



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, March 15, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner/Chief Building Official; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Logan Stang, Planner I; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Michael Hendershot, Civil Engineer II; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant; Jimmy Hoppel, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Brian Galli, Architectural Alliance (Case 1); Andreas Larisch, M+A Architects; Nathan Harrington, Osborn Engineering; and Michael Villipoto, TMG Adventure Parks, Inc. (Case 2); and Brian Sell and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan (Case 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the February 15 meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTION/DETERMINATION

1. **BSD SRN – Z Cucina Patio Expansion 18-008MPR**

6584 Riverside Drive Minor Project Review

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for a patio expansion for an existing tenant space in Block B of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood and is on the east side of Riverside Drive, approximately 200 feet southeast of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented the aerial view of the site to show the location as it relates to the other blocks and the proposed site plan that delineates the layout of the proposed patio. She reported the existing patio area that was approved with the original site is along portions of the western and southern facades of the building and the proposed patio would be adjacent to the existing open space in between buildings B1 and B2.

Ms. Burchett said 550 square feet has been added for the proposed patio but no canopies or awnings were proposed. She explained the proposed landscaping planter boxes are made of steel and will limit/enclose the area. She said a 6-foot encroachment into open space areas is permitted under the development agreement and the Law Director's office has supported this encroachment. Ms. Burchett said the patio includes outdoor seating and presented the proposed furniture and fixtures; which includes Brazilian teak table tops with a metal disc base and cushioned exterior side chairs. She added no outdoor speakers or advertising are proposed at this time.

Ray Harpham asked if the only entrance to this area was through the restaurant to which Ms. Burchett answered affirmatively.



Claudia Husak noted the proposed expansion went beyond the 6-foot allowance; the expansion is actually 10 feet, 1 inch. She reported that Staff had concerns about the patio extending out from the building when in fact this patio would not extend past the existing architectural precast concrete curb and would just fill the portion that was notched out from the building originally. Vince Papsidero said it serves as an alcove while leaving the integrity of the open space protected. Ms. Burchett said the existing pedestrian zone will be maintained through the open space as the patio is flush with the outer edge of the building. She reported that the Zoning Inspectors have reviewed the existing trees and determined that they would not thrive in the approved location and were supportive of their removal.

Donna Goss inquired about the seating capacity as she wanted to ensure there was enough room for circulation and ADA access. Ms. Burchett said the applicant is proposing the number of seats as shown on the floor plan, which consist of three, two-top tables and three four-top tables that equate to 18 seats. She said clearance accessibility must meet standards with the proper egress which is good and this would be further verified with the building permit.

Mr. Papsidero asked what the General Staff Review comments were of this proposal. Ms. Burchett reported additional egress for fire was requested and has since been addressed by the applicant. Mr. Papsidero asked if the applicant was meeting requirements for landscaping to which Ms. Burchett answered affirmatively.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for a Minor Project Review with no conditions.

The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a motion to approve the Minor Project with no conditions. Mr. Harpham motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and the vote was unanimous to approve the Minor Project Review.

CASE REVIEW

2. ID-2 – Urban Air Adventure Park 17-101WID-DP

7679 & 7685 Dublin Plain-City Road Development Plan Review

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for two, one-story, 20,000-square-foot indoor entertainment and recreational use facilities for an approximately 2-acre parcel and a 2.88-acre parcel, both located in the West Innovation District and zoned Research Flex District. He said the site is south of Dublin Plain-City Road, approximately 750 feet west of the intersection with Cosgray Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.042(D).

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and reported this was last reviewed at the end of last year and the applicant has returned with a revised submittal. He presented the site plan that was proposed in December 2017. He said the zoning code contains a size limitation for this use and therefore the development will be constructed on two parcels with a single shared access. He said the applicant is working directly with ODOT on the location of the access and installation of a left-turn lane as the right-of-way is under ODOT's control. He said the location of the parking and the distance of the building from SR 161 has been a concern because code requires that parking be minimized in front of the building.

Mr. Stang said based on previous discussions and the concerns outlined by Staff that the applicant proposed two conceptual site options for review. He presented the revised site plan and noted the courtyard space was changed to distribute parking to the sides and back of the building and a continuous drive aisle was added to improve circulation. He said Staff previously had concerns with the dead end drive aisle on earlier iterations of the site and that the loop now resolves that concern.

Mr. Stang said the retention basin was originally proposed as a triangle shape at the rear of the site and that design has been revised to wrap around the south eastern portion of the site. He said additionally the applicant will use underground storage to supplement the pond.

Mr. Stang stated the development will be constructed in two phases; the first phase is planned for the east side of the site including the shared access and the second building will be constructed shortly thereafter. He said there is now a mixed seating area and open lawn area proposed as well as additional pedestrian connections to the parking. He said the main entrances for each building directly face Dublin-Plain City Road.

Mr. Stang said the architecture for building one has mainly stayed the same and presented all four elevations; whereas, the architecture for building two has been changed slightly. He presented an illustration of the previous design for the north elevation of building two as well as the new design to demonstrate relocation of the entrance and architectural detailing. He noted the windows were slightly modified and the overhead door was moved to the rear of the building with the least visibility.

Mr. Stang reported that as Staff reviewed the most recent proposal they provided the applicant with a number of comments such as verifying parking calculations, coordinating plan sets, verifying the dumpster location, providing an AutoTurn exhibit, and updated stormwater management information.

Mr. Stang reported the applicant has worked on these issues but they will still need Administrative Departures and a Parking Plan. He said specifically there are discrepancies with the location of the dumpster and they need to ensure it is not located within the drive aisle. He reported that Fire completed their analysis and the temporary turn for phase 1 does not meet Code as it is a gravel turn around. Mr. Stang said Staff has suggested that a curve be added towards the second building to meet requirements as fire apparatus must be able to circulate throughout the whole site with Phase 2.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the agreement with the roundabout project and how the improvements on the roadway need to be in line with this project. Andreas Larisch, M+A Architects answered he was not sure as to the timing but they have been working closely with ODOT.

Mr. Stanford emphasized this is something they need to coordinate as they should be on the same path as far as timing, etc. He requested a condition be written by the applicant for timing because when an agreement is in process, full approval needs to be in place. He encouraged the applicant to work with the City's engineer, Michael Hendershot on writing the condition. Nathan Harrington, Osborn Engineering, said they are working on it with ODOT, Union County, and Dublin.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the overhead door being moved to the south side of the site and wanted to know how that door would be used relative to the loading space. Mr. Larisch answered the door would not be used for public access or constant deliveries; the door will be used to get the initial equipment into the building and then again when anything large needs to be replaced. He emphasized it is not a traditional loading dock and they will not be getting deliveries on a regular basis. Mr. Stanford affirmed the overhead door would be used operationally infrequently.

Mr. Stanford said utilities are connected on two separate parcels and easements will be needed in case one parcel is sold off in the future.

Mr. Larisch asked if there was an update on a timeline for the (future) roundabout planned for Cosgray and Dublin-Plain City Road. Mr. Stanford said he could not yet provide a timeline.

Colleen Gilger inquired about the parking numbers because Code requires 300+ parking spaces. Mr. Larisch said they have 120 which they believe is plenty for a similar size type of use and their analysis backs that statement. Ms. Gilger said she was concerned with the number of party rooms proposed because that would bring in a lot of business and 120 spaces might not be enough in combination with the other activities offered. She said she has witnessed this first hand at several other places in the region. Mr. Larisch said the second building has more parking and the activity offered there limits the number of people that can be there at one time so the second parking lot may serve as overflow parking for the first building, if needed.

Vince Papsidero thanked the applicant for revising their layout based on the comments from staff. He added it was very well done and staff appreciates the efforts made by the applicants. He asked how the edges of the plaza space will be handled between the two phases because he does not want the courtyard to look unfinished during that time. Mr. Larisch explained it would end in an appropriate spot so that the detailing can be continued with the second phase.

Donna Goss asked about the location of the main entrance; if it was still at the northwest corner. Mr. Larisch said it was and they are protecting it by adding bollards at the end of the entrance since the building aligns with the access drive.

Mr. Larisch said the client really wants to get going on this project. He asked if something like changing shrubs would be an issue that would prevent them from moving forward for a determination. Mr. Papsidero asked if the applicant had any other concerns or needed any more feedback from the ART. Mr. Larisch answered he was not concerned about anything major.

Mr. Stang indicated the ART could make a determination on April 5, 2018, as long as the applicant was able to submit the required materials by then, as there are still larger items to work through. Jack Reynolds, Smith and Hale, has been working with legal staff on preparing the easement documents which should be addressed before the determination.

Mr. Stanford again encouraged the applicant to work with Mr. Hendershot for any site engineering issues and to follow up with Union County to get timing questions answered.

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

INTRODUCTION

3. BSD SRN – Hen Quarter Patio 18-013MPR

6628 Riverside Drive Minor Project Review

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for a 525-square-foot patio and associated site improvements for an existing tenant space in Block C of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood and is on the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and pointed out the location of building C2 relative to Block C. She said Bridge Park Avenue has a cycle track that is 5 feet wide and a pedestrian way that is also 5 feet wide so no high volume vehicular traffic is expected in that immediate area.

Ms. Burchett said a canopy is proposed to cover the patio with a roller shade system with vinyl acrylic covering three exposed sides to shelter patrons from the elements, similar to what is used at Cap City Diner. She said the shades will require a Waiver to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). Ms. Burchett reported that there were a couple of comments made at the General Staff Review as the planters appear to be encroaching into the right-of-way and they were concerned about drainage. Brian Sell, Moody Nolan, provided information on the downspouts that would handle rooftop drainage. He also said the patio is elevated and would only encroach four inches. He explained the planters are centered between the posts and the line of planters would create a "wall" at the property line but they are not allowing the overhead to exceed the patio. He added the new plans illustrate that clearer.

Aaron Stanford strongly recommended that the applicant eliminate any encroachment. He asked if the applicant could just modify or adjust his layout to fix that four-inch encroachment.

Ms. Burchett agreed with Mr. Stanford and emphasized there should not be any restriction to that right-of-way because the pedestrian access is already condensed. She said usually the pedestrian walkway and cycle track combined are 12 feet wide and in this instance it is only 10 feet.

Shawn Krawetzki asked if this issue could be resolved by pushing the posts back so the planters could still align. He also inquired about the width of the planters as well as their thickness. Mr. Sell said they use sheet steel for planters so there is a slim thickness and currently they are proposed to be flush with the posts.

Ms. Burchett asked if air would pass through the custom filigree patio screen on the west elevation at the entrance corner that extends to the top of the awning. She noted the screen design includes a logo on the west elevation. She added there are canopy-mounted aluminum channel face lit letters on top of each of the covered patio facades which do not meet the requirements of the Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Husak said the proposed vinyl acrylic panels will require a Waiver and encouraged the applicant to remove the logo from the screen otherwise it would require approval under a Master Sign Plan. She also noted that there have been issues with certain establishments using a similar vinyl product where the applicant, upon conditional approval, agreed to have those panels up when patrons are not using the patio space. She said instead they have used the patio as an extended service area keeping the panels down and the tables set regardless of patrons being present.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, described the filigree screen as a fenestration that will also be visible at night.

Mr. Stanford said he is concerned about the design on the screen where the premium views are of the pedestrian bridge and river. He asked if the applicant would consider installing it on the east end instead to keep this view unobstructed. Ms. Umbarger said this also provides shading from the sun on the west side and they envision this will be very nice as the sun is setting. Mr. Sell said the applicant likes it on this end as it also makes that section more private. The ART asked if the applicant would consider having the filigree design on both ends of the canopy, if they are not interested in switching it from west to east.

Mr. Krawetzki asked about the filigree screen covering the canopy band between the awning and the chicken logo. He asked if the screen in the transition space could be eliminated so the canopy band is continued on all sides. Mr. Sells reported at one time the filigree was separated but they revised it to appear as one solid piece. Mr. Harpham asked if they put the screen vertically instead of angled across that band they could produce a shadow line along the top of the canopy.

Mr. Sell inquired about next steps. Ms. Burchett explained the ART would be making a recommendation on the materials, as part of the Minor Project Review that could be determined April 5 after the case review.

She said if the applicant stays with the vinyl screens as part of their proposal, they would need to get approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission at their meeting on May 3, 2018.

Mr. Sell asked if the shades be separated from the MPR and just the structure is included so they can move forward with construction and not have to wait on a decision about the screens from the Commission. He indicated they would rather propose this Minor Project Review without the shades so there is no delay and the Waiver for the screens could come forward later. Ms. Burchett recommended then that the drawings not show vinyl shades for the review to which Mr. Sell agreed.

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.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on April 19, 2018.