



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, December 21, 2017 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Rachel Ray, Economic Development Administrator; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner/Chief Building Official; Jay Anderson, Director of Parks Operations; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Alan Perkins, Fire Plans Examiner.

Other Staff: Logan Stang, Planner I; Tammy Noble, Senior Planner; and Jenny Rauch, Planning Manager.

Applicants: Andreas Larisch, M+A Architects; Jack Reynolds, Smith and Hale, LLC; Nathan Harrington, Osborn Engineering; and Michael Villopoto, TMG Adventures Park, Inc. (Case 1).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 7 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 presented an aerial view of the site as well as the proposed site plan. He said that this application had been reviewed by the ART before and that specifically the applicant is here to talk about the site layout. He said that there has been discussion internally about whether or not the proposed layout meets the Code requirements as there is a provision requiring employee and service parking to be at the side or rear with visitor parking limited to the front of the building. He said the applicant is here to discuss their intent for meeting that provision prior to moving forward for a determination. He stated that the applicant has addressed some of the other comments made during the review such as including more of the courtyard with the construction of Phase I.

Andreas Larisch, M+A Architects, said the first item to consider is the Zoning Code requires significantly more parking than what the applicant would actually need to operate. He said that since the requirement is based on occupancy, the applicant is required to provide a little over 300 spaces but are proposing about half of that to be shared between both buildings. Mr. Larisch said that additionally, many customers will travel with multiple people in a single vehicle as opposed to having everyone drive separately. He said this further reduces the need for parking spaces.

Mr. Larisch said pertaining to the layout, there is a concern with what surrounds this property. He said that they are located in an industrial area with open storage located behind their property. He said this in addition to the stormwater pond concerns from a safety standpoint as they do not want children to have direct access to these areas. Vince Papsidero asked what type of security they would have on-site to handle these concerns. Michael Villopoto, TMG Adventures Park, Inc, said this is one of the few freestanding buildings they would have throughout the country. He said most of their operations are connected to larger



shopping centers that might have security already provided. He said parking in the rear does not work from a functional perspective either, as there is a single entrance on the front of the building.

Mr. Papsidero said that since the applicant chose this site the ART cannot use the surrounding context as a reason to defer from the Zoning Code. He said this is intended to be an industrial area of the City. Mr. Larisch said the operation needs a construction-type building similar to a warehouse, which is why this area works for their client. He said the entrance is still a concern as the courtyard is closed off to provide a connection between the buildings and they want to limit which entrances the public can use. Mr. Papsidero stated it is a conflict between the function of the building and the site versus the intent of the Code provision.

Jack Reynolds, Smith and Hale, LLC, asked if mounding or additional landscaping could suffice to screen the parking. Mr. Papsidero said that the concern is the relationship between the site and the right-of-way. Mr. Reynolds said initially, the pond was located near the right-of-way but was moved due to engineering requirements. He said the client was in favor of this as it made sense for the operation and removed the safety concern of the pond. He said theirs is a permitted use in the Code, as well, so they need to work towards finding a middle ground.

Ray Harpham stated the parking in the rear does not necessitate a problem and he would be curious to see how the building could change to address the requirements of the Zoning Code. He said since they only have a few freestanding operations, the interior function is not limiting how they can meet the requirements. Mr. Reynolds emphasized this is not an office or manufacturing use. He said this is more of a retail use and retail uses do not hide their parking or the entrance to their business. Mr. Harpham responded that if there are this many constraints then maybe there is another site more suitable for this operation.

Mr. Villopoto said they initially looked at properties in the Bridge Street District but knew they would have trouble meeting the Zoning Code requirements. He said this property worked better for their operation given that they need a tall, one-story building to fit their use. He said if the parking location is this much of a concern then they will revise the layout. He stated they have been working on this for almost a year and he is now concerned with timing. Mr. Papsidero reiterated that parking behind the building would be consistent with the requirements.

Aaron Stanford asked if the applicant could reduce the size of the pond. Nathan Harrington, Osborn Engineering, said they cannot shrink the pond due to stormwater management requirements. Mr. Stanford said that if they cannot get rid of the pond then maybe they can reduce it through other means. He said they could look into using permeable pavers for the parking spaces or incorporating the landscape islands into the management system. He said Engineering sees a lot of ponds because they are usually cheaper but the applicant has the ability to use alternative options, which could then help with the site layout concern. Mr. Harrington said they could look into incorporating some of the recommendations.

Rachel Ray said that from Economic Development's perspective, there is concern with setting a precedent for future development by disregarding the Code requirement for parking location. She said in addition, while they hope this business will serve the community well for the long term, she said Economic Development thought it was important to consider the next user and how this building can be adapted. She said at this point, the lack of parking and space for vehicular circulation at the rear of the building limits its future adaption for permitted West Innovation District industrial uses that will require loading and truck access. Mr. Reynolds said that the interior layout would have to change drastically in order to provide rear access, which puts them in a difficult situation.

Mr. Papsidero suggested if the applicant is opposed to completely revising the submittal, he recommends the applicant return with conceptual layouts showing how the rear parking could function. He asked if parking could be further reduced to help in providing more space for site layout purposes. Mr. Stang said that the applicant is already requesting a reduction of parking so if the ART is supportive then the applicant could remove more parking spaces to allow for additional space. Mr. Larisch said that the operation does not need 160 parking spaces so they would prefer to remove more spaces, if possible. Mr. Papsidero said the ART would entertain a larger reduction if it meant adhering to the requirement of limiting parking forward of the building. He suggested the applicant use examples of other facilities as justification for the parking reduction. Mr. Villopoto stated that other facilities only need around 110 parking spaces so if they can remove an additional 30 then it would go a long way. He said he is still concerned with the safety of children given the industrial area behind their property.

Mr. Harpham asked if the buildings could be connected through some other means. He asked how tall the buildings are. Mr. Larisch said the buildings are 24 feet tall and that they cannot connect the buildings due to the size requirement listed in the Zoning Code. He added the courtyard was used to provide the connection instead and they think the courtyard would serve as a nice amenity for the site as well.

Mr. Harpham said if the applicant provides conceptual site plans, the ART could gain a better understanding of the site constraints. Mr. Reynolds said they would begin on the sketches and would return soon for a review.

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

INTRODUCTIONS

2. BSD SCN – Charles Penzone – The Grand Salon 17-119MPR/WR

6645 Village Parkway Minor Project Review/Waiver Review

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for site improvements for the 12,000-square-foot Charles Penzone Grand Salon on a 1.8-acre parcel zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood. He said the site is west of Village Parkway, northwest of the roundabout with Shamrock Crossing. He said this is a request for a review and approval of Minor Project Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Mr. Stang restated this application includes two case types: a Waiver Review; and Minor Project Review. He said the Waiver requested is to remove a door located on the west elevation that faces the parking lot and adjacent stormwater pond. He said the door was not a principal entrance and due to the interior layout changes, the applicant requests the door be removed and replaced with similar material that surrounds the door. He said a Blank Wall Waiver was already approved for this elevation so no additional Waiver would be required.

Mr. Stang said the other part of this application is the change of the canopy design located at the northeast corner of the building. He said that during the Site Plan Review, the canopies included a unique design, which served a functional purpose while providing a visually interesting design. He said the canopies were proposed as an acrylic material and now the applicant is requesting a corrugated metal roof. He said the applicant was concerned with the acrylic material leaking and therefore not functioning properly as a canopy, which is why the applicant is requesting the change. Mr. Stang stated that the canopy has already been installed in the proposed material as the building is currently under construction.

Vince Papsidero said this is primarily used for coverage of a single parking spot. He said after visiting the site, the canopy almost disappears and is not quite as prominent as it had appeared in the renderings. He said there could be concern though since this detail was discussed with the Planning and Zoning Commission when the original proposal came through for their review.

Rachel Ray said that it did not appear there were drastic changes from the approved plan to now. She indicated she was curious to know how the discussion went during the initial review with the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the original design allowed for light to come through the canopy, which was a nice detail that the corrugated metal would not provide.

Jennifer Rauch said that the proposed design might fit better with the design scheme. She said the original proposal of the canopy provided visual interest per the renderings but that canopy may appear differently in person. Ray Harpham said he is underwhelmed by the change and is reluctant to make a decision based on what the discussion was with the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Harpham asked if the door could be replaced with a window as opposed to completely closing off that façade. Mr. Stang answered that staff had discussed that option as well but have yet to hear back from the applicants. He said staff would continue working with the applicants to address the request for removal of the door as this case has just begun staff review.

Ms. Ray asked how staff felt about the removal of the door. Mr. Stang indicated this elevation is considered the back of the building and would only be visible once one is on-site. He said ideally, if the door could be replaced with a window, then that is the best option but staff could support the removal given its location.

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

**3. BSD P – Riverside Crossing Park, Phase I – East Plaza
17-124SP**

**Riverside Drive
Site Plan Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a proposal for site improvements that include a pavilion, a seating water feature, paths, and landscaping for the first phase of the Riverside Crossing Park, East Plaza. She said the site is west of Riverside Drive, north of the roundabout with SR 161. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Rauch said the Pedestrian Bridge Landing at the West Plaza recently received approval and now designs have been finalized for the East Plaza. She stated the East Plaza includes several pieces and is substantially similar to the approved Basic Plan Review.

Ms. Rauch said the proposal includes an upper terrace with direct access to the (future) bridge, a pavilion along the edge of the terrace with seating areas throughout, a small kitchen, and a restroom facility. She said the pavilion is surrounded by mostly hardscape and provides connections to the lower terrace, which has built-in concrete seating. She said a water feature can house a temporary ice rink for special events.

Ms. Rauch stated there are many pedestrian paths that provide connections throughout the park and the design of Riverside Drive along the park provides for flexibility to allow for food trucks. She said there is significant grade change towards the river, which allows for a service area to be located underneath the pavilion. She said this will house mechanical equipment and provide storage for Parks and Recreation to use for maintenance equipment for the park. She said the pavilion is predominantly a wood and metal

structure with a standing seam metal roof. She concluded there is lots of transparency to encourage activity along with a covered section that includes a large fireplace.

Rachel Ray asked if the water feature was located on both sides of the area. Ms. Rauch responded in the affirmative. Ms. Rauch stated that the water feature and concrete seating are designed to look organic as they move throughout the site.

Ms. Ray inquired from a use perspective, what the large lawn area can support. She thought this was a great opportunity to provide programming for the City of Dublin's corporate wellness program, called "FitBiz," which allows employees of Dublin companies to participate in a wide range of physical activities and wellness classes, and she was hoping the lawn could accommodate different options.

Ms. Rauch said that the lawn area is relatively flat but does contain a slight grade change. Vince Papsidero stated the grade change is more gradual than what is depicted in the renderings. Ms. Rauch said that north of the East Plaza are larger areas that could accommodate games such as kickball but this area could definitely house yoga and other group activities. Ms. Rauch said that there has not been much programming at this time to allow for flexibility. Ms. Ray asked if the plaza could be rented. Ms. Rauch said that has not yet been determined but indicated it would most likely not be available for rent.

Ms. Rauch said that there is a joint meeting scheduled on January 4, 2018, for the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Architectural Review Board to review this proposal and that City Council has the final approval authority. She indicated this proposal will most likely be back before the ART in late January for a recommendation to City Council.

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 2:58 pm.