



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 1, 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; Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant; and Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Logan Stang, Planner I; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Jenny Rauch, Planning Manager; Nichole Martin, Planner I; JM Rayburn, Planner I; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Todd Giallorati, Dublin Station, LLC (Case 1); Greg Briya and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan (Case 2); Floyd Tackett, Tackett Custom Carpentry, Ltd. (Case 3); and Randy Roberty, Design Collective (Case 4).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the August 25, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATION

**1. BSD C – Funky Scissors
16-067MPR**

**6305 Sawmill Road
Minor Project Review**

Logan Stang said this is a request to install a new wall mounted sign for a tenant space within the Trader Joe's Shopping Center on the west side of Sawmill Road at the southwest corner of the intersection with West Dublin-Granville Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §154.066.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed sign as it would appear on the existing sign band with routed letters. He said it meets the Code for size, height, location, number, and color.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval with no conditions.

CASE REVIEW

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, B5 Parking Structure
16-060MPR**

**6561 Mooney Street
Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for exterior modifications to a previously approved parking structure to revise architectural elements and building materials for building B4/B5 in the Bridge Park Development, northwest of the intersection of (future) Banker Drive and (Future) Mooney 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 §153.066.

Ms. Burchett said Staff reviewed the proposed changes on August 4, 2016, and requested additional changes and information on materials. She said the majority of changes were the addition of panels to the

façades. She presented the additional coverage on the east and south elevations. Per Staff's comments about the vegetative green wall, she said the applicant provided the proposed trellis system.

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, presented a sample panel in its raw version and explained it will be powder coated in a couple of colors. He said the width of the panel is 3 feet and can extend in length to 12 feet. He explained the reason they decreased the size of the green wall was to achieve the 40% open air requirement while still adding panels because the green wall is calculated as a solid.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said the green wall serves as a design aesthetic cascading out of the façade.

Donna Goss asked how the metal panels are affixed to the walls. Mr. Briya answered with U-shaped clips and within each bay there will be an accent light.

Vince Papsidero asked how many panels are used. Mr. Briya answered 2 per bay or 3 per bay depending on the size of the bay.

Jeff Tyler recalled originally discussing the use of exterior lighting so the walls could appear as playful as possible. He asked if exterior lighting could be added.

Mr. Papsidero asked if the applicant's goal was to play with color. Mr. Briya said it would depend on the final color palette of the panels but the light will be white as the fixture does not accommodate a colored light.

Mr. Tyler recalled discussing colored lights on the exterior and the panels were undulating. Ms. Umbarger said the final design uses white light. Ms. Burchett said she would research the previous comments to confirm what colors were discussed.

Shawn Krawetzki asked if the concrete walls would be visible behind the screen/panels and if they would be painted a color to coordinate with the panels. Mr. Briya said color has not been considered for the concrete but may be a consideration as the forms go up and imperfections become visible. He noted the panels are spaced two inches apart.

Mr. Krawetzki inquired about opacity given one can see through the screen/panels. Mr. Briya said it is no different than building C4/C5 and those panels have the same sized perforations.

Ms. Umbarger said they have added a lot more brick detail and caps that punched those elements out, which makes it an improvement over the original design.

Mr. Tyler asked if all the panels would be on the same plane and the answer was yes.

Mr. Krawetzki inquired about the distance the panels would be off of the building. Ms. Umbarger responded the distance would vary because the panels are on an angle but the average is about 1 foot, 6 inches.

Ms. Burchett presented before and after renderings of the elevations for comparison.

Mr. Tyler stated he liked the change in the vertical breaks as they now break up the façade so it does not appear as one long wall. He said he agrees with Mr. Krawetzki in that the concrete bands should be tinted to match the panels so it reads as a whole. He indicated the panels themselves were an acceptable alternative to the original design and said they will work if there is appropriate lighting provided. Ms. Umbarger indicated that if the concrete is a darker color it would detract from the shadow pattern they are trying to achieve.

Mr. Krawetzki inquired about the randomness of the panel placements. He encouraged the applicant to either provide more symmetry or more randomness, not something in between.

Mr. Papsidero noted the panels used at OSU on Lane Avenue is a finer panel and closer to a fabric material. He indicated these metal panels should cast more of a shadow.

Ms. Burchett concluded the ART's recommendation to the PZC is scheduled for September 8th.

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

PRE-APPLICATION

3. BSD HR

73 S. Riverview Street Pre-Application Review

JM Rayburn said this is a request for the construction of a new single-family dwelling with an attached garage for a property at the southeast corner of South Riverview Street and Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and non-binding feedback for a future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Mr. Rayburn said the existing single-family structure on this property was approved for demolition by the Architectural Review Board on August 24th but one of the conditions of approval was that the applicant must obtain approval of a proposed design for a single-family residence that would be erected in its place before demolition could commence.

Mr. Rayburn presented elevations for all four sides of the proposed dwelling that is a three-bedroom home with the master on the first floor. He noted the proposed building height is 26 feet, seven inches to the main gable peak and the proposed lot coverage is 3,724 square feet or 32.7%.

Floyd Tackett, Tackett Custom Carpentry, Ltd., said he had changed the front elevations since his submittal as he wanted to block Eberly Hill Lane from the front porch and make it appear more like an addition to the home. He noted the front porch is 30 feet from the stop sign and prefers as much space as possible between the front porch and the stop sign.

Logan Stang noted this property has three frontages and the south is the only elevation up against another house.

Jeff Tyler indicated everyone likes the south elevation the best as the design seems the most complete but have some minor issues with the other elevations.

Mr. Tackett said he is open to suggestions.

Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to take clues from the southern elevation and apply more symmetry to the north and east elevations. He said he struggles with the front elevation as the columns appear too small. He inquired about the architectural style.

Mr. Tackett offered to try double columns. He said his architect refers to the architectural style as vernacular.

Shawn Krawetzki added the window placement and sizes are all over the place and not consistent.

Mr. Tackett pointed out the large window was designed to add plenty of light for the stairwell specifically.

Mr. Tyler said he liked the eyebrow dormer element that is on the existing house and asked if that could be incorporated into this new design.

Donna Goss agreed having a more elaborate dormer like an eyebrow or shed may address the issue with the east elevation to create more interest.

Vince Papsidero inquired about the use of the water table. Mr. Tackett said he could decrease the stone section but it might look odd in relation to the roof.

Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to play around with detail and alter proportions. He said overall, scale wise this structure works and the material choices make sense. He noted it is a large house on a small site.

Jenny Rauch indicated the ARB may question the proposed attached garage when a detached garage was on the site before.

Mr. Tackett asked if the use of HardiPlank was acceptable and the answer was yes. He agreed to modify the east and north elevations and said landscaping will help overall.

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

OTHER

Lori Burchett said this is a review of materials provided for Cap City (Case 16-063MPR) as a condition of their approval granted by the ART on August 18, 2016.

Ms. Burchett said if the materials do not meet the Code, the applicant would need to pursue a Waiver from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Randy Roberty, Design Collective, presented the new material of woven acrylic. He explained a dark gray fabric would outline the acrylic on all four sides at a width of 12 inches and that 8 inches is the minimum width the border could be. He said this will provide a four by seven or eight foot clear area. He indicated that the fabric would blend well with the other building materials. He explained the shade system would operate like an umbrella on simple tracks that allow the acrylic to slide up and down for inclement weather.

Ms. Burchett provided photos of buildings using vinyl for comparison and she pointed out the covering would be tucked back behind the structure.

Mr. Roberty noted large cedar planters would surround the patio's perimeter in lieu of a railing and they would block the lower portion of the acrylic. He said the area between the columns is approximately 10 – 12 feet and the tracking system would run inside the columns that are a brushed stainless steel.

Ms. Burchett said specific screening for patios is not called out in the BSD Code. She said historically, acrylic and this type of screening has not been permitted as part of the primary or secondary materials for a façade. If approved, she said this would set a precedence.

Jeff Tyler recalled when businesses at Bridge and High tried to do something similar; the proposals did not even make it to the PZC. Ms. Burchett said the BSD Code allows for 'other high quality materials' as permitted by the reviewing body and in this case, it would be the PZC and they would need to approve a Waiver. She said if the Commission embraces this, it will set a precedent and is fairly certain other restaurants coming into the BSD will ask for the same.

Mr. Roberty said he wanted to work through this and move forward to the PZC.

Vince Papsidero asked if there would be heating elements for the patio. Mr. Roberty said there is no HVAC system for out there and they do not plan to use it in the winter. He said the main concern is if it is a nice day, the patio and restaurant are filled to capacity and it starts to rain. He explained they would like the ability to drop something down quickly and then put it back up once the storm passed. He said the screens they are proposing would be operated manually, like blinds.

Mike Altomare asked if the screening material was flame retardant. The applicant responded it was.

Mr. Altomare asked if smoking is permitted on the patio, then when the panels are lowered, the smoke could bother the other patrons. Mr. Roberty said Cameron Mitchell does not allow smoking anywhere in his restaurants.

Aaron Stanford asked for clarification on how the screens would be utilized. He said if the screens are not solely used to provide protection from the rain then it has more of an impact and questioned how that could be managed.

Mr. Roberty said in other cities they have set restrictions on the use as a condition of approval or limited the length of time the approval would be in effect. He said sometimes they have to apply for an annual re-approval that could be revoked if the screens were not being used as proposed.

Ms. Burchett said procedurally, some sort of condition could be added but questioned how Staff would effectively manage that.

Mr. Stanford said he could see the restaurant wanting to extend the seasonal use when there can be extremely nice days in the winter. He encouraged the applicant to consider glass.

Mr. Roberty said if they used glass to enclose the patio it would become an addition and not a patio space and the increased cost would be significant.

Mr. Tyler requested a mach up built with the actual material for the ART to make a determination.

Mr. Tyler concluded by thanking the applicant for paying attention to the feedback provided from the ART.

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 2:55 pm.