



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, November 2, 2017 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Ray Harpham, Interim Chief Building Official; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant. Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect arrived to review the last case only.

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

Applicants: Dan Morgan, Behal Sampson Dietz (Case 1); Bhakti Bania and Zac Romer-Jordan, BBCO Design LLC (Case2); Wayne Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants LLC (Case 3); Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Case 4); and Sean Clark, DaNite Sign Company (Case 5).

Jennifer Rauch called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. She asked if there were any amendments to the October 19 meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented. She noted the following Minor Modifications:

- Bridge Park, Local Cantina – Modifications to sign, provided general requirements are maintained.
- The Offices at Stoneridge – Modifications to sign, provided general requirements are maintained.

PRE-APPLICATION

1. BSD HC – Redwood Financial Group 17-110ARB-BPR

113 S. High Street Informal Review

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for the demolition of an existing detached accessory structure and construction of a new 4,000-square-foot office building behind an existing historic structure with associated site improvements. She said the site is west of South High Street, approximately 100 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane. She said this is a request for an informal review of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site. She stated the City of Dublin is currently considering an amendment to the Bridge Street District Zoning Code and Zoning Map and this property is within the scope of the amendment proposal for creating a new district. If adopted, she said the zoning requirements would change for this property. She said that could include limiting building types and height as well as decreasing building and lot coverage. She explained the applicant has filed this application under the current Zoning Code and would be governed by the current regulations. She said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* still apply and no amendments are intended in the near future.

Ms. Burchett said the existing commercial building, formally a single-family house, is a historic structure built in 1870 and is considered contributing per the Historic and Cultural Assessment. However, she said the detached accessory building (garage) is not specifically addressed in the Historic and Cultural Assessment nor is it detailed in the Ohio Historic Inventory.



Ms. Burchett presented the proposed conceptual site plan where the applicant plans to infill the property with a two-story building constructed in the rear of the existing one and the one and a half-story historic structure will remain as an office use that has frontage on South High Street. No changes are proposed to the existing structure, she noted, but an 11-space parking lot is proposed for the west side of this property with direct access from Mill Lane. She said a pocket park with seating areas and a courtyard are also proposed. She pointed out that the proposed 400-square-foot pocket park would be between the existing structure and the northern property line and the shared entry courtyard proposed would connect the two buildings.

Ms. Burchett said the character of the Historic District has been established as an intimate, small village scale with buildings located close together, along the sidewalk, and range from one to two-and-one-half stories in height. She noted that nearly all of the buildings have a residential quality rather than a continuous streetscape of commercial buildings with storefronts. The spatial relationships among buildings, she said, make Historic Dublin unique and the existing open spaces between the buildings adds to this character.

Ms. Burchett stated the footprint of the proposed building is 2,000 square feet and the total building coverage would be $\pm 30\%$ of the lot with 69% total impervious lot coverage. There is a separation of 11 feet, 8 inches proposed between the two buildings and the proposed structure is 68 feet from the rear property line.

Under the proposed Zoning Code amendment, Ms. Burchett noted the maximum height of new structures would be 24 feet measured to the midpoint of the eaves and there is a required separation of a minimum of 18 feet between buildings. She said buildings would be limited to one and a half-stories in the rear. Additionally, the building footprint would be limited to 1,800 square feet with a maximum building coverage of 50% and 75% maximum impervious - with a 10% allowance for semi-pervious surfaces.

Ms. Burchett said the story height and mass for the proposed new construction is larger than the existing structure. She stated the *Guidelines* recommend the following:

- Design should observe typical nearby building heights by using a similar height, but in any case do not exceed two stories [at the street grade]; and
- Massing should be fairly simple, generally as plain rectangular shapes.

Ms. Burchett indicated the heights are relatively comparable but the mass is larger than the existing historic building on the site. She indicated it would be unique with the one and a half-story structure on High Street as the infill in the rear would be taller and this is not seen very often in Historic Dublin.

Three proposed concepts were presented with the view from High Street looking northwest and then from High Street looking southwest.

Ms. Burchett noted the business next door, Gem Law, is a two-story building with a one and a half-story accessory structure/carriage house behind it on that property.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed footprints and mass for the three concept designs vary slightly but overall, measure about the same for mass and height. She emphasized the *Guidelines* note that Dublin has an unusually intimate scale and that nearly every building has a small, pedestrian scale that is inviting to people. She added new construction should be designed with a sense of scale appropriate to that of Historic Dublin, with proportions carefully controlled.

Ms. Burchett stated the footprint of the proposed building is 2,000 square feet and is 4,000 square feet in size, while the footprint of the existing historic structure is 1,000 square feet and is 1,286 square feet in size. According to the Franklin County Auditor, she reported, the main two-story building on the property to the north has a $\pm 1,700$ -square-foot footprint and 2,580 square feet in size with the one and a half-story building in the rear. The property to the south has a $\pm 1,200$ -square-foot footprint and is 1,563 square feet in size.

Ms. Burchett indicated the two-dimensional architectural pattern is consistent with the character of the existing building with the dropped hip roof, roofline, and basic rectangular form; and new building designs should use massing similar to that of adjacent and nearby buildings. She said the existing structure is a gabled design and the proposed structure mimics this design type.

Inspirational images were provided to reflect a conceptual character with the materials, textures, and colors of a rustic cottage character. Ms. Burchett said the *Guidelines* identify materials such as wood, brick, and stone and new buildings should have an appearance with a visual texture compatible with what already exists. She concluded the inspirational palette appears consistent with the general aesthetic of the established character.

Ms. Burchett presented the Informal review discussion questions:

1. Does the Board support the demolition of the existing accessory structure?
2. Is the overall proposed building and arrangement appropriate with the surrounding established context in regards to height and massing?
3. Is the Board supportive of the proposed architectural form and conceptual character of the building as it compares to the Design Guidelines?
4. Is the overall open space arrangement appropriate within the established character of the Historic District?
5. Are there other considerations by the ART?

Ms. Burchett reported that Staff supports the demolition of the accessory structure/garage as it is not contributing, despite the fact that the entire site is considered contributing.

Ms. Burchett noted the small pocket park proposed between the buildings exceeds the amount of open space required.

Ms. Burchett indicated the next step is for the applicant to take this application informally to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for non-binding feedback.

Aaron Stanford asked if the parking meets requirements because he would like to suggest that the two spaces closest to Mill Lane be eliminated for better maneuverability. Ms. Burchett said the number of spaces meets the Code, as shown. Ms. Burchett said that change could be considered in a Parking Plan for consideration by the ARB.

Ray Harpham inquired about distance between parking space rows. Ms. Burchett answered 24 feet for the parking aisle dimension.

Donna Goss asked where the dumpster would be placed. Dan Morgan, Behal Sampson Dietz, said they are not that far along with the plans yet. He pointed out that the businesses today use standard trash receptacles as opposed to a large dumpster container and this would likely continue since their use does not produce that much waste.

Claudia Husak inquired about height. Mr. Morgan said there were two versions and suggested the ART consider the perspective more than the measurements proposed because the site falls back so the two-story building proposed will not appear that tall.

Mr. Morgan requested general input on massing and if the height was too great. He suggested that if they sink the second floor down, parking could be reduced. Mr. Harpham indicated the applicant would benefit with the larger building in the back. He agreed that the ART look at this with an accurate perspective; as one looks across South High Street, the building behind will hardly be seen.

Ms. Goss indicated she was less concerned about the height than she was with the massing. Mr. Harpham said the size is increasing from 1,600 square feet to 1,800 square feet.

Mr. Morgan requested the ART's initial thoughts about the architecture. He said the inspirational images reflected the owner's tastes in architecture. He asked if they were heading in the right direction; should the design be more modern or if they should shy away from that. He explained they were trying to strike a balance between not creating a fake historic look but at the same time, did not think the architecture should be too modern, either.

Jennifer Rauch indicated that historically, after discussions with neighbors, the neighbors have preferred to conserve the historic character of this area. She stated she thought the inspirational images proposed look amazing. Ms. Husak agreed the images were lovely and the City would be lucky to have architecture of that caliber.

Ms. Burchett asked if the ART could see the visual benefit by losing some height/mass in the background with the proposed materials. She added the elements help make the proposed building subordinate to the existing structure.

Ms. Goss indicated that the carriage house structure on the Gem Law property appears and feels like an accessory structure.

Ms. Rauch suggested the ART consider the difference in scale.

RECOMMENDATIONS/DETERMINATIONS

2. BSD SCN - Infiniti - Addition 17-085MPR/CU

3890 Tuller Road Minor Project Review/Conditional Use

Nichole Martin said this is a proposal for an addition for three new car detail bays and one new drive-thru car wash on the 4.57-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood. She said the site is north of Tuller Road, approximately 750 feet north of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review; and a review and a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.236.

Ms. Martin presented the aerial view of the site as well as the two buildings contained therein. She explained the site is on the curve of Tuller Road with a small amount of frontage on Sawmill Road but is better aligned with the I-270 ramp to Sawmill Road heading south. She pointed out the structure involved in this application, which is on the furthest west portion of the property, oriented towards Tuller Road.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed site plan that shows the ±1,000-square-foot building addition that will be added to the northwest side of an existing automotive dealership. She said the addition will contain three new service bays and a drive-thru car wash. She said the location of the existing dumpster will be relocated just east of the addition and the enclosure will be constructed with brick to match the existing structure and addition and will feature decorative metal gates.

With the location of the building addition and the variable width of the drive aisle behind the structure and the constriction of the fire lane, she said, Fire is requiring an AUTOTurn analysis be submitted prior to building permitting. She added the extent of the pavement within the setback is proposed unchanged with this application as the site was originally developed prior to the application of the standard. Additionally, she said, the applicant will need to provide a Parking Plan demonstrating adequate parking for the site. She noted that parking for Vehicle Sales, Rental, and Repair is required at 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet of building plus 1 space per 2,000 square feet of outdoor display. She added the BSD requirement is less than the requirement under which the site was developed; however, due to the frequency of vehicles being parked on-site and not within a parking space or a fire lane, the Fire Marshal is requiring that all fire lanes be designated with no parking signs. This is a condition of approval, she said.

Ms. Martin stated the architecture of the building addition is proposed to match the existing structure so it will be finished in a modular brick veneer and detailed with a brick course. She added four new metal guard garage doors are proposed on the north elevation facing I-270 and will be painted to match any existing doors on the building. She noted these garage doors will be significantly screened by existing mature landscaping. She said additional landscaping is not required on the site due to the minimal site modification but the applicant has elected to provide 128 square feet of landscaping.

Ms. Martin said lighting will be added with the building addition that will match the lighting fixtures on the existing structure but no lighting is proposed for the parking lot or anywhere else on site.

Ms. Martin noted the request for the Minor Project Review needs to be determined by the ART as well as the applicant's request for a recommendation to the PZC for a Conditional Use. She said Vehicle Sale, Rental, and Repair are a conditional use in this district and with the expansion of the auto-oriented use impacts on adjacent sites must be considered. She said the carwash will only be used for vehicles being serviced on site during the dealership sales and service hours of operation. She added the car wash will not be open to the general public.

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

- 1) That all fire lanes be designated with 'No Parking' signs to the satisfaction of the Fire Marshal;
- 2) That an Auto-turn Analysis be provided for the site including the accessibility of the northern drive aisle for fire equipment, to be submitted prior to building permitting; and
- 3) That a comprehensive Parking Plan be provided to Planning for approval demonstrating adequate parking for the site, prior to building permitting.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Conditional Use with no conditions.

Ms. Martin concluded the applicant is present to provide additional information and to answer any questions.

Jennifer Rauch asked how many service bays exist. Zac Romer-Jordan, BBCO Design explained there are currently three along I-270 and this request is just an extension of those. He explained one of the service bays is used currently for the car wash.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Minor Project Review was approved. She called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Conditional Use was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**3. BSD HTN – The Avenue – Outdoor Speakers
17-106CU**

**94 North High Street
Conditional Use**

Nichole Martin said this is a proposal for the use of outdoor speakers in a patio and exterior entrance space for a 6,000-square-foot restaurant in Historic Dublin. She said the site is east of North High Street, approximately 400 feet north of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board who will in turn make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission who is the final authority for approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.236.

Ms. Martin presented the floor plan that contained the proposed overhead speaker locations for the tenant space in this Z1 Building of the Bridge Park West Development. For this proposal, she said, the request is for two speakers at the front entry and seven in the patio area, which is similar to the conditions at Cap City Diner. As such, she said the condition for speaker use for outdoor seating and dining would only apply here as well so the two speakers at the entry would need to be eliminated in order to meet the Code requirement.

Ms. Martin noted the Nuisance Code that was also used in determining Cap City's request, which states that the emission of sound that is 'plainly audible' at a distance of 50 feet from the building is an emission of sound that may disturb the peace, and is therefore not permitted. She explained that 'plainly audible' is defined as any sound that can be detected by a person using his or her unaided hearing faculties. She presented a graphic that represented the areas that would be impacted by the sound within 50 feet of the patio speakers.

Ms. Martin said Code Enforcement would be responsible for policing the sound levels. She said that staff has expressed concerns about the possible noise conflict that could occur between buildings Z1 and Z2 and how it would play out in the West Plaza. In response, she said the applicant would not provide live music and the music would be played on the patio during hours of operation and that would include one hour past closing of the main restaurant.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board and the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Conditional Use with two conditions:

- 1) The use of outdoor speakers be limited to the tenant's hours of operation, not to exceed one hour past closing; and
- 2) Speakers are only permitted for the patio, and therefore be removed at the entry on North High Street.

Ray Harpham asked how 'plainly audible' is measured versus using decibel levels. Ms. Martin reported that legal counsel reviewed the Nuisance Code and determined they are supportive of how it is currently written and do not suggest changing it to a required decibel level measurement.

Matt Earman asked the applicant what decibel level can be expected. He said if sound cannot be plainly audible past 50 feet, if 50 decibels would be the expected level. Wayne Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants, answered the noise will be louder but no more than 85 decibels and maybe even closer to 80 decibels. He added that their patios are generally quieter but he does not know the precise levels. He said he is fine with the regulation of 'plainly audible'.

Staff contemplated that speakers cannot be used during special events on the West Plaza and if a condition should be added for approval. Mr. Earman indicated that noise on the West Plaza will also be an issue if two different types of music are being played from the two buildings Z1 and Z2 at once. He added that there could be a competition between the two buildings to attract patrons but he did not know of a way to enforce that.

Mr. Schick said Cameron Mitchell Restaurants like to create energy with sound but at the same time, they want to be a great neighbor. Mr. Earman said, personally, he wants the music but is concerned if many people/customers complain to the City and how that should be handled.

Jennifer Rauch suggested a trial period be set like what was required for patio screens whereby the applicant would come back to the Board after an agreed upon evaluation period. Mr. Earman said he would support the earlier suggestion of adding a condition of approval be that limits music from businesses when a program has been planned on the West Plaza; that programming should take precedence.

Ms. Martin suggested the following condition:

- 3) The use of outdoor speakers be prohibited during City sanctioned special events or programming in the Riverside Crossing Park – West Plaza.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Conditional Use was recommended for approval with three conditions to the Architectural Review Board, as well as the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**4. Bridge Park, Blocks A, B, & C – Amendment to MSP
17-107MSP**

**Riverside Drive
Master Sign Plan**

Nichole Martin said this is a proposal for Amendments to the previously approved Master Sign Plan for Blocks A, B, and C within the Bridge Park Development, zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the site is east of Riverside Drive, north of the intersection with SR 161 and West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for amendments to a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066, and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site, highlighting the three blocks included in this application. She said Master Sign Plans are intended to allow for one-of-a-kind, whimsical, and unique signs that use the highest quality materials and construction while allowing for flexibility to deviate from the standards of the BSD Sign Code provisions. In the case of Bridge Park, she said it has become clear that neither Staff nor the Landlord can account for every variable within the approved plan; therefore, unforeseen circumstances and unintended consequences have resulted. Additionally, she noted tenants have been challenged with the interpretation of the regulations.

Ms. Martin explained that by staff enforcing what was approved in the matrix for the Master Sign Plan and the regulations per the Zoning Code along with the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines, the City has not attained signs as desirable and creative as they could have been, due to the compounding regulations.

The amendments, she said, are for the overall design of signs to provide additional flexibility; therefore signs should not be limited or restricted in:

- Colors;
- Secondary image size;
- Logo size; or
- Secondary copy size.

Ms. Martin explained that currently, Code permits canopy signs mounted on the face or on the canopy and having them permitted underneath the canopy is being requested. She presented graphic samples for reference. Additionally, she said exposed neon is permitted for internal and external illumination and provided examples of those signs as well.

Ms. Martin said an update will be made to the general matrix to include a new sign type – PED Art Sign. She provided the definition: A smaller Placemaking Art Sign that offers more freedom with sign design and form; and requires additional detail, high quality materiality, and unique lighting. This sign type is not intended to permit larger or more visible projecting signs.

- Sign location and design must be administratively approved by the Planning Director, prior to the sign permitting submittal;
- Building must have a minimum of 50 feet on the right of way;
- Sign must be located within the first level of the building at a height not to exceed 15 feet; and
- Size of the sign is limited to 50 square feet.

Ms. Martin presented multiple examples of signs desired and summarized the general regulations matrix modifications:

- **Projecting Sign:** Must be within Level 1 and are less than or equal to 12 square feet in size.
- **PED Art Sign:** Less than or equal to 50 square feet in size and must have 50 square feet of frontage on a public right of way.
- **Canopy Edge Sign:** Now permitted underneath the canopy.
- **Sandwich Boards:** Must be located in front of the tenant space within a distance of 6 feet and be located between the sidewalk and the curb.

Ms. Martin added if a tenant modifies the building façade to create an additional leasing area, signs can be added, provided it conforms to all applicable regulations. She said applicants will need to demonstrate every side of the elevations and sign types to specifications. She indicated that permitting locations of signs to be finalized with the sign permitting process will provide design flexibility as staff works with tenants.

Ms. Martin concluded the applicant has met the criteria with one condition; therefore, approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Master Sign Plan Amendments with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant provide an approved Master Sign Plan containing all approved amendments to Planning, prior to sign permitting.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said he agreed with the reduction in size from 16 square feet to 12 square feet for projecting signs. He said he has not reviewed all the projecting signs currently installed and but the Cantina meets that size. He reported their Master Sign Plan is an addendum to their leases.

Jennifer Rauch suggested a caveat for signs already installed.

Donna Goss said City rule trumps what may be in a lease agreement.

Ms. Martin suggested the solution could be to make these amendments applicable to applications going forward.

Mr. Starr said he provides a Landlord Approval Letter to his tenants.

Ms. Rauch asked how conflicts could be avoided. Ms. Martin indicated there should be a finite number of conflicts. Claudia Husak said we all need to be strict about enforcing the Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Master Sign Plan Amendments were recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**5. BSD C – Smiths Medical – Sign
17-109MPR**

**5200 Upper Metro Place
Minor Project Review**

Nick Badman said this is a proposal for a 100-square-foot corporate office interstate wall sign for an existing office building, zoned BSD-C Bridge Street District Commercial. He said the site is on the southeast corner of the SR 161 and the I-270 interchange. 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. Badman presented an aerial view of the site that has approximately 650 feet of frontage on I-270 and 150 feet of frontage on Upper Metro Place. He said there is a single access point on Upper Metro Place and a shared use path connection along the north side of Upper Metro Place.

Mr. Badman reported the BSD Sign Code was amended on March 29, 2017, whereas:

- Only applicable to existing buildings in select BSD zonings
- 'Existing buildings' are those that do not comply with BSD form-based building types
- Signs for these buildings/tenant spaces will comply with the 'Standard' Sign Code until they are redeveloped
- Ensures signs are consistent with the style of development
 - Auto-oriented = fewer, larger signs
 - Pedestrian-oriented = more, smaller signs

Mr. Badman presented the single proposed 100-square-foot wall sign the applicant is requesting to be installed onto an existing corporate office on the southwest corner of the SR 161 and I-270 interchange. He explained the wall sign that will be flush mounted contains blue, internally-illuminated, LED channel letters. The sign, he said, will be mounted within the fourth story of the building at an overall height of 40 feet, 4 inches.

Mr. Badman said all of the Minor Project Review Criteria has been met, as well as the requirements in the Zoning Code for number/type, size, location, height, and colors. Therefore, he said, approval is recommended with no conditions for the Minor Project Review.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Minor Project Review was approved.

INTRODUCTION

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

7679 & 7685 Dublin Plain-City Road Development Plan Review

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

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and noted the two parcels combined are less than five acres.

Mr. Stang reviewed the expedited process for the West Innovation District, whereas the ART has the most reviewing power but there are provisions where applications can be kicked up to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The proposed site plan was presented that shows the orientation of the two buildings on the site and a line between to separate the work to be done in two phases but where approval is being sought for both with this application.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed elevations for Building 1 and pointed out the main entry point. He described the buildings as interesting, contemporary, tall buildings as they are proposed at 34 feet in height. He also presented the proposed elevations for Building 2 with the architecture being a mirror image of the first building.

The proposed courtyard was presented that will fill the space between the two buildings, which is also the entryway for both but it is not intended to be built until Phase 2 begins. Mr. Stang added a fence is proposed to run along the north and south sides as there will be additional amenities for the buildings to use.

Mr. Stang said a single wall sign is proposed for each building, which appear to meet the Code for each building. He presented the signs that both state "Urban Air" in orange and gray letters respectively but one has the text "Adventure Park" and the other "Skydiving Park".

Mr. Stang reported staff will continue to review the application and an ART determination is scheduled for December 7, 2017.

Colleen Gilger asked if these building could be changed into another use down the line and Mr. Stang answered they could be converted fairly easily. She asked her fellow ART members if they had any issues with these appearing as twin buildings and if the City would want identical buildings next to each other.

Mr. Stang said that Code does not require that these two buildings appear different from each other.

Jennifer Rauch asked if a suggestion could be made to the applicant to consider different accent colors at least. Ms. Gilger asked if something could be done to make the entryways more interesting.

Shawn Krawetzki indicated the buildings would then be similar enough to be 'sisters' but not 'twins'. Claudia Husak said she thought it was fine to have identical buildings.

Mr. Krawetzki asked why the applicant could not have one building instead of two and if that is why the area is open between. Mr. Stang answered there is a size restriction in the Code that only allows 20,000 square feet for indoor recreation and entertainment uses per parcel.

Ms. Gilger recalled the ART pushed another business nearby to produce more than just box forms for their architecture. Mr. Stang noted there are projections from the building where gray and orange colors are shown but it is hard to tell from the submitted drawings.

Mr. Stang said the applicant is trying to maximize the site. He said they are required to have twice as many parking spaces than what they are showing, which currently is 161 spaces. He said there are a number of uses that can fit into indoor entertainment but they will probably never need what is required per Code. He added the WID allows a parking analysis to be submitted and approved by the ART to permit a reduction in required parking.

Ms. Husak directed staff to review the parking for a recent request from an applicant with a very similar use because she recalled that they wanted more parking spaces.

Aaron Stanford asked what is located east to this site. Mr. Stang answered residential and a future roundabout. He clarified there are two houses closest to the intersection of SR 161 and Cosgray Road that the City is purchasing for the improvements.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the timing between the two construction phases to which Mr. Stang answered its dependent on construction of the first phase.

Ms. Gilger asked what happens if Phase 2 does not happen as the courtyard is tied to that second phase. Mr. Stang said perhaps part of the courtyard plan could be constructed with Phase 1 to ensure an amenity is provided to both buildings. Mr. Krawetzki indicated if half of it was installed with Phase 1, it would get torn up with the installation of Phase 2. He suggested maybe some of the landscaping could be installed for the use of the first building.

The ART discussed the dumpster location and found it to be very close to the pond and the concern was for the refuge trucks that will need to back into that area for pick-up.

Mike Altomare said he was seeing issues with fire access, not as much with Building 1 but certainly with Building 2 and circulating throughout the site. Mr. Harpham added there are specific requirements for fire access to be considered. Mr. Stang said he would request more information from the applicant.

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 3:12 pm.