



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, April 6, 2017 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development Administrator; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal;

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Dustin Todd, Architectural Alliance (Case 1); Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Greg Briya and Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan (Case 2); Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Land & Development; Bruce Sommerfelt, Signcom Inc. (Case 3); and Brian Suiter, Kaufman Development; Justin Goodwin, MKSK; and Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross LLC (Case 4); Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; John Woods, MKSK; Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T; Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects; and Teri Umbarger and Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan (Case 5).

Jennifer Rauch called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm. She asked if there were any amendments to the March 23rd meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

MINOR MODIFICATIONS

Jennifer Rauch stated that three minor modifications have been approved by Staff. She said the following are the minor modifications:

- 1) Charles Penzone Grand Salon – Other modifications deemed appropriate by the Director.
- 2) Bridge Park Buildings B3 and C4/C5 – Changes in building material or color.
- 3) Ram Brewery – Other modifications deemed appropriate by the Director.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or comments regarding these modifications. [There were none.]

DETERMINATIONS

1. BSD SRN – Pins Mechanical – Patio 17-017MPR

6558 Riverside Drive Minor Project Review

Lori Burchett said this is a request for a patio and exterior modifications for Building B1 of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is on the northeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and Banker Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.065.

Ms. Burchett indicated the applicant is proposing to create two patio spaces along frontage on Riverside Drive and Longshore Drive. She said the larger patio space (Riverside Dr.) incorporates a wall proposed in wood to provide privacy from the adjacent patio. Dustin Todd, Architectural Alliance, explained the wall would be constructed with wood posts and horizontal wood planks.

Ms. Burchett reported the quality of the picnic tables have been revised to coordinate with the other tables by using the same company that will use a wood top and finish to match the other tables.

Ms. Burchett said the smaller patio space (Longshore Dr.) includes a raised bar along the perimeter of the space with seating within a private area where a 6-foot clear pedestrian zone will be maintained.



Shawn Krawetzki asked what type of plants were planned for the planters. Mr. Todd answered they will match what was approved at the original submittal, which the tenant or building owner will be responsible for installing.

Colleen Gilger inquired about the requirements for having an outdoor area where liquor is served. She said the steps are wide open and could be concern. She emphasized the applicant should verify that this is acceptable.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the outdoor furniture coordinates with the design of the interior furnishings in a similar and high-quality design.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's approval of the Minor Project Review.

**2. BSD SRN – B4/B5 Parking Garage
17-025MPR**

**6561 Mooney Street
Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for exterior modifications to a previously approved parking structure to revise architectural elements for the B4/B5 parking garage in the Bridge Park Development. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Mooney Street and 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 §153.065.

Ms. Burchett reported that on July 29, 2016, the Commission disapproved a Minor Project Review for proposed façade changes to the building B4/B5 Parking Garage based on the proposed design and materials not being of the same quality and character as the approved design. She added the applicant appealed the Commission's decision to City Council on October 7, 2016 and Council upheld the Commission's decision to disapprove the application.

Ms. Burchett stated this project proposes minor changes to the basic design of the garage facades. The south and east facades remain clad in brick she said, but additional masonry detail has been added to the brick facades. She noted the other proposed changes the applicant is now requesting:

- The spandrel panels above the entrance are detailed with a vertical brick pattern and the horizontal mesh screens have been removed to avoid conflict with the canopy hangers.
- The southeast corner has a one-story vegetated screen wall for ventilation rather than the multi-story vegetative screen that had been previously approved.
- Additional brickwork was added to the crash walls.
- Residential balcony guardrails were revised to a vertical picket style, rather than mesh panels.
- Mesh panels on the south façade of Level 2 were eliminated to maintain a consistent elevation as the panels wrap around the east side of the garage.
- Revise the stainless steel mesh to a frameless perforated aluminum panel similar to the C5 Garage.

Ms. Burchett explained the west and north façades of the building include residential "liners" and are not proposed to change from the previously adopted plan aside from the balcony pickets.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan presented material samples. He explained the color was the same but the finished product would be powder coated. He presented additional photos that showed the brick work that has been completed.

Ms. Burchett presented the graphics showing both the previously approved and the proposed plan.

Mr. Briya explained the last time the applicant proposed a flat panel but that material was reevaluated as the mesh tension was 1000 lbs per foot on every level. He said they received comments that the in/out aspect of the panels for the building was overwhelmingly supported so they have gone back to that design. He indicated the green screen was actually higher than it appears in the drawings.

Ms. Burchett asked the applicant if they would offer visibility into the parking structure. She asked if light would play off the facades like the PZC had requested.

Mr. Briya said the opacity will be the same and the openness is the same for ventilation. He explained the panels would sit out three feet to be undulating, which has not changed.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the original mesh panels proposed for the balconies. Mr. Briya said it did not make sense to keep those.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's approval of the Minor Project Review.

**3. BSD SCN – Party City – Sign
17-024MPR**

**6655 Sawmill Road
Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this is a request for the installation of two ground signs for an existing multi-tenant shopping center at the northwest corner of the intersection of Sawmill Road and Village Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.065.

Ms. Martin reported that in 2016, the ART reviewed and approved a Minor Project Review (MPR), Case 16-031, for a wall sign for Party City meeting the BSD Code requirements in place at the time. Subsequently, she said an application for a Master Sign Plan, Case 16-042, was submitted for the site looking at existing and future tenant sign allowances but the case did not move forward to Planning and Zoning Commission for review and approval.

In February 2017, she noted that City Council approved amendments to the Bridge Street District sign provisions (Ord. 13-17) for existing structures in the BSD. She said the applicant has submitted the following proposal in time to vest rights in the BSD sign code allowances prior to the amendments effective date, March 29, 2017.

Ms. Martin stated two ground signs for the existing multi-tenant building are proposed. One sign is proposed in front of the building along Sawmill Road, and the other is proposed to the rear side of the building, west of the entrance off Village Parkway. She described both signs as having 24 square feet of graphic area atop a cast stone sill with a brick clad base to match the building proposed at a height of 7 feet, 11 inches. She added each sign has two tenant panels, which are proposed to be black with a silver divider/retainer; the tenant names are proposed to be white, 1-inch thick acrylic, push-thru letters with halo illumination. She concluded perennial plantings are proposed around the base of each sign.

Ms. Martin said the signs meet the Code requirements for number/type, size, location, height, and colors. Therefore, she said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's approval of the Minor Project Review.

CASE REVIEWS

4. ID-2 & ID-4 – Kaufman Development 17-023INF

Shier Rings Road & Cosgray Road Informal Review

Claudia Husak said this is a request for review for a future residential development including approximately 130 single-family lots and 202 townhome apartments on a 64-acre site. She said the site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Shier Rings Road and Cosgray Road. She said this is a request for a review and feedback for an Informal Review of a future development application under the provisions of the Zoning Code.

Ms. Husak reported the applicant received an Informal Review early on in a conceptual manner and the Planning and Zoning Commission provided encouraging feedback. She said the site is located in the West Innovation District, which is currently under review for Zoning Code updates. She said that Kaufman is ahead of the City's schedule as the updates will not be finalized until the end of the year. She reported City Council plans to have a Work Session regarding the WID on April 17th, 2017.

Ms. Husak stated that no action is required of the ART today as the intent is to identify issues and provide feedback to the applicant.

Ms. Husak presented the site that includes a parcel of original owner's farm that has not yet been annexed into the City but the applicant will need that before a formal application can be accepted.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed site plan and noted it is similar to the last time it was reviewed, which includes a major connector street bisecting the site. She pointed out that the multi-family units are in the northern and western sections of the site and single family units in the south along Shier Rings Road. She said the single family units will be served by alleys and will front public open spaces. She noted there are some open spaces throughout site, some of which are public and the remainder private spaces. She also noted the clubhouse that houses the pool and the adjacent parking in the southeast corner. The PZC questioned whether parking was needed for potential gathering but that would depend on the programming. She concluded there is a lot of water shown at this site and maintenance discussions will need to begin early on as to the responsibility. She added roads platted and open space maintenance and ownership will also be discussed.

Ms. Husak presented the circulation plan and pointed out the major thoroughfare through the site, which is in the Thoroughfare Plan as part of the Community Plan. She indicated that there needs to be public access to the north and further analysis and discussions will determine which route is most appropriate.

Ms. Husak expressed her concerns with the units set up with driveways connecting to a major public street. She presented a conceptual layout of the lot dimensions and housing type plan for the single family units.

Ms. Husak presented conceptual renderings and pointed out the varying roof types (some shown with solar panels) and modern architecture that fits the area very well. She added the multi-family architectural style will mesh with the single family home section.

Brian Suiter, Kaufman Development, said they know where they stand, he wanted to make sure he was going in the right direction and that is why they requested feedback.

Justin Goodwin, MKSK, said he understands the need for a north connection is anticipated as that is where more industrial development will happen but he questioned how that could be determined if the applicant did not know how the site would layout, exactly. He said the western section is closer to the Sports Ohio site and indicated it might be appropriate to defer that connection until they know what might happen on the Sports Ohio site. Mr. Suiter remarked the collector road shown in the Thoroughfare Plan is much larger

but he does not know when it will be built. He asked if a connection is really necessary because these roads throughout the development are intended for slow traffic at around 25 mph. He emphasized these roads may appear major but they are just neighborhood yield-only roads and he does not anticipate driving traffic there. He agreed there were a lot of curb cuts for the townhome units.

Mr. Goodwin inquired about fire access.

Aaron Stanford reported the traffic engineer said there needs to be at least one connection to the north to help distribute traffic. He said the northern piece is a long stretch of land that would require additional connections. He indicated there could be some flexibility on how this is made but there will definitely be a push for a public street connection.

Ms. Husak noted that where the connection happens, pulling out of a drive way will be dangerous in the north section where spacing is so close.

Due to the density of driveways, Mr. Stanford said no parking is available and there are no curbs on the edge. Mr. Suiter said this layout is identical to the New Albany site and there have not been any issues there.

Jeff Tyler asked the applicant if they considered combining garage locations to minimize curb cut numbers. Mr. Suiter answered they would not combine garages because there is direct access to the units but driveways could be consolidated. Jennifer Rauch added that if driveways were combined there would be larger paved spaces leaving larger green spaces instead of it being chopped up.

Ms. Husak inquired about the layouts showing a triangle of roads as she was concerned how they would function. Mr. Goodwin said the triangle has parking on one side and there are two-way yields, 20 feet wide with on-street parking throughout the development. He explained the street is 20 feet wide with an additional 9 feet for parallel parking spaces. Ms. Husak said she was concerned with the geometry in the triangle spaces.

Mike Altomare said Fire cannot access that 20-foot-wide road with the 9-foot-wide parking space. He suggested there at least be a hammerhead design at the end of the road.

Matt Earman said he was concerned if/when owner green spaces are eliminated, where the collection of stuff goes, including lawn furniture and if the debris would end up on the side of the house. Mr. Suiter answered there are small patio spaces and private/public spaces would be designated.

Mr. Stanford asked how the multi-family section is connected by pedestrian paths. Mr. Goodwin answered the circulation is shown on a separate document with sidewalks all throughout. Mr. Stanford noted there are a lot of driveways on the northern edge. Mr. Goodwin said there are some units with head-in parking so the parking is handled like a single-family driveway. The design challenge Mr. Stanford pointed out was pedestrian paths dying into parking lots.

Ms. Husak indicated there needs to be an inventory of open space and enough man power to maintain it. Shawn Krawetzki said the amount of water needed should be considered to which Mr. Suiter agreed. Ms. Husak said she was surprised to see the amount of pond proposed. Mr. Suiter said they would like options to minimize these areas as much as possible.

From a building code standpoint, Mr. Tyler said power for a single lot versus a condominium needs to be based on the property line and not an imaginary line. He indicated the applicant has locked himself into small narrow units and two larger units could not be permitted next to each other. He said the applicant will have to fire rate the building and the cost will go up significantly.

Mr. Stanford reported that EMH&T is doing a traffic study, concurrently and they will meet with staff to work out the layout for streets early.

Mr. Tyler asked the applicant to consider trash pick-up, emergency services, and mail pick-up and delivery as these will need to be addressed sooner rather than later.

Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross LLC, indicated the Zoning Code could change and asked where staff is in the process. Ms. Husak answered they have prepped for the City Council meeting on April 17 and the materials are being disseminated tomorrow. She explained the Code piece will be presented at a high level and the approach is going to be for areas affected by Code rewrites. She said Planning is hoping for Council to sign off on the process so it can move forward. She said Code rewrites will include changing "shall" to "should" and the consultant is recommending changes to the general use table. She emphasized that Mr. Goodwin will need to work within the current Zoning Code. She indicated that the West Innovation District will be the first to see changes to the Code.

Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to consider early on how they will deal with screening/fencing for patios and accessory structures since the lots are so close together and what will be allowed for accessory structures on individual lots. Mr. Suiter said those issues would be solved in the Homeowner Association documents. Mr. Suiter said marketing will be for sustainable living. Mr. Tyler said they should consider how to handle rain barrels and if trash cans should fit in garages because those have been big issues in other parts of the city.

Mr. Krawetzki suggested patios should be planned instead of being left open to interpretation due to the building design and proximity to neighbor's back doors. Mr. Suiter added that while this is a manufactured community, sometimes people want the option for privacy away from the more public spaces.

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

**5. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, D-Block
17-022BPR/PP/FP**

**Riverside Drive & John Shields Parkway
Basic Plan Review/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

Claudia Husak said this is a request for the development of three mixed-use buildings containing approximately 223 residential dwelling units, 76,000 square feet of retail space, and a parking structure. She said the site is on the southeast corner of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Husak said four buildings are proposed for this block counting the garage structure and the residential liners separately. She said ultimately, City Council has the decision-making responsibility for all three parts to this application: Basic Plan Review, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat. She explained the Preliminary and Final Plats will be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission to be forwarded to Council and that the plats are not under the ART's purview. She added that if the applicant and staff were prepared, an informal review of the Basic Plan would be conducted by the PZC on April 20th and their findings would be forwarded to City Council for review and determination of the Basic Plan.

Ms. Husak presented the aerial view of the site as well as the proposed Basic Plan and noted the three buildings, the greenway proposed, the tunnel under Riverside Drive, and the residential liners along Mooney Street. She pointed out where the grocery is currently proposed in Block D. She reported there has been a lot of discussion regarding the proposed extension of Longshore Drive. She said a development plan was approved that included all of the Bridge Park development but shortly after, additional development plans

were approved for each block separately due to the Zoning Code amendments. She added Block D was one of the outstanding blocks that needed to be revisited based on all the additional changes.

Ms. Husak asked the applicant why a Final Plat is part of this application. Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, answered the Final Plat can be postponed to a later application, which is probably more appropriate. Ms. Husak asked if the City was an applicant as the greenway along John Shields Parkway is currently owned by the City of Dublin. Mr. Quackenbush said the plat can be revised to both include the greenway and bring Dublin on as an applicant or adjusted to remove it completely.

Ms. Husak described the buildings in Block D.

Building D1: Floor 1 - restaurant, retail, commercial space; Floors 2 – 5 residential condominiums

Building D2/D3: Floor 1 - grocery and residential liner; Floor 2 - residential and terraces

Building D4/D5: Floor 1 - parking garage and retail; Floor 2 – parking garage and residential

Ms. Husak noted the following list of issues or concerns identified at a high level on the first pass:

- No meetings with staff regarding Block D to identify potential issues prior to submitting an application, which is unlike all the other blocks in this development.
- Building D1, Floor 1: currently has one lobby on (proposed) Longshore Street with a corridor that runs to Riverside Drive. She asked if a dual lobby makes more sense by adding a lobby at Riverside Drive directly across from the current one shown.
- Building D1: PZC was concerned that multiple buildings throughout the development look similar to other buildings in the Columbus area and they want to see a unique design that provides variety.
- Proposed Longshore Street as a thru street: Traffic and Engineering have concerns with the circulation and people trying to make a right turn onto Riverside Drive and crossing multiple lanes to connect to the (future) John Shields Parkway Bridge.
- Grocery and needs: in an urban development; movement of patrons and deliveries; and carts.
- Longshore Street should line up with Larimer Street. The proposed location for the loading docks would require the trucks to pull up to Larimer Street and then jog back into the loading docks across Mooney Street.
- Loading area/drop off areas for groceries appears large in front of the grocery store.
- There are condominiums located in Block H across from the proposed location of the loading docks and noise and visibility is a concern for those units impacted by this area.
- The open space proposed between building D2/D3 and building D4/D5. There is a retaining wall and reflecting pool with a 12-foot drop and only accessible if one maneuvers through the garage.
- Open space dedicated on areas separate from this site need to be documented; there needs to be a map of areas that are already designated for other blocks in the development.
- Tuller Ridge Drive is treated like 'back of house' as that is where all the transformers and generators are currently proposed. Screening walls would be required along Tuller Ridge Drive making this unfavorable to pedestrians.
- Residential units attached to the garage appear to have first floor access only through the garage and a "back door" area on Tuller Ridge Drive, which will not be very safe.

- Façade transparency and lack of information for the D2/D3 building.
- Number of entrances and proposed locations for residential and commercial areas.
- Proposed grocery does not yet have a tenant and therefore not able to be finalized. Possibly phasing this project may be appropriate. Some pieces are finalized and some are not.

Ms. Husak said Planning does not feel comfortable taking this to the Commission on April 20th and that would not be the best strategy as further review is needed.

Jennifer Rauch recommended that staff go through the additional list of concerns.

Aaron Stanford said the loading dock has major issues. He said that maneuvering into the public street that goes north (Larimer Street) would cross a pedestrian crossing, which would disrupt that path.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, said they looked at many different location options for a loading dock and they were all negative but this plan was the least negative. She said with the grade issues they are facing it makes it a challenge to find a place for the loading dock because the trucks cannot maneuver a steep grade of roughly a 12% slope. Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, added he had previously expressed concerns about the path the trucks would have to take to enter and exit the loading docks and that this was not the first time Planning had seen this plan. He said they are not sure if they want a street there or not and finding a dock space has been a challenge.

Jeff Tyler said he understood the challenge as this building requires four-sided architecture so there is no 'back of house'. Obviously, he said this needs to be resolved before moving forward.

Ms. Rauch said more discussion needs to happen between the applicant and staff regarding these details. She said the proposed grocery location does not have a specific tenant and the grocery store space is driving the design of the block.

Mr. Stanford asked why there is not a T-connection to Larimer Street. He asked how the site will be serviced because the area does not currently have water, hydrants, or fire access. Mike Altomare said without water and a way to get in and out, he cannot commit a truck to that area immediately.

Mr. Quackenbush asked if a fire truck could pull into open space. Mr. Altomare said there is still the issue of no water service. Mr. Quackenbush asked if a hydrant could be added to the open space like a private hydrant. Mr. Stanford said Riverside Drive does not have a water main servicing this building and there cannot be a dead end main line from Tuller Ridge Drive.

Ms. Husak suggested moving transformers and generators from Tuller Ridge Drive and make Tuller Ridge Drive a more interesting street for pedestrians to promote activity.

Ms. Husak asked for clarification on what the support area includes within the parking structure. Ms. Umbarger said support would be provided the same as on buildings C4/C5.

Mr. Stanford suggested the entrance on Riverside Drive be one way up to Longshore; catching the person going north on Riverside Drive without having to go all the way around John Shields Parkway. Ms. Husak answered this is more than what we normally give comments on and that traffic engineers need to weigh in on these issues more thoroughly.

Ms. Husak said staff would compile a list of additional items needed for the review. She said currently the number of planning analysis waivers required is in the 40s because staff does not have enough information.

She said this can be provided on paper or staff can meet regularly to work these issues out. She restated that this application is not ready for a public meeting. She added taking this to City Council on May 22, 2017, might be aggressive and suggested the applicant go before the PZC, informally, to ensure all concerns are being addressed upfront.

Mr. Hunter said the elephant in the room is access and how the extension of Longshore will work for this site.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 3:45 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on April 20, 2017.