



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, December 7, 2017 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

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

Applicants: Andreas Larisch, M+A Architects; and Michael Villopoto, TMG Adventures Park, Inc. (Case 1); and Linda Menerey and Justin Maxwell, EMH&T (Case 2).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the November 30 meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

CASE REVIEW

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

7679 & 7685 Dublin Plain-City Road Development Plan Review

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for two, one-story, 20,000-square-foot indoor entertainment and recreational use facilities for an approximately 2-acre parcel and a 2.88-acre parcel, 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 reported this application was introduced a few weeks ago before staff sent out their Comment Letter.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site as well as the proposed site plan. He said staff and the ART has had concerns about the layout with parking towards SR 161 and the fire access around the back of the building. He noted the requirement for parking in the WID is that visitor parking may be in front of the building while employee parking is located to the sides or rear of the building. He reported the applicant has stated they will have more customers than employees so customers would need to park in the front. He said staff had requested a better understanding of how the fire access works so the applicant provided an Auto-turn exhibit for review.

Mr. Stang said the 300-space parking requirement exceeds the applicant's needs so the applicant provided a parking analysis to be reviewed against the Code requirements. He explained the eastern portion of the site will be developed first and the western portion that includes the second building and parking for that building will be developed later. Shared parking therefore, is also considered in the calculations, he said, for this entertainment and recreational use.

The elevations for proposed building 1 were shown to compare to the elevations of proposed building 2. Mr. Stang said the architecture was fairly identical. He said in response to the ART's concern about the amount of relief used in the architecture from previous graphics, the applicant provided renderings to



demonstrate better shading from the relief of the buildings. He pointed out the areas of the buildings that project or are recessed.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed courtyard plan, where the majority of it would be constructed in Phase 2 of development. He reported that the ART had concerns if Phase 2 did not occur then Phase 1 would have no outdoor amenity so the applicant revised the plan to show the part of the courtyard that would be constructed with Phase 1. He added that temporary fencing for the patio space would be installed during Phase 1.

Shawn Krawetzki asked why more of the landscaping was not to be completed with Phase 1. Vince Papsidero asked how the rest of the landscape bed that runs along building 1 would be treated. Andreas Larisch, M+A Architects, answered it would just be seeded until they begin construction on Phase 2 and that more of the landscaping could be included upfront.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the parking and drive aisles to be completed in Phase 1. Mr. Stang explained the property line cuts straight through so everything to the east of the shared property line would be included in Phase 1, which is the access from SR 161 and continued around to the backside of the building. He added there would just be a dead end at the western property and the area to the west of the shared property line would be included in Phase 2.

Mr. Papsidero asked if the setbacks had been met to which Mr. Stang answered affirmatively. Mr. Stang said an Administrative Departure would be needed to address the shared patio area that goes right up to the property line.

Matt Earman asked if Phase 2 was programed or if it was contingent on how well Phase 1 developed. Mr. Larisch said a plan is set; construction depends on when the first building is finished but Phase 2 would most likely begin six months after completion of Phase 1.

Colleen Gilger said she thought the intent of the West innovation District was to push the building up closer to the street frontage and provide the parking in the rear. She said she would like to see the edge be consistent with adjacent properties such as Command Alkon.

Michael Villopoto, TMG Adventure Parks, Inc., said they originally proposed the detention basin in the front of the building with parking to the rear but staff requested it be moved to the rear of the property, which then does not leave enough room for parking in the back.

Mr. Stanford asked if the applicant had considered other ways for stormwater management besides a detention basin. He suggested there are alternatives and it would be best if the pond could go away; parking issues could be resolved by using underground stormwater management.

Mr. Papsidero mentioned that initially the applicant proposed two entrances and wanted to know what happened to that plan. Mr. Larisch said they explored dual entrances but they needed more of a gap with the roundabout so close to this property, as requested by ODOT. Mr. Stang noted most of the right-of-way is under ODOT control. He said the applicant is working with both the City and ODOT. Mr. Stanford said a small portion overlaps and they will want help with the turn lane so it will depend on what comes first. He suggested this issue be spelled out in a condition of approval just to explain how this all happens.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there was anything different between the two buildings proposed. Mr. Larisch answered they are the same configuration.

Mr. Stang said staff needs to review the materials that were received too late for this meeting but the applicant will come back to the ART on December 21, 2017, before they move forward to the PZC. He explained that the next step will be, if everything is minor and can be addressed with conditions, for the ART's determination.

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

INTRODUCTION

1. BSD O – Echo, Neighborhood Hospital PID: 273-009147
17-118PP/FP/DP/SPR/MSP Preliminary Plat/Final Plat/Development Plan
Review/Site Plan Review/Master Sign Plan

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for construction of an 18,000-square-foot, 24-hour, inpatient and emergency hospital facility on a 3.5-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Office. He said the site is south of West Dublin Granville Road, approximately 500 feet west of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Development Plan and Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066; review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066, and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines; and review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and noted it is just east of Heartland. He reported that the applicant was before the ART a few months ago and reviewed by the PZC on September 21 for a Basic Plan Review. At that time, he said the applicant demonstrated how the developable area is reduced due to the constraints of the site.

Mr. Stang said the vehicular canopy was discussed at length at the PZC meeting because they struggled with the location on the front and disapproved the Waiver request to have the canopy on the side instead of the rear. He added they had concerns with the building location and the treatment along SR 161 as the plan did not appear to be an urban setting engaging the street but more a suburban setting. He reported the Commission was concerned with the type of patient care that would be offered and if this company was associated with any large hospital system. Due to confidentiality, he said, the applicant could not state who the end user is. Specifically, he added, the Commission inquired about psychological care patients and those going through Detox, which is not part of the Conditional Use aspect.

Mr. Stang said the applicant has revised the plans based on the comments received from the Commission. He pointed out the building is closer to SR 161 and they created a better treatment at the front where there can now be more interaction with the street. The remainder of the site, he said, is relatively similar to the Basic Plan.

Mr. Stang said the architecture had not finalized but the ART and the PZC had been favorable to the modern materials proposed. He said that the architecture was almost identical to the Basic Plan with the exception being a new entrance along the plaza area. The proposed elevations were presented and he noted there is a good deal of grade change, which is why a two-tiered plaza was introduced that connects with the sidewalk.

Because this building will facilitate emergency services, Mr. Stang said, the applicant has requested additional signage, which requires a Master Sign Plan. He said Code allows one building mounted sign per

frontage and one ground sign per frontage so the applicant could have four signs overall. The applicant is requesting seven signs, he said, which includes two directional ground signs, one monument sign, two tenant identification signs, and two building mounted directional signs for the ambulance entrance and emergency entrance. He said staff has begun reviewing these signs and had provided initial feedback to the applicant.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, reiterated that the Commission had issues with the vehicle canopy and interaction with the street so they moved the building forward, which brings the canopy along with it. She said they have added a lot of landscape to the graphics to emphasize the six-foot grade change and the issues for pedestrians and vehicles alike to get to the building.

Vince Papsidero inquired about the size of the canopy in comparison to the signs proposed as the renderings did not all appear to be the same. Ms. Menerey answered there were several iterations but thought the correct one appeared to be six feet wide and noted the canopy band is only three feet in height. She added that the canopy has been revised and is wider now to accommodate two cars: 1 car could be parked while the other car is just stopping to drop someone off or could simply drive through. Mr. Papsidero asked if the size of the sign is enlarged then.

Shawn Krawetzki asked how wide the plaza space was. Justin Maxwell, EMH&T, said the top tier of the plaza is 10 feet wide and the lower tier is 6 feet wide.

Aaron Stanford asked if the plaza space was intended to be public or private. Ms. Menerey indicated the lower part was certainly public due to its location and was not sure about the upper terrace. Mr. Stang said the applicant is not required to dedicate any public space; all of it will be located on private property but will certainly feel like publically accessible space.

Mr. Papsidero indicated the terraced areas would provide interaction with the street now and that turned out really well. He said it made the entrances feel very welcoming.

Matt Earman asked about the color of brick proposed. Ms. Menerey answered the brick color is beige and presented material samples. She said they are trying to mix warm and cool colors as they are the trend right now. She said you will see bright white mixed with a warm beige or gold used with silver, for examples.

Mr. Krawetzki asked if there were any designs made with the brick pattern. Ms. Menerey said there were no soldier courses proposed, etc. Mr. Krawetzki asked if there was any way to connect the wall with the building through some type of detailing. Ms. Menerey pointed out the shadow lines at the windows and suggested that perhaps they could do more detail on the long wall for cohesiveness.

Mr. Stanford inquired as to whether any lighting will be proposed for the plaza. Ms. Menerey said no additional lighting is planned.

Sergeant Tim Hosterman said, historically, the Police Department encourages lighting. He inquired about the benches for the plaza. Mr. Maxwell described the benches as ones that can be bolted down to the foundation, first and foremost. He said the benches at the street level are designed with backs to them and the benches on the upper plaza do not have backs. Ms. Menerey added bike racks have been proposed too, and described them as a silver-gray.

Sergeant Hosterman asked if this facility would be open 24-hours a day. Ms. Menerey guessed that certain areas would be limited during later hours. She did not think the door facing SR 161 would be open 24 hours

but patrons would just need to walk around the corner to enter through the double doors under the vehicular canopy that will always be accessible, night or day.

Sergeant Hosterman inquired about the type of clientele this facility would service and if that would include psychiatric patients, which would create a lot of additional issues. He recalled the PZC had asked if the facility will need accommodations like Dublin Springs, such as accommodating patients to go outside where fencing would be required. Ms. Menerey answered she does not know the end user yet but the client, Embree, said clientele is higher-end, private pay and that it would be upscale for the inpatient services side of the business. She said emergency services would be the other side of the business taking care of patients with broken arms or needing stitches, etc., if this was found to be the closest hospital. Mr. Stang reported the client had discussed they were working to eliminate the psychiatric room they are required to have, but currently are required to provide for this treatment.

The ART discussed the designs of the signs. Mr. Stang reported that directional signs are not permitted to include logos and would be smaller in scale. Claudia Husak said this has not been addressed specifically in the Code. Mr. Papsidero said he thought in this MSP, there appeared to be overuse of logos and that at a minimum the logos should be removed from the directional signs. Mr. Stang said one directional sign is proposed at each access and these would be double sided. Ms. Husak indicated this might be something staff should re-evaluate because once someone has reached their destination there is no additional need for directions.

Colleen Gilger asked if the applicant was planning any signs for the internal wall that can be seen through all the glass for the lobby and if the City can limit what they are permitted to have in the lobby. Mr. Stang said the City cannot regulate any sign beyond three feet from the front wall so if the applicant located a sign on the inside wall it would be out of their purview.

Ms. Menerey indicated she cannot commit to removing the logos from the directional signs without first conferring with her client. Mr. Papsidero suggested Ms. Menerey could encourage public art in the plaza space.

Mr. Stang said a comment letter will be sent within the next couple of weeks. He said the applicant could return for the ART meeting on January 4, 2018, if they could provide materials the week between Christmas and New Year holidays. Ms. Menerey indicated the architect is challenged to meet quick turnaround times.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 2:55 pm.