



STEVEN M. ROBERTS, ARCHITECT  
5803 DESTINY COURT CINCINNATI, OHIO 45237  
513-226-7489 steverobertsarchitect@gmail.com

---

June 1, 2017

**From:** Steven M. Roberts, Architect

**To:** Logan Stang, Planner I  
5800 Shier-Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016

**Re:** TownePlace Suites - Basic Plan Review

This letter is in response to your Basic Plan Review letter, dated May 23, 2017:

### **General Comments**

1. *Due to the proposed lot split and future master development a Basic Development Plan should be submitted alongside this application showing tentative lots with dimensions. This requirement would be similar to the master development plan exhibit showing the entire block and potential lots with dimensions.*

**Response:** A Basic Development Plan application is attached.

2. *A Preliminary and Final Plat will be required due to existing deed restrictions outlining zoning setbacks on the properties. This is not required now but will need to be submitted before final site approval can be obtained.*

**Response:** RVP Engineering will submit in the near future.

### **Architecture**

3. *Building Type may be better classified as a Corridor Building similar to Home2 Hotel. Most requirements are the same as the Mixed-Use Building, however a waiver would be required to permit the Corridor Building Type. Staff would be supportive of this given the similarity to Home2 and consistency with surrounding development.*

**Response:** A Corridor Building is slightly less restrictive for Transparency requirements and Front Property Line Coverage (75% from 95%). However it is slightly more restrictive for Maximum Impervious Coverage (80% from 85%) and our design is currently at about 81%.

4. *Please remove current sign package. Signs will be required with the final site approval but current proposal exceeds number of permitted signs and overall size.*

**Response:** The signage has been removed from the revised building elevations and renderings.

5. *Please incorporate more glass into facades to remove blank walls and increase overall transparency, especially on the north and south elevations.*

**Response:** For the time being windows have been added to the guestrooms occupying those blank wall spaces. To do so will require rearrangement of the guestroom layout and negotiation with the Marriott Brand to confirm a revised room layout will be acceptable. For the blank wall occupied by a Utility Room on the first floor a vertical garden or "green wall" is proposed.



6. *Please incorporate more architectural elements to define the entry on the north façade, facing Upper Metro Place.*

**Response:** The North entry is located in a projecting outside corner where a glass curtainwall is proposed to extend vertically up all 5-stories, indicating it as an iconic location on the facade. Additionally, there is a projecting overhang above the Entry at the Second Floor level to notify visitors of the sheltered entry. Finally, the Entry will also be located in the proposed Open Space with outdoor seating (tables, chairs, umbrellas), bike racks, upscale landscaping, and hardscaping that really helps identify it as an active space. We feel there will be enough architectural elements to define this entry but are always open to additional suggestions.

7. *Please provide transparency calculations for the non-street facing facades (south and east elevations) for review.*

**Response:** All calculations have been updated with the additional windows and the non-street facing calculations have been added to Sheet A5.2.

### **Landscaping**

8. *Please provide a tree survey of the existing lot including species, size, condition (dead, poor, fair, good), and status with this application (removed, relocated, etc.).*

**Response:** A tree survey is provided with the revised drawings on L400.

9. *Code requires a landscape island be provided for a run of no more than 12 parking spaces. Please try to incorporate additional landscape islands to the extent possible.*

**Response:** The parking layout and landscaping plans have been revised to meet this requirement.

10. *Landscape islands should be incorporated into the stormwater management system per the Bridge Street District code.*

**Response:** Due to the size of the islands, grade restrictions of the site, and depth of the proposed storm sewer system we will be unable to provide any effective bio swales in the islands. However, we are addressing water quality volume and treatment in the proposed underground detention facility. We will also provide treatment at each catch basin with inlet filters to remove sediment prior to entering the detention basin. Our proposed system will comply with the state mandate for water quality treatment for the site.

11. *Perimeter buffering would be required along the southern property line adjacent to the parking lot and neighboring development.*

**Response:** A Waiver will need to be requested for this requirement due to limited space. The parking spaces and drive aisles are already at a minimum, and the building width cannot be reduced. We may be able to reduce the southern patios, sidewalk, and lay-by lane by a maximum of total of two feet, which is still not enough to dedicate to the south property line buffering. Alternatively, would could explore a possible fence installation as a buffer. However, we do not feel a buffer would be necessary due to the existing southern properties also being commercially zoned and primarily comprised of rear parking lots for the Extended Stay, Butler Schein Animal Health, and Chase Bank buildings.



STEVEN M. ROBERTS, ARCHITECT  
5803 DESTINY COURT CINCINNATI, OHIO 45237  
513-226-7489 steverobertsarchitect@gmail.com

---

### **Engineering**

12. *Please verify all measurements on civil drawings are correct. Two parking measurements on page C120 include landscape islands and have wrong space count.*

**Response:** Dimensions have been corrected on revised drawings.

13. *Please remove all parking located in the utility easement along Upper Metro Place.*

**Response:** A Waiver will be requested to allow 6+/- parking spaces in the utility easement on the west side of the property. Property Owners accept responsibility for repairing the parking stalls should utility work be required in that areas. Removing 6 parking spaces would reduce to total parking count to 105. However, we would like to consider any alternative locations or parking layouts that would still provide 111 total parking spaces without encroaching into the utility easement and without adding to the proposed lot size.

14. *Please verify if calculations are based on the existing lot or the future lot created after the lot split. There is a discrepancy between the civil drawings and architectural drawings.*

**Response:** Calculations are based on the lot size created after the proposed lot split. The Civil and Architectural drawings have been reconciled.

The foregoing is, to the best of our knowledge, an accurate summary of the items referenced in the review letter and our documents. We look forward to your prompt approval of our submitted documents. Please contact me if you have any further questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Steven M. Roberts, Architect, NCARB