it against either building type. She asked him to not only consider the setback but also the other requirements like transparency to minimize the number of Waivers to be requested.

Mr. Papsidero noted that Waivers are supported when there is a quality building proposed. Ms. Husak said when the need for Waivers is not the fault of the applicant it provides Staff with an argument for the need, which is more technical in nature.

Mr. Tyler asked if sustainability was considered for this site and the building itself. He indicated sustainability would be easier achieved if planned early.

Subhas Patel, Towneplace Suites, said Marriott has a program for LEED certified buildings which would be an option for this site.

Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to start thinking about the dumpster enclosures and transformers, etc.

Mr. Roberts said they are sensitive to the operations and appearance of dumpsters. He said various options for the site were considered prior to them contacting the City.

Mr. Tyler said an overall master plan would help the application. Mr. Roberts said he did not want to get locked in to anything; he wanted to keep his options open. He said the potential lot line could become an issue.

Mr. Patel asked if any hotels are under parked in the City. Mr. Papsidero said they meet Code. Mr. Patel said he expects everyone to drive to the site and would still like to pursue a Waiver for their parking needs.

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

### **CASE REVIEW**

#### **3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, B3 Amenity Deck 16-061MPR**

#### **4551 Bridge Park Avenue Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this is a request for exterior modifications to a previously approved structure to eliminate a ±1000-square-foot rooftop amenity deck and associated structures for building B3 in the Bridge Park Development, southeast of the intersection of (future) Bridge Park Avenue and (future) Longshore Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §154.066.

Ms. Martin presented the site plan and noted where the structures and deck would be removed. She said the applicant is focusing on the amenity space on the third floor. She presented the before and after graphics and the amenity space programming. She explained it is intended for a gathering space where the pedestrian crossings connect.

Ms. Martin presented the before and after graphics of the roof plan. She said the applicant provided site lines for comparison.

Ms. Martin noted the major change to this site is the elevation; without a penthouse, the structure will appear cleaner. She said the proposal is similar to the approved plan but the ART suggests the application be reviewed by the PZC since there is such a change to the elevation.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said the original plans did not include the rooftop amenity but then when they thought it was a good idea, the PZC was reluctant. He indicated that since the PZC did not want this in first place, they will probably be supportive of the change.

Ms. Martin recalled the tower element architecture was more of the Commission's concern than the amenity itself. She said they were not taking advantage of the space inside.

Mr. Hunter pointed out that building C3 has a roof deck and building B3 has a third floor amenity space. He added that building B3 has direct access to building B2 that has a rooftop deck. He clarified that the amenity spaces in building B2 were considerably larger than those in building C3.

Jeff Tyler said there was a difference between amenities and architecture. He recalled the issue PZC had was with the design of the tower not the amenity space. He said the applicant needs to be cognizant of the amenity issue or it can erode the entire character of the district.

Mr. Papsidero asked if the third floor amenity programming was a literal representation. Mr. Hunter indicated it would be pretty close to that, including soft seating and a large television. He said they would like to keep the space flexible so it can be used in different ways. He said they have this amenity in every building and believe it will get more use than a rooftop amenity. He cited an example for the use of the

room. He said people are downsizing when they come to live here but they still may need space that could seat 15 guests; this space would be available for that use.

Shawn Krawetzki asked if the space would be similar to what would have been on the roof. Mr. Hunter answered it would not because there would not be a shuffle board or foosball table, etc.

Ms. Martin said she would review the recommendation of the Commission. She said she wants to ensure the promise of a rooftop amenity did not prompt the support of other approvals.

Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to make sure they ended up with a quality product after the eliminations. He said the amenity could be interior versus exterior but the experience should still be the same or better than the rooftop experience they are eliminating.

Mr. Papsidero asked how this amenity room compares to the other buildings. Mr. Hunter explained that the amenity space in building C1 has a full kitchen so it does not have the flexibility for a farm table etc. that is proposed for building B3.

Mr. Krawetzki inquired about public open space compared to private.

Mr. Hunter said the BSD Code states there has to be public open space. He stated the applicant has already provided ample open space and this is a private amenity space going over and above what is required.

Claudia Husak pointed out that the applicant did not provide open space for buildings G & H because they stated amenities were provided elsewhere and requested a Waiver.

Mr. Tyler said the two are not equating to the same. He encouraged the applicant to be cognizant of promoting something and then taking it away; they need to demonstrate how it is going to be better while possibly moving away from the original intent. He said when a change meets the original intent, the ART can be more comfortable supporting it and there is support for the architecture.

Mr. Papsidero suggested the applicant demonstrate the direct connection to the rooftop of building B2.

Mr. Tyler inquired about access. Mr. Hunter said the amenity is only accessible by residents with a key card. He said the public is not able to pass through those pedestrian bridges.

Ms. Martin concluded by stating the ART recommendation to the Commission is scheduled for August 25<sup>th</sup> to enable the Commission's review at their September 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

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

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:02 pm.