



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, May 31, 2018 | 2:00 pm

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

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Nichole Martin, Planner I; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Logan Stang, Planner I; Sierra Saumenig, Planning Assistant, and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Teri Umbarger and Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan; and James Peltier, EMH&T (Case 2).

Donna Goss called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm. She asked if there were any amendments to the May 17, 2018, meeting minutes. The minutes were approved as presented.

Ms. Goss noted the Minor Modifications that were deemed appropriate by the Planning Director.

1. Bridge Park, Building B4
2. Local Cantina
3. Bridge Park, Buildings B1 & B2
4. Z Cucina
5. Bridge Park, Building B2 (Sweetwater's)

Ms. Goss asked the ART if they had any issues or questions regarding the above Minor Modifications. [There were none.]

DETERMINATION

**1. 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 review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin said the ART last reviewed this proposal May 17 and were concerned with the circulation outside of the patio; the grade change as it would apply to a walkway; and the operation of the mobile fire table.

Ms. Martin presented the aerial view of the site and the existing conditions as viewed from Village Parkway as well as a graphic to show the highlighted proposed patio location.

Ms. Martin presented an amended site plan that includes the new walk around the patio that provides a connection to the existing walk as well as a connection to the public right-of-way. This plan, she said, also included details of the landscape plan that showed a tree and plantings to be relocated and the light bollard



and trash receptacle that were to remain. She reported the applicant also provided the metal fence and post detail with two gates to be located near the building. She noted the proposed 430-square-foot patio would contain six moveable lounge chairs, two stationary benches, side tables, planters, a mobile fire table, and string lights overhead all remain unchanged.

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

- 1) That the applicant coordinate with the Washington Township Fire Department to ensure safe seating with the operation of the fire pit; and
- 2) That the applicant provide verification the pedestrian path slope is in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) at Building Permitting.

Ms. Goss asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She called for a vote on a motion to approve the Minor Project Review with two conditions as stated above. Mr. Harpham motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and the Minor Project Review was approved.

RECOMMENDATION

2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D 18-007SPR-DP-CU

PID: 273-012703 Site Plan and Development Plan Reviews Conditional Use

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 Site Plan and Development Plan Reviews and a Conditional Use 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 along with the proposed Development Plan outlining the roadway network with building pads and lot configuration for the four buildings. 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.

Ms. Burchett reported that the Site Plan was informally reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission at their meeting on May 3, 2018. While the Commission was supportive overall, she said, there were comments regarding the pedestrian circulation around the pedestrian tunnel, the pedestrian experience along any blank walls at the street level and the Commission's preference of the private open space for Building D3 to be open and accessible to the public. Lastly, she reported the Commission appreciated the continuation of high-quality architecture.

Ms. Burchett said that while the Basic Plan Review has been approved, the applicant has furthered developed the architecture and site improvement details, which can all be found in the Planning Report.

Ms. Burchett began reviewing the nine Administrative Departures that were identified during the analysis with graphics that highlighted the following items: tower width, front property line coverage, required building zone, façade requirements, vertical increments, required change in roof plane, minimum primary

façade materials, ground story height, and upper story transparency, noting the buildings which these departures corresponded.

Ms. Burchett then explained the 33 Waivers identified for the four buildings included in this proposal, which she represented on graphics to show the location of the Waivers. These included parapet wrapping, horizontal shadow lines, tower quantity, height, and location, permitted primary façade materials, vertical transitions, multiple vertical materials, transitions of same material, entrance design, window requirements, front property line coverage, front required building zone, required build zone treatment, corner side required building zone, lot coverage loading spaces, parking entry, access, and design, number of frontages, transparency, vertical increments, entrance location, number of entrances, horizontal façade divisions, primary materials, encroachments, and blank wall limitations.

Claudia Husak noted that Block A, which contained only three buildings, had a similar number of Waivers and therefore the 33 Waivers for four buildings is not uncommon.

Ms. Burchett presented elevations of Building D4/5 and explained a Conditional Use is identified for portions of two unlined sides of the parking garage along Longshore Street and Tuller Ridge Drive. She noted the building does contain commercial and residential liners for two full sides of the parking garage.

Ms. Burchett said a Fee-in-Lieu is requested for the 0.56 acres of off-site open space. She explained that per Code, open space is calculated based on the number of units and not the size of units. With the mix of residential unit sizes some of which are micro units under 500 square feet, which is a disproportional to other residential developments with larger units. Additionally, the proximity to public parks within 600 feet provides for usable, quality open space for the residents.

Ms. Burchett said the Development Plan Review is consistent with all applicable review criteria.

Ms. Burchett said there is a proposed Parking Plan to allow for 735 parking spaces where 1,087 spaces would be required and a Site Plan Review with eight conditions, which she reviewed:

- 1) That the applicant not use highly reflective glass, spandrel, or heavily tinted glass to meet the minimum transparency requirements;
- 2) That if gated entries are proposed, the applicant will work with staff to provide the required stacking spaces without encroaching the public right-of-way;
- 3) That the applicant work with staff to ensure that all off-street loading spaces shall be at least 12 feet wide and meet the minimum requirements;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to provide required building foundation landscaping along all sides of a building not otherwise occupied by entrances, sidewalk, parking, loading areas, or similar areas;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to ensure ground-mounted mechanical equipment is properly screened and is consistent with the design throughout the development;
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to include lighting within the pedestrianways;
- 7) That the applicant record an easement for the encroachment of the bridges to the satisfaction of the City Engineer; and
- 8) That the applicant revises the building plan to ensure all door-swing areas will not encroach into the public right-of-way to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(5)(b)(4).

Ms. Burchett noted that some of the conditions above are for Code requirements that were not specifically identified with submittal items that would need to be confirmed at the time of building permitting. She said the applicants were present to answer any questions.

James Peltier, EMH&T, asked for clarification on Condition #3. Ms. Burchett said she was referring to the loading area inside the garage.

In conclusion, Ms. Burchett recommended approval of nine Administrative Departures:

1. §153.062 (D)(4)(b) Roof Type ~ Tower Width: Required - The width of a tower shall not exceed its height; Requested – The south tower of Building D4/D5 is proposed at 12 feet wide, with the height at 11 feet.
2. §153.062 (O)(5)(a)(1) Mixed Use Building Type ~ Front Property Line Coverage: Required - Minimum 95% front property line coverage; Requested - Building D1 to be 92% at Tuller Ridge Drive.
3. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) ~ Front Required Building Zone: Required - 0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 10-20 feet; Requested - To provide ±16 feet at Riverside Drive for Building D2.
4. §153.062 (O)(5)(d)(4) Mixed Use Building Type ~ Façade Requirements. Vertical Increments: Required - Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet; Requested - Building D1 to be ±48 feet at two locations on the east elevation.
5. §153.062 (O)(12)(d)(4) Parking Structure Building Type ~ Façade Requirements - Vertical Increments: Required - Vertical increments shall be no greater than 30 feet; Requested - Building D5 to be ±33 feet on the south elevation and ±31 feet on the west elevation.
6. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) ~ Change in Roof Plane: Required - change at 80 feet; Requested - To allow no more than ±84 feet on the north and south elevations of Building D1.
7. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(5) ~ Minimum Primary Façade Materials: Required - 80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass; Requested:
Building D1: to allow no less than ±73% on the west façade, ±76% on the south façade, ±77% on the east façade, and ±74% on the north façade;
Building D2: no less than ±74% on the north façade, ±71% on the south façade;
Building D3: no less than ±61% on the south façade; and ±72% on the west façade; and,
Building D5: no less than ±78% on the west façade.
8. §153.062 – Height (b) ~ Ground Story Height: Required - The ground story shall be between 12 feet and 16 feet in height; Requested - To allow for a ground story height of no less than 10 feet at the east end of Building D3; no less than 10 feet at the east end and 17 feet on the west end of Building D4.
9. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) - Upper Story Transparency: Required - Minimum street façade upper story transparency of 30%; Requested - To allow for a transparency of ±27% on the east elevation of Building D4.

Ms. Burchett recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 33 Waivers:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(b) – Parapet Wrapping
Parapets shall wrap all sides of the building.
Request: To allow parapet not to be wrapped on all sides of Building D4/D5.
2. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Shadow Lines.
Parapets shall wrap all sides of the building.
Request: Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and to define the top of the parapet Buildings D1, D3, and D4/D5.
3. §153.062 (D)(4)(a) Roof Type Requirements - Tower Quantity.
Only one tower is allowed per building.

Request. Allow for three towers for Building D4/D5.

4. §153.062 (D)(4)(a) Roof Type Requirements and 153.062 (O)(5)(g)(12) - Tower Height.
Maximum height shall not exceed the height of an additional upper floor of the building to which the tower is applied. Maximum of 14 feet.
Request. Allow for north tower to be ±18 feet in height on Building D4/D5.
5. §153.062 (D)(4)(b) Roof Type Requirements. Tower Location.
Permitted on facades only at terminal vistas, corners at two principal frontage streets, and/or adjacent to an open space type.
Request. Allow for Building D4/D5 towers to not be located at a terminal vista Principal Frontage Street, or adjacent to an open space.
6. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(5) – Permitted Primary Façade Materials.
Facades not visible from Street. A combination of Primary and Secondary materials shall be used. Use of a secondary material for an entire façade is not permitted.
Request: To allow secondary materials on the west and south facades of Corridor Building D4; to allow the Thin Brick on Building D3; Thin Brick on Building D4; and Thin Brick on Building D5.
7. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(a) – Vertical Transitions
Vertical transition shall occur at inside corners.
Request: To allow fiber cement panel and aluminum metal tile transitions at the same plane for Building D3 on the north elevation; and thin brick and fiber cement panel transitions on the same plane for Building D4/D5 on the north, south, and east elevations on the fifth floor.
8. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(b) – Multiple Vertical Materials.
Where proposed, the 'heavier' material in appearance shall be incorporated below the 'lighter' material.
Request: To allow for tongue and groove wood siding below brick on the north, south, and west elevations of Building D4/D5.
9. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(c) – Transitions of Same Material.
Transitions between different colors of same material shall occur at locations deemed architecturally appropriate.
Request: To allow for brick colors transition horizontally on the same place between on the 3rd through 5th stories on Building D2 All Elevations; brick colors transition vertically on the same place between the 1st and 2nd stories on Building D3 North, South and East Elevations; and brick colors transition vertically on the same plane between 1st and 2nd stories on Building D4/D5 East and North Elevations.
10. §153.062 – Building Types (F)(3)(a) – Entrance Design.
All principal entrances are to be at a pedestrian scale, effectively address the street and be given prominence on the façade through the use of architectural features.
Request: To allow the design of the proposed principal entrance to Building D3, to not be prominently articulated/differentiated from other entrances through architectural features.
11. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(d) – Windows.
Windows may be wood, anodized aluminum, metal-clad or vinyl-clad wood, steel, or fiberglass.
Request: To allow for composite frame windows in Buildings D3 and D4/D5.

12. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(f) – Windows.
Windows within masonry walls shall have architecturally appropriate lintels and sills.
Request: To allow for no lintels or sills within masonry walls on Buildings D1 and D2.
13. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows.
Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one by four trim or brick mould casing.
Request: To allow for no trim or casing for fiber cement walls in Building D3; and a projecting precast concrete sill for windows in fiber cement siding walls on Building D4/D5.
14. §153.062 (O)(5)(a)(1) Mixed Use Building Type. Building Siting. - Front Property Line Coverage.
Minimum 95% front property line coverage required.
Request. Buildings D1, D2 to be 44% at Riverside Drive.
15. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(a)(1) – Front Required Building Zone.
0-10 feet with up to 25% of the front façade permitted between 5-25 feet.
Request: To allow ± 3 feet for Building D5.
16. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) – Required Build Zone Treatment.
Patio or streetscape permitted treatments.
Request: Landscaping proposed at south RBZ for Building D1.
17. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(a)(1) – Corner Side Required Building Zone.
Corner side permitted between 5-25 feet.
Request: To allow ± 0.7 feet for Building D5.
18. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(2) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage.
Maximum of 85% lot coverage.
Request: To allow for $\pm 96\%$ impervious lot coverage for Buildings D1 and D2; $\pm 93\%$ for Building D3; and $\pm 98\%$ for Building D4 and D5.
19. §153.065 – Required Loading Spaces (B)(7)(c)(1) and 153.065 (B)(7)(c)(1) – Number Required.
The number of spaces is based on the size of the principal structure. Two spaces are required.
Request: Allow for no loading space directly adjacent to Building D1.
20. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (O)(12)(a)(3) – Entry for Parking.
Rear, side, corner side facades on non-principal frontage streets.
Request: Allow for entry on front façade (Tuller Ridge Drive) for Building D5.
21. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (O)(12)(a)(3) – Access for Parking.
Access to be provided from an alley or service street.
Request: Allow for access on street for Building D5.
22. §153.065 – Parking and Loading (B)(5)(a)(2) – Parking Structure Design.
Double entrance and exit lanes shall be no wider than 24 feet at the street right-of-way.
Request: Allow for width of south entrance/exit lanes to be ± 56 feet for Building D5.
23. §153.065 – Parking Location and Loading (B)(5)(a)(4) – Number on Frontages.
On non-principal frontage streets, only one entrance and one exit lane shall be permitted for each 200 feet of frontage.

Request: Allow for two entrance and two exit lanes on Tuller Ridge Drive for Building D5.

24. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency.
Minimum ground story transparency of 70%.
Request: Building D1: to allow no less than $\pm 53\%$ transparency on the east (Longshore Street), $\pm 59\%$ on the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, and $\pm 53\%$ on the west (Riverside Drive) elevation; Building D3: no less than $\pm 30\%$ on the north (John Shields Parkway) elevation, $\pm 31\%$ on the east (Mooney Street) elevation, and $\pm 28\%$ on the south (Larimer Street) elevation and; Building D4: no less than $\pm 21\%$ on east (Mooney Street) elevation, $\pm 33\%$ on south (Tuller Ridge Drive) elevation, and $\pm 31\%$ on north (Larimer Street) elevation.
25. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Upper Story Transparency.
Minimum street façade upper story transparency of 30%.
Request: To allow for a transparency of $\pm 24\%$ on the north elevation of Building D4.
26. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments.
Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet.
Request: Building D1: to allow more than ± 101 feet on the west elevation, ± 60 feet on the south elevation, ± 60 feet on the east elevation, ± 60 feet on the north elevation;
Building D2: to allow no more than ± 61 feet and ± 134 feet on the west elevation, ± 58 feet on the north elevation; ± 61 feet on the south elevation, and ± 157 feet on the east elevation;
Building D3: to allow no more than ± 51 feet on the south elevation and ± 52 feet on the east elevation; Building D4: to allow no more than ± 63 feet on the north elevation; and
Building D5: to allow no more than ± 63 feet on the north elevation.
27. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(3) and 153.065(I)(4)(b) – Street Façade: Principal Entrance Location.
Principal entrance to be located on Frontage Street Façade of Building.
Request: To allow principal frontage entrance to be located on Longshore Street for Building D2; on Larimer Street for Building D3; on Mooney Street for Building D4; and on west façade for Building D5.
28. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(3) – Street Façade: Number of Entrances Required.
One entrance per 75 feet of façade minimum (3 entrances required).
Request. To allow 1 entrance on north (John Shields Parkway) façade, 2 entrances on east (Mooney Street) façade, 2 entrances on south (Larimer Street) for Building D3; 0 entrances on east (Mooney Street) elevation and 0 entrances on west (Longshore Street) elevation of Building D4; and no entrances on the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) façade of Building D5.
29. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(4) – Horizontal Façade Divisions.
On buildings 3 stories or taller, horizontal divisions are required within 3 feet of the ground story.
Request: To allow no horizontal façade divisions at east elevation of Building D2; all elevations on Building D3; all elevations on Building D4
30. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.
Request: Building D2: to allow no less than $\pm 70\%$ on the east façade and $\pm 50\%$ on the west façade; Building D3: no less than $\pm 56\%$ on the north façade and;
Building D4: no less than $\pm 67\%$ on north façade, $\pm 69\%$ on east façade; $\pm 29\%$ on west façade.

31. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(5)(a)(1) - Right-of-way Encroachments.
Awnings, canopies, eaves, patios, and projecting signs are permitted to encroach.
Request. To allow for a canopy to encroach on Building D5 on Longshore Street.
32. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Blank Wall Limitations (Street).
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.
Request. To allow for the middle portion of the south elevation on Building D3 to be a blank wall on ground story; and 2 areas on the north elevation and 2 areas on the east elevation of Building D4.
33. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(12)(d)(1) – Street Façade Blank Wall Limitations.
No open area greater than 30% of a story façade, as measured from floor to floor, shall be windowless on the ground story and solid on the upper stories.
Request. To allow a maximum of ±60% of windowless area of the south (Tuller Ridge Drive) façade at ground story of Building D5.

Ms. Burchett recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use for portions of two unlined sides of the parking garage in Building D5 with no conditions.

Ms. Burchett recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Fee-in-Lieu of the Open Space requirement for the 0.56 acres of off-site open space.

Ms. Burchett recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan Review with no conditions.

Ms. Burchett recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Parking Plan to allow for 735 parking spaces where 1,087 spaces would be required and the Site Plan Review with eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant not use highly reflective glass, spandrel, or heavily tinted glass to meet the minimum transparency requirements;
- 2) That if gated entries are proposed, the applicant will work with staff to provide the required stacking spaces without encroaching the public right-of-way;
- 3) That the applicant work with staff to ensure that all off-street loading spaces shall be at least 12 feet wide and meet the minimum requirements;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to provide required building foundation landscaping along all sides of a building not otherwise occupied by entrances, sidewalk, parking, loading areas, or similar areas;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to ensure ground-mounted mechanical equipment is properly screened and is consistent with the design throughout the development;
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to include lighting within the pedestrianways;
- 7) That the applicant record an easement for the encroachment of the bridges to the satisfaction of the City Engineer; and
- 8) That the applicant revises the building plan to ensure all door-swing areas will not encroach into the public right-of-way to meet the requirement of §153.062(O)(5)(b)(4).

Ms. Goss asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She called for a vote on a motion to approve nine Administrative Departures. Mr. Harpham motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and all nine Administrative Departures were approved.

Ms. Goss called for a vote on a motion to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 33 Waivers. Mr. Harpham motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and all of the 33 Waivers were recommended for approval.

Ms. Goss called for a vote on a motion to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Conditional Use for portions of two unlined sides of the parking garage in Building D5 with no conditions. Ms. Gilger motioned, Mr. Harpham seconded, and the Conditional Use was recommended for approval.

Ms. Goss called for a vote on a motion to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space for the 0.56 acres of off-site open space. Mr. Harpham motioned, Mr. Krawetzki seconded, and the Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space was recommended for approval.

Ms. Goss called for a vote on a motion to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan Review. Mr. Harpham motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and the Development Plan Review was recommended for approval.

Ms. Goss called for a vote on a motion to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Parking Plan to allow for 735 parking spaces where 1,087 spaces would be required and a Site Plan Review with eight conditions. Mr. Harpham motioned, Mr. Krawetzki seconded, and the Parking Plan and the Site Plan Review were both recommended for approval.

INTRODUCTIONS

3. BSD HC – Dublin Town Center Exterior Modifications 18-034ARB/MPR

19 W. Bridge Street Minor Project Review

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for exterior modifications including siding and window replacements to an existing commercial building located within Historic Dublin. She said the site is southwest of the intersection of West Bridge Street and High 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*.

Donna Goss reported she received a letter from Tom Holton stating concern for the existing condition of the building. Ms. Burchett answered there were mainly maintenance issues. She said the applicant would like to replace the wood siding on the building and has proposed HardiPlank in the same color and design as what is existing. She said the applicant also wants to replace the windows with aluminum clad wood windows.

Ray Harpham asked if the applicant provided why the deterioration occurred. Ms. Burchett answered the applicant did not divulge that information. She added she has been primarily working with the architect and not the owner.

Ms. Burchett said this is not a historic building and HardiPlank has been used for other new construction projects in the area. She said HardiPlank is not an approved material and therefore a Waiver would need to be requested.

Claudia Husak asked for locations for which this material has been used and approved. Ms. Burchett cited the (former) Biddies location as having used HardiPlank and the proposed window. She said parts of the Z Building also used the same materials. Ms. Husak recalled a Pella wood aluminum clad window used at 109 South Riverview and that building had historical character, which the ARB also approved. She then mentioned there was a historic building on North High Street but the ARB ultimately told the applicant to use a wood window to keep in line with the historical character of the building.

Ms. Burchett noted this building is not a historic structure as it was constructed in 2001. She said the roof and stone will remain. Mr. Harpham recalled an instance when the wood trim was coming off the building across the street from this property.

Ms. Goss confirmed the size of the HardiPlank will match the current siding size and this would match the conditions when approved as a Planned Unit Development. Ms. Husak said she was not an architect so she asked if the HardiPlank would still have the same feel and appearance as wood or whether the change will be more noticeable. Mr. Harpham used the HardiPlank sample to explain how they come with different patterns and on the product provided, the striations are good so it will appear the same as wood. As for the feel, he said one would just have to tap on it to realize it was not real wood siding. He concluded he would have no trouble supporting a recommendation of approval to the ARB for their determination on appropriateness.

As for the windows, Mr. Harpham said the hardest part with matching the appearance of windows is the mullions. He said the windows will be wrapped as to protect the structure from the weather and it is not a substandard material so that is all a positive upgrade. Shawn Krawetzki suggested that if the mullions were placed on the inside of the window, the historical character is removed but they last longer. Mr. Harpham again suggested the ART leave the final decision to the ARB.

Ms. Goss noted that the existing windows all have four panes so she suggested they continue that pattern for consistency but how the applicant achieves that will be up to the ARB.

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

**4. BSD SRN – Hen Quarter
18-040WR**

**6628 Riverside Drive
Waiver Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal to allow for the installation of operable sun shades at an existing tenant space in Building C2 of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is northeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant previously received approval for the patio and at that time the applicant had indicated that the owner is interested in a cover for the patio. She said the applicant is proposing vinyl screens that are similar to those used at the Cap City Diner, which is also in the area but the specifications do not exactly match so more dialogue is needed with the applicant. She presented material samples of the sunshades and the panes of vinyl. She said staff would be more supportive of the sunshades if they were only to be down during appropriate weather and staff was more concerned with the vinyl panes. Therefore, she said staff is recommending a permitted material because the material proposed was determined to not be of high quality.

Ms. Burchett said while the Planning and Zoning Commission had approved a similar product for Cap City Diner, stringent requirements and conditions were attached. Unfortunately, she said, that establishment is not complying with all the conditions, particularly when the shades can be up or down. She reported that when staff has visited Cap City Diner and the vinyl is down, the wind makes the vinyl bow outward and it is not attractive. Ms. Husak remarked this applicant is not the same restaurateur but it is still a concern that should be addressed. Shawn Krawetzki was concerned that since the screen is so dark, the decorative hen

filigree proposed on the west end of the patio will disappear when the screens are down. Ms. Burchett said she would review that further with the applicant.

Ray Harpham recalled the ART did not provide a recommendation of approval to the PZC for the Cap City Diner as the ART was against using the material. He said the PZC approved the proposal but there are issues with trying to enforce the conditions. He thought one of which was that the PZC had the right to revisit the application at a later date to ensure this was the right product and conditions were being met.

Colleen Gilger said there are too many tenant spaces with these covered patios that act as building expansions and not enough open patio space. Ms. Husak said she was concerned with longevity and how the vinyl parts stretch over time. Mr. Harpham noted that with the dark screens transparency is essentially eliminated.

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

**5. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block H
18-041WR**

**PIDs: 273-012751 & 273-012752
Waiver Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal to permit an alternative material on the exterior elevations as architectural detailing for Block H of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is southwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Dale Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett said the materials and design of Block H in the Bridge Park Development were approved, which included EIFS for detailing but now the applicant is requesting to change out the EIFS that was permitted for Fypon as the details they proposed cannot be made from EIFS.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic showing the locations where this new material would be installed. She said the look would be the same as the approved plans. She indicated the applicant had shared where Fypon has been used in Ohio and they said it is also considered a standard material used in similar areas. Claudia Husak said the applicant stated Fypon is easier to form on the building and they are concerned with the longevity and maintenance of EIFS.

Aaron Stanford asked if there were photographs provided as to where Fypon has been used before. Ms. Husak recalled Fypon was used for the majority of the architectural details at the Woodlands at Ballantrae. Ray Harpham said Fypon can be very detailed and looks like wood so it is used for decorative pieces.

Shawn Krawetzki said he thought the product fades and yellows and would require significant maintenance. Ms. Husak recommended the applicant be asked to address that concern. Mr. Harpham requested a Specifications Sheet from the manufacturer to better understand the material. Mr. Stanford asked about the color to be used for most of the trim and Ms. Burchett answered light beige but the heavier materials would be a gray color. Ms. Husak said the applicant cannot get EIFS to perform as needed which is the reason for this request.

Ms. Husak noted the elevation drawings were inconsistent so Ms. Burchett said she would ask the applicant to revise them. Donna Goss emphasized the ART will need clarity on where the material will be installed and for the applicant to provide material samples and Specification Sheets in order for the ART to make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Donna Goss asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. Claudia Husak pointed out that the ART will be meeting again next week because May was a five-week month.

Ms. Goss adjourned the meeting at 2:50 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on June 7, 2019.