



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, May 17, 2018 | 2:00 pm

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

Other Staff: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Tammy Noble, Senior Planner; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant, and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Dustin Todd, Architectural Alliance (Case 1); Tony Coalt, AIA, Meyers + Associates Architecture (Case 2); Tracy Perry, NBBJ; and Wendy Tressler Jasper, Columbus Metropolitan Library (Case 3); Tom Linzell, M+A Architects (Case 4); Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Mr. Gonzalez Gonzales, Moody Nolan, James Peltier, EMH&T; and John Woods, MKSK (Case 5); and Jule Polletta, Radelet McCarthy Polletta, Architecture and Interior Design; Denise Pampera, Graziano; and Chris Jaeger, Graziano Construction (Case 6).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the May 3, 2018, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

1. **BSD SRN – 16-Bit Arcade 18-028MPR**

6564 Riverside Drive Minor Project Review

JM Rayburn said this application is a proposal for installation of four overhead garage doors, a patio along Longshore Drive, a door along the northern façade, and associated site improvements for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. He said the site is east of Riverside Drive, approximately 275 feet southeast of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Mr. Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site, which is in Block B, Building B1. He presented the proposed site plan that showed the location of the three tenants with 16-Bit Arcade proposed for the unit on the north end, Pins Mechanical is on the other end (south) with both having frontage on Riverside Drive. He said the existing patio along Riverside Drive will remain the same size as approved as part of the site plan. Additionally, he said, the applicant is proposing to add a perimeter bar top railing, which will match in appearance to the previously approved details for the Pins Mechanical patio to the south. He stated the patio meets the requirements of outdoor dining and staff is requesting the applicant coordinate indoor and outdoor furnishings.

Mr. Rayburn presented photographs of the current site conditions for the northwest corner of the B1 building as well as the façade of the west elevation on Riverside Drive. He said the proposed patio use is consistent with the approved accessory uses within the district. He said the patio areas are proposed along frontage on Riverside Drive and Longshore Drive. Mr. Rayburn said the existing Riverside Drive patio will remain the same size as approved as part of the site plan. Mr. Rayburn said a smaller patio area is proposed on the east elevation along Longshore Drive. He explained the proposed patio does not extend into the public right-



of-way and the proposal maintains the required six feet of feet clear pedestrian zone. He said the patio includes a raised bar along the perimeter of the space with seating. The applicant is proposing to match the appearance to the previously approved Pins Mechanical patio to the south. He said the applicant is proposing to add a door along the northern façade to provide another point of access from the outside to which he noted the location with a graphic.

Mr. Rayburn said the proposed garage door system will replace the three previously approved storefront windows along the west elevation as part of the site plan and one garage door on the east elevation. He stated the overhead garage doors maintain approved transparency requirements and will match the appearance of the Pins Mechanical space to the south that was previously approved. He noted glass is a permitted primary material and wood siding is a permitted secondary material, which concluded his presentation.

Mike Altomare inquired about the northwest corner fire connection because he was concerned about access being maintained. Dustin Todd, Architectural Alliance, answered there would be a fence and a gate just for access to that connection and the gate would not be for patrons to use. The ART determined a condition of approval should be added regarding same.

Donna Goss asked how the bi-fold doors work from a safety aspect. Mr. Todd explained one side works like a typical door with a panic bar while the rest is accordion style that runs on a track at the top and the bottom. Ms. Goss asked if it was manually operated and Mr. Todd answered affirmatively. He added they have to account for fresh air requirements.

Mr. Rayburn said approval was recommended for the Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to coordinate the outdoor furniture with the interior furnishings for a high-quality design; and
- 2) That the applicant work with the Washington Township Fire Department to ensure the Fire Department Connection is appropriately secured.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote. Ms. Gilger motioned, Mr. Harpham seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with two conditions. The motion carried and the Minor Project Review was approved.

**2. BSD SCN – Penzone Patio
18-033MPR**

**6645 Village Parkway
Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for a 430-square-foot patio and associated site improvements for an existing salon and spa, zoned Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood. She said the site is on the west side of Village Parkway, northwest of the roundabout with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin reported the (final) Site Plan for the construction of the ±12,000-square-foot building (salon) and associated site improvements were approved on October 13, 2016. She said the Master Sign Plan was approved on December 7, 2017, to allow for a total of three signs for this project. She said the salon is now open and operating and the applicant has yet to obtain the sign permits that were required, prior to the installation of the signs.

Ms. Martin presented the existing conditions of the view from Village Parkway as well as a graphic to show the highlighted proposed patio location. She noted the 430-square-foot patio will contain six moveable lounge chairs, two stationary benches, side tables, planters, mobile fire table, and soft landscaping materials for along the Village Parkway frontage. She added the area will be enclosed with a metal fence with two gates located near the building. She said the applicant has indicated the intent of this patio space is to permit patrons to consume alcoholic beverages outdoors as part of the day spa experience. She reported that staff has noted the fence restricts any circulation outside of the patio and are requesting the sidewalk be extended for continued circulation around the building and to the public right-of-way.

Ms. Martin presented graphics to show examples of the proposed seating, mobile fire table, trash receptacle, fence, and lighting as well as the layout of these amenities. She indicated she advised the applicant to coordinate with the Washington Township Fire Department on the final location and details associated with the operation of the mobile fire table.

Vince Papsidero indicated that since the details of the proposed patio location were not received, there needs to be a condition of approval added that the applicant will work with Staff.

Mr. Papsidero inquired if the patio can be reduced in depth. Ray Harpham noted the proposed patio is located within an existing path with a limited width. Shawn Krawetzki said that since the existing landscaping would be disturbed with the extension of the walk to permit circulation around the patio, the applicant would need to replant a tree and shrubs. He suggested that a condition of approval be added. Tony Coalt, Meyers + Associates Architecture, reported he has given the client options for pathways. He indicated that once the client reveals his preference, he will provide staff with a detailed plan. Mr. Harpham inquired about the grade change. Mr. Coalt answered the grade change was not significant; the walkway will be three feet wide to comply with the ADA regulations. He said there are also light bollards currently around this plaza area that they will need to be sensitive to as well as the landscaping that was just planted. The ART suggested a condition of approval be added for the applicant to maintain as much landscaping materials as possible while installing the pathway, etc.

Mr. Papsidero told the applicant to expect a call from the Law Director's Office because they need to get the sign permits in or they will be required to remove the illegal signs.

Mike Altomare inquired about the mobile fire table. Mr. Coalt explained a small propane tank produces a small flame so this fire table is just a decorative piece and not meant to provide heat. He added it is mobile just so it can be rolled into storage for the winter with the patio furniture.

Mr. Harpham asked why the ART is tasked with approving this application with all these conditions attached. He suggested the ART wait to make a determination until the plans have been revised. Claudia Husak asked if the ART would be more comfortable if the application was tabled until the client decides what to do. Mr. Coalt agreed to table this application.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote on a motion to table. Mr. Harpham motioned, Ms. Goss seconded, and the application was tabled at the request of the applicant.

RECOMMENDATIONS

3. **BSD HTN – CML Dublin Branch and Downtown Dublin Parking Garage - Signs** **17-125MSP** **95 N. High Street** **Master Sign Plan**

Jennifer Rauch said this application is a proposal for a Master Sign Plan for the Columbus Metropolitan Library, Dublin Branch and the Downtown Dublin parking garage. She said the site is west of North High Street, approximately 250 feet northwest of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch reported the temporary construction fence banners for during construction are to be located on N. High Street and North Street. Ms. Husak indicated that this subject has recently been discussed at City Council.

Ms. Rauch said that when the ART reviewed the ground sign previously they requested the heights for both sides of the sign since it will be installed on a slope. Ms. Rauch presented the sign in relation to the building and pedestrians and noted the sign is six feet, six inches on the tall side, and six feet tall on the short side.

Ms. Rauch presented the window graphics that will be applied to the entry doors on North Street and High street. She presented the three street-facing signs on the garage, which are canopy and projecting sign types. She referred to the report for details such as colors, etc.

Ms. Rauch presented a view of the parking garage on North Street and asked the ART if a condition should be added concerning a sign type for graphics. She said that in this instance, the graphic is on the large wall, inside the garage but noted the graphic is far back. Vince Papsidero said he did not think it would be an issue but thought our records should legitimize it. Ms. Husak questioned whether the graphic is a sign or not. She noted there is a stipulation in the Code that states interior signs need to be three feet back from wall or window but in this case, there is no wall/window in front of it as it is visible on the back wall as seen through the opening of the garage. She said there will be times when there are cars parked in front of it, blocking it from view. Ray Harpham suggested the graphic on that back wall is not a deal breaker. Ms. Husak recommended this graphic be considered an interior wall graphic and the ART should determine a size limit.

Ms. Rauch presented the public entrance on Franklin Street and noted the grade change is much shorter.

Ms. Rauch presented the elevation on Rock Cress and noted the location of the bike hub and parking, which is signified by a bicycle on the side of the wall as a projecting/art sign with illumination. She then turned everyone's attention to the painted numbers in the tower signifying the parking level. The ART determined for an appropriate scale, the numerals should be reduced to six feet in height and the font should be the same for all. The ART also noted the colors used for the numerals were bright. Mr. Papsidero said that a height limit of six feet seems reasonable, as wayfinding colors help too.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended to City Council for a Master Sign Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant reduce the height of the proposed stairway numbers to six feet; and
- 2) That the applicant include an additional sign type to allow the internal wall graphics at the North Street entrance.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, and it was unanimous that the request for a Master Sign Plan was to be recommended for approval to City Council with two conditions as stated above.

**4. BSD HTN – Condado Patio
18-032ARB/MPR**

**104 N. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for a 525-square-foot patio and associated site improvements for an existing tenant space in Bridge Park West zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood. She said the site is east of North High Street, approximately 600 feet north of North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site and identified the tenant space within the Bridge Park West development as Building Z1. She presented photographs of the front façade showing the existing conditions of the building looking northeast and southeast. She presented the west façade of the whole building on N. High Street with the proposed façade alterations highlighted, which included overhead doors in place of the existing storefront windows, the removal of stairs on the southern portion of the tenant space, installation of fencing around the patio along with ten-foot-high poles for the overhead lighting, and string catenary lighting above the patio space.

Ms. Martin said the tenant proposes to occupy the entire first floor of this building, which has three entrances. She said the primary entrance where a (future) sign would be installed is the northern most entrance; the central entrance will be used for food service to the patio; and the southernmost entrance will remain as an accessible entrance to the interior of the restaurant. She said the patio is proposed along the west façade of the building in front of the restaurant and at the south end of the patio, she said, it slopes down to two feet below grade of the adjacent sidewalk.

Ms. Martin stated the patio is proposed to contain 11 tables with 32 seats with 24 of the seats located south of the primary entrance in a gated area to allow for the consumption of alcohol per the State of Ohio, Division of Alcohol Control. She indicated staff is concerned the proposed layout, which includes additional tables and chairs outside the fenced area and adjacent to the main tenant entrance, may create a conflict between servers and waiting patrons. Furthermore, she said, the patio plan may limit the mobility and accessibility of patrons with disabilities as chairs will likely encroach into the walkway. Therefore, she said, staff recommends the applicant eliminate the dining tables at the north end, adjacent to the primary entrance. She said the proposed patio furniture is made of a dark wood with metal accents and the tops will be artistically painted in a geometric design.

Ms. Martin stated a catenary light system is proposed, which would be supported by six, 10-foot tall metal columns painted to match the existing black railing and proposed black, metal fence. She added the applicant is proposing a frosted bulb with a white LED light at 12 inches on center and an output of 91 lumen per square foot. She indicated there are no umbrellas proposed and the patio will be open and uncovered. She reported that several existing patios within the Historic District incorporate a similar lighting system.

Ms. Martin said three storefront windows are proposed to be replaced with three garage doors, which have an alternative mullion design. She explained the garage doors will not provide indoor-outdoor access to the patio space because they do not go all the way to the ground but rather will act as an amenity in warm weather. She reported the applicant revised the garage door selection to address ART's previous concerns regarding the mullion pattern (Overhead Door Model 511); however, the garage door design is still

inconsistent with the base building across the extent of the western façade and Overhead Door Model 521 has been recommended. She said this model has a thinner mullion and staff recommends it be painted a dark color to be less visible within the first floor. She presented a picture of a door to serve as an example of what is desired.

Ms. Martin stated that while signs are not part of this application, all signs will need to meet the approved Master Sign Plan for Bridge Park West and will require a review and approval of sign permits, prior to the installation of the signs.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for the Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant use Overhead Door 521 in a dark finish, subject to Planning's approval prior to building permitting; and
- 2) That the applicant eliminate the patio seating north of the north entrance to the tenant space.

Shawn Krawetzki inquired about service for the two-top table to the far southern end of the patio, next to the fence. He said if the patio is fully occupied, there is not enough circulation. Mr. Krawetzki said if the patrons or servers cannot easily approach a table to provide/receive service, this patio will not be fully functional with the proposed layout. Tom Linzell, M+A Architects, said the tenant wants as much seating as possible, but agreed functionality is important.

Claudia Husak inquired about the amount of reflection on the glass because it appeared as if it was mirrored. Mr. Linzell said the glass of existing doors has the same reflectivity. Ms. Husak suggested a condition of approval be added, as follows:

- 3) The glass in the garage doors match the reflectiveness of the existing windows.

Mr. Papsidero asked if that was achievable. Mr. Linzell said he would look into this question, but thought it was possible.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, and the Minor Project Review was recommended for approval with three condition to the Architectural Review Board and would be forwarded to the ARB for their meeting on May 25, 2018.

**5. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D
18-007SPR**

**PID: 273-012703
Site Plan Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for a mixed-use development for Block D of the Bridge Park Development, including four buildings with approximately 110,000 square feet of office space, 44,000 square feet of retail space, 35,500 square feet of commercial space, 186 residential units, and a parking garage with 671 spaces. She said the site is southeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site in context to the existing Bridge Park Development, the proposed Development Plan outlining the roadway network with building pads and lot configuration, and the Landscape Plan for all the open spaces included in this block. She noted where Longshore Street bisects the site running north and south from Tuller Ridge Drive to John Shields Parkway and Larimer Street that

connects from Mooney Street to Longshore Street. She said this proposal is similar to the Basic Plan but contains significantly more detail on materials, architectural design, and open space design.

Ms. Burchett provided an overview of the individual buildings starting with D1, which is a Corridor Building with six stories; commercial on the first floor, office on the second, and 43 residential condominiums on floors three thru six. She said D2 is a Corridor Building with six stories; retail on the first floor and office space on floors two thru six with balconies on various sides facing Riverside Drive and Longshore Street. D3, she said, is a Corridor Building with six stories; commercial on the first floor and 83 residential units on floors two thru six with an elevated courtyard open space facing Larimer Street. Lastly, she said, D4/D5 is a Corridor Building with six stories; commercial on the first floor with a loading dock from Tuller Ridge Drive and a parking garage on floors two thru six. She said the garage is lined with 60 residential units on floors one through five, due to the grade change, that face Mooney Street and Larimer Street. She concluded by noting new materials are being introduced on buildings D3 and D4/D5, which are textured aluminum metal tiles.

Ms. Burchett noted that ART has reviewed the project previously and the applicant has provided materials for final review with a recommendation by the ART on May 31, 2018, and a determination by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) at their June 7, 2018, meeting.

Ms. Burchett noted the locations of the proposed buildings on the site plan. Claudia Husak asked the applicant if the notch in the boundary identified the right-of-way at the pedestrian tunnel. Miguel Gonzalez confirmed that this is the location of the right-of-way for the tunnel.

Ms. Burchett stated that the project was informally reviewed by the PZC at their meeting on May 3, 2018. While the Commission was supportive, she said, there were comments regarding the pedestrian circulation around the pedestrian tunnel, the potential for an open market in Building D4, the durability of the proposed aluminum tile, and the private open space for the benefit of Building D3. She noted that the applicant had revised the elevations to remove the aluminum tile at the ground level to address concerns of durability. Ms. Burchett presented the west elevation of Building D2 showing the location of the pedestrian tunnel and canopy of D2. She presented D3, noting this building was primarily residential with commercial at the ground level. She highlighted the private elevated open space.

Ms. Burchett presented elevations of Building D4/5 noting the potential market space, although no tenant is confirmed so far. She mentioned that the building would contain commercial and residential liners for two full sides of the parking garage, and the unlined portions would require Conditional Use approval along Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive.

Ms. Burchett stated that during the analysis, several Waivers were identified, several of which are consistent with previously approved Waivers reviewed by the ART. There were some that staff had identified that would be helpful to have the ART's review and feedback. Beginning with D1, she noted, a Waiver would be required for a roof change after 80 feet. She presented the west elevation showing a portion of the building that would require this Waiver and questioned whether there should be a continuous roof line at this elevation. She noted that staff had commented that due to the high visibility on Riverside Drive, this entrance should be designed as a primary entrance with details that highlight the entrance and a type of ornamentation should be considered.

Mr. Papsidero had asked the applicant if they considered creating a vertical element to address the continuous roof line. He suggested making the break more prominent. Mr. Gonzalez had said they would consider adding this element and mentioned that the raised feature on the east elevation can be seen through the west elevation giving an interesting perspective.

Ms. Husak asked whether the limestone used at the base of the building is a material anywhere else in Bridge Park. Mr. Gonzalez answered the limestone was a new material.

Ms. Burchett presented the northwest elevation of Building D2 noting that there were mixed comments from the PZC regarding the treatment of the northwest corner. She noted that some Commissioners were supportive of the design and others expressed concerns with pedestrian circulation at this prominent corner and that there is no entrance to the building at this corner.

Mr. Papsidero mentioned that some drawings appear inconsistent, particularly with the colonnades and the setback of the building from the right-of-way. Mr. Hunter noted that some of the piers have been removed and that Mr. Gonzalez's is working on changes to the drawings. Ms. Burchett asked if there was no longer a covered walkway along this portion of the western elevation. Mr. Gonzalez confirmed this. Colleen Gilger questioned whether the first floor was primarily retail. Mr. Hunter replied affirmatively.

Ms. Husak noted that the area between the glass wall of Building D2 and the piers is 9 feet at the narrowest area and at the widest it is a little over 10 feet. She emphasized that this appears narrow.

Mr. Papsidero questioned whether the canopy could be translucent so as not to feel so heavy and enclosed. Mr. Hunter said that the canopy is 18 feet in height. Mr. Gonzalez mentioned that the canopy does not encroach the right-of-way.

Ms. Burchett presented a rendering of Building D3 noting that the PZC was very supportive in regard to the materials and overall design. She mentioned that Waivers on the north elevation for blank wall limitations would be required along the greenway. A Waiver would also be required for the number of entrances on this elevation. The applicants are asking for a reduction to allow for one residential main entrance and not individual entrances to the units. Mr. Gonzalez noted they are addressing blank wall issues with materials and vegetation. Mr. Papsidero expressed concern with the lack of entrances and questioned whether this was a missed opportunity for residents. He noted that this elevation now feels like side yard for the structure and not a prominent façade facing the public greenway.

Mr. Hunter noted that that the u-shape building pulls the entrances to one side of the building and they would need to add an elevator and stairs and would lose units in the building. He further mentioned that the footprint hugs the right-of-way and the tenant space at the northwest corner may bring more activity and they may ask for windows to provide additional transparency.

Ms. Husak questioned whether the entrance area issue is due to a grade change.

Ms. Husak noted that staff perceives the first level of Mooney Street as not active and that it is not inviting. Mr. Gonzalez noted the main entrance and some balconies along the elevation. Ms. Husak noted during the Code revision process, the Form-based Code consultant had made that comment that for urban spaces, not every single street has to be active and asked the ART for their opinion. Mr. Papsidero mentioned that this becomes a residential street and felt more internal, which is not necessarily a negative from a residential experience.

Ms. Burchett noted that Building D4/5 would require Waivers for blank walls and the number of entrances in the residential liner. Mr. Hunter described the open market concept in this building and that it would be similar to the North Market. He mentioned there was a good conversation at the PZC regarding loading areas. Ms. Husak noted that the applicant would need to consider refuse collection, particularly with this use to which the applicant agreed.

Mr. Papsidero inquired if there would be any space for vendors to spill out onto the sidewalk. Mr. Gonzalez noted that they had to maximize the footprint due to the lot layout.

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

**6. BSD SCN – Residences at Tuller Heights
18-021BPR**

**PID: 273-008811
Basic Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this proposal is for a four-story, approximately 140,000-square-foot retirement facility consisting of approximately 130 residential units - 20 of which may be allocated for personal care, two dining areas, two studio spaces, and a fitness center. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak said the applicants from Pittsburgh were present: Julie Polletta, architect for Radelet McCarthy Polletta Architecture and Interior Design introduced herself; Denise Pampera, representative for Graziano, the developer and contractor introduced herself; and Chris Jaeger, with Graziano Construction introduced himself. Ms. Husak explained this Basic Plan Review was going before the Commission this evening because the applicant wanted them to weight in before going on to City Council.

Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of the site and noted that condominiums are being considered to be adjacent to this property. She pointed out the residents of Grey Stone Mews are usually very vocal about projects and this proposal is not exciting them so that is a good thing – they are likely not to oppose it.

Ms. Husak briefly went through the BSD process and said the final reviewing body to make a determination will be City Council.

Ms. Husak showed the existing conditions from the northeast view looking down John Shields Parkway and the northwest view from the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed site plan with a graphic of the site superimposed onto the aerial view of the site from a geographical standpoint to show the frontage on John Shield's Parkway and Village Parkway. She explained a new street will be going in straight from John Shield's Parkway to Tuller Road and another to cut across from that new street to Village Parkway, running right along this site and that is where this facility will be accessed.

Ms. Husak indicated there is a potential for a Parking Waiver to be requested as the Code requires more parking spaces than what is needed for this facility. She pointed out the different areas that signify what that space is used for, including the mechanicals. She said the residents' common areas will all be located at street level and highly visible facing the public street so the life of the residents can be seen. She said outdoor patio seating will be included for the Café and Bistro-style dining areas that wrap around the tower. Other interior spaces clustered on the ground level, she said, include a pub-style recreation area, planting area, art studio, library/lounge, salon, and fitness center all at the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She pointed out the residential units are on the opposite corner, which is John Shields Parkway and a future street. She recalled the applicant had said the apartment units are for residents living independently and for residents with personal care needs.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed elevations to provide the applicant's concept of the architecture and pointed out the tower feature on the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway where the applicant anticipates a lot of activity both inside and out.

Ms. Husak stated that in the submitted renderings, the architecture looked flat and not as articulated as she would have liked to have seen for this prominent location. She noted a lot of brick of different colors was proposed and asked the architect to speak further on the design. Julie Polletta, architect for Radelet McCarthy Polletta Architecture and Interior Design explained that a portion of the building has four stories whereas there are three stories on other sections to adjust for the grade change. She said gray metal panels were introduced for the fourth stories and gray brick is proposed for creating the residential porches. Ms. Husak suggested landscaping could go a long way for softening up the streetscape.

Ms. Polletta indicated the tower corner will be a very public space and they would like to introduce a plaza area with perhaps a piece of public art. She said the plaza at the other opposite corner relates to the indoor dining spaces, which may require a Waiver. Lastly, she pointed out the proposed rooftop terrace.

Ms. Husak said multi-family units are permitted in this area and this is what this residential community is classified as and there is no requirement to have mixed-use on the three-story portions.

Ms. Husak said "Aging in Place" is a concept being embraced right now so that is good for the applicant. She also noted that walkability, open spaces, and architecture are on the forefront.

Shawn Krawetzki said he would like to see more push/pull with the facades. He said the balconies project beyond the façade but he would like to see them out even further. He suggested the parapet at the corner could also be pushed out further. He said the tower feature could be taller to provide more prominence on that corner.

Ms. Goss asked the applicant to elaborate on their needs for emergency services and recommended they talk to the Township Trustees.

Denise Pampena, representative for Graziano, indicated that everyone seems to have a different idea as to the meaning of "Age in Place". She explained that this is a lifestyle and socialization is provided. She emphasized that this prominent location and scale of the proposed facility will provide both visual interest and opportunities for social interaction at the street level. She said those older residents want an active, vibrant life instead of just sitting somewhere, having a nurse visit weekly. Vince Papsidero emphasized this concept is for a multi-family building but geared to a certain age group and no skilled nursing is included, he pointed out.

Ms. Rauch asked how they plan to activate the street because the elderly facility called The Grand (that opened nearby) is all internal. Ms. Pampena stated that is the difference. They want their residents to be out and about and the porches will enable that. She restated the Café and Bistro-style dining areas will have outdoor patio seating on this prominent corner. Mr. Papsidero indicated that is important to emphasize. He 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 4:00 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team May 31, 2018.