



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, January 17, 2019 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Brad Fagrell, Director of Building Standards; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant; and Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal.

Other Staff: Logan Stang, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Chase Ridge, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant; Jimmy Hoppel, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Craig Snider, Signarama Powell (Case 1); Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan (Case 2); James Peltier, EMH&T and Brian McNally, Meyers & Associates Architecture (Case 3); and Chris Winkle, Noah's Event Venue (Case 5).

Mr. Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the meeting minutes from December 6, 2018, December 20, 2018, or January 3, 2019. [There were none.] All three sets of minutes were approved as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. BSD SCN – Throw Nation, Sign
18-082MPR**

**6649 Dublin Center Drive
Minor Project Review**

Richard Hansen said this application is a proposal for a wall sign for an existing commercial tenant space within Dublin Village Center that is west of Dublin Center Drive, ±1,000-feet northwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Mr. Hansen presented an aerial view of the site as well as the proposed 24-square-foot wall sign that is comprised of white, individually-mounted channel lettering with an orange PSA Vinyl secondary image to be installed directly onto the existing gray sign band. He said all aspects of the proposed sign would meet Code with the condition that the applicant ensures the secondary image does not exceed 20% of the maximum permitted sign area.

Mr. Hansen presented an image of the elevation with the proposed sign as it would appear over the main entrance at a height of 13 feet.

Mr. Hansen said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that the secondary image does not exceed 20% of the maximum permitted sign area.

Vince Papsidero asked the applicant, Craig Snider, Signarama Powell, if he agreed to the condition to which he answered affirmatively. Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion. Colleen Gilger motioned, Donna Goss seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review. (Approved 8 - 0)



**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block D, Parking Plan
19-001MPR**

**PID: 273-012703
Minor Project Review**

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for a Parking Plan for Block D of the Bridge Park Development zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood that is southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and John Shields Parkway. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and reported 735 parking spaces were approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission during the Site Plan Review where 1,085 were required by Code and now the applicant is requesting to reduce the parking spaces to 717. The required parking count is based on the highest demand scenario using restaurant uses for all commercial portions of Block D. The proposed decrease of 18 spaces is due to changes in the structured parking layout that provides improved circulation within Building D4/D5. Per the proposal, 63 on-street spaces will be spread throughout Block D, while 654 will be within the parking structure.

Mr. Stang concluded approval is recommended for the Parking Plan without conditions under the Minor Project Review to permit 717 parking spaces where 1,084 spaces are required.

Colleen Gilger asked if Bridge Park were found to be under parked at any time in the future, if additional stories could be added to this structure. Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, replied there is no opportunity for stories to be added but if in the future the amount of parking allotted now was not needed, the structure could be changed to mixed-use buildings.

Brad Fagrell asked how parking is shared with other structures. James Peltier, EMH&T, answered that Crawford Hoying Development Partners has been conducting a non-scientific parking study and found that generally, extra parking is available. Tim Hosterman added Crawford Hoying has said that during a couple of events, both the Block B and Block C garages were full but the hotel parking was still not filled to capacity.

Mr. Peltier said there had been an issue of insufficient parking due to the reserved signs that were posted already for future tenants but they have since removed 90% of those signs.

Vince Papsidero indicated there will be more parking to come as Blocks F and G are developed.

Ms. Gilger said she was also concerned about having enough parking once the office building in Block A is filled.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion. Ms. Gilger motioned, Ms. Goss seconded, to approve the Parking Plan under the Minor Project Review. (Approved 8 - 0)

RECOMMENDATIONS

**3. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1
18-080DPR/SPR**

**PID: 273-008867
Development & Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan**

Claudia Husak said this application is a proposal for a six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel and commercial building and associated site improvements located southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan and Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of the site and the BSD Block layout with Block F highlighted for context. Blocks F and G have been informally reviewed and the Basic Plan Review was approved by City Council. The applicant has addressed the Commission's concerns regarding open space, trash, and circulation and provided summarized comments as well as a Parking Demand Study Data.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed site plan that included one building on one lot and a private street within a platted reserve area in the northern portion of Block F and a graphic showing the proposed public open space. The main change from the previous proposal is the elimination of a pool that was within the building. The Open Space requirement is not met with the proposal. Smaller open spaces are planned but will not be counted as they are located on a separate parcel. She explained the applicant will make up the deficiency as the rest of the block develops.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed landscape plan and noted the retaining walls could potentially exceed Code but this is due to the grading. There is a mid-block pedestrian way to provide walkability from the garage to the hotel; a drop-off area for hotel guest; and a dedicated on-street loading zone for hotel and restaurant deliveries.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed elevations as visible from the northeast, northwest, southeast, and the passenger drop-off area. The architecture for the east elevation on Dale Drive has been changed and no signs are visible now. She noted the alternative material proposed.

Ms. Husak stated 15 Waivers have been requested with the Site Plan Review, which is average for an application of this size in the BSD. Staff still has a few concerns in terms of pocket parks as the building has two frontages. She presented graphics as she explained the need for each of the following 15 Waivers:

- 1) Building Types – Parapet Height
- 2) Building Types – Horizontal Expression Lines
- 3) Building Types – Windows, Projecting Sills
- 4) Building Types -- Vents, Air Conditioners, and Other Utility Elements on Street Facing Facades
- 5) Building Types – Rear Setbacks
- 6) Building Types – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage.
- 7) Building Types – Street Facing Transparency
- 8) Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations
- 9) Building Types – Vertical Increments
- 10) Building Types – Permitted Primary Façade Materials
- 11) Building Types – Change in Roof Plane
- 12) Open Space – Provision of Open Space
- 13) Open Space – Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required
- 14) Open Space – Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings
- 15) Open Space – Ownership

Ms. Husak said staff is supportive of the contemporary architecture for this L-shaped, six-story Corridor Building with restaurant space on the ground story and ancillary hotel uses and amenities. The design is consistent with the character of the area, with building mass and scale visually reduced through overlapping rectangular forms defined by diverse and complementary materials cladding the exterior.

Ms. Husak said a Parking Plan is part of the Site Plan Review to allow for an Adjustment to Required Vehicle Parking through Shared Parking Calculations. The combination of uses proposed requires a total of 187 parking spaces, and 12 on-street parking spaces are provided along the perimeter of the site. To assist in meeting the parking requirement, 142 existing surplus parking spaces in the Block B parking structure will be applied to the uses in building F1, for a total of 154 parking spaces provided. The surplus parking spaces

are the result of the existing parking structure on B Block to the west providing more spaces than the minimum required for Block B uses when initially approved. This will handle the majority of the parking for the hotel and restaurant. She presented information obtained from the applicant containing data for the parking demand for both weekdays and weekends and with the different uses showing different peak times that off-set each other, including adjustments from the other blocks.

Ms. Husak stated the ART has the power to approve Administrative Departures because the differences varying from the Code are within 10%. The following three Administrative Departures have been requested and explained the need for each:

1. Corridor Building Type – Upper Story Transparency
2. Corridor Building Type – Vertical Façade Divisions
3. Corridor Building Type – Required Change in Roof Plane

Ms. Husak said the Development Plan is recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) without conditions.

Ms. Husak stated the Site Plan Review is recommended for approval to the PZC with eight conditions as follows:

- 1) That the applicant evaluate opportunities for provision of required publicly accessible open space;
- 2) That the applicant provide a public access easement to and over the proposed Pocket Park;
- 3) That an on-street van accessible parking space be provided based on the provision of three new parking spaces;
- 4) That bicycle parking spaces be provided as required by Code;
- 5) That exterior lighting specifications for all proposed fixtures be submitted with building permits;
- 6) That exterior lighting be provided in the area of the Pocket Park to meet the minimum foot candle requirements of Code;
- 7) That details and specifications for the proposed vehicular canopy be submitted with building permits; and
- 8) That the applicant verify the proposed height of the retaining walls surrounding the open space along Winder Drive and request any necessary approvals should they exceed Code-permitted height.

Ms. Husak said the applicant had sample materials to share with the ART. Brian McNally, Meyers and Associates Architects, indicated they are backing off of the alternate façade product previously proposed and plan to use fiber cement with a smooth finish instead.

Aaron Stanford requested clarification on parking numbers. James Peltier, EMH&T, said when Block B was built, they provided 142 stalls over the Code requirements. He said 187 stalls were needed for the hotel. 140 stalls were left over from Block B. Per the Shared Use Study, the office use on Block B requires 107 stalls, which are not used on the weekends so they are available to the hotel on weekends as well as 5 pm – 10 pm on weekdays when the office is closed; 250 spaces are available for the hotel on weekends.

Ms. Husak said there are concerns with the functionality of the pocket park and encouraged the applicant to either make up the minimum numbers required when they develop the remainder of the block or pay a Fee-in-Lieu. Mr. Peltier asked where specifically for this application they are falling short of the requirements. Ms. Husak answered $\pm 1,900$ square feet of publicly accessible open space is required with this Site Plan for the mix of commercial uses. A total of $\pm 1,200$ square feet of open space are provided as a Pocket Park on the south side of the building, north of Winder Drive (Private). The Pocket Park is defined as part of building F1 containing steps and retaining walls and is programmed with a variety of seating areas. Based on the

proximity of the proposed Pocket Park to the hotel and the degree of separation from the public right-of-way and other existing open spaces, the primary users of this space will be hotel guests. She added the site for building F2 cannot be taken into consideration at this point and believes that is where they could make up the difference.

Ms. Husak indicated the applicant could go before the PZC on February 7, 2019. She restated the ART needs to make a determination for three Administrative Departures today, and recommendations to the PZC for the Development Plan without conditions, 15 Waivers, and a Site Plan with eight conditions that also included a Parking Plan.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended for three Administrative Departures:

1. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)1. Façade Requirements, Upper Story Transparency. Minimum transparency required for upper stories of street facing facades is 30%. Request. Proposed transparency of 28% for the upper stories of the north elevation.
2. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) Façade Requirements, Façade Divisions. Vertical Increments no greater than 45 feet. Request. South elevation—middle portion permitted to be 48-foot wide vertical increment.
3. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane. Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet. Request: To permit a roof plane of 87.92 feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane on the west elevation.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan without conditions.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 15 Waivers:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height. Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high. Request: To parapets of .5 feet and 7.5 feet in height.
2. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Expression Lines. Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building. Request: Expression lines distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and define the top of the parapet.
3. §153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows, Projecting Sills Required. Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one-by-four trim or brick mould casing. Request: To permit windows to be recessed into the siding clad facades with no projecting sills.
4. §153.062 – Building Types (N)(4)(a)(5) Vents, Air Conditioners, other Utility Elements. Vents, air conditioners, and other utility elements are not permitted on street facing facades. Request. Permission for PTAC and VTAC units grills/louvers on street facing facades and architectural louvers above restaurant storefront windows for future mechanical systems.
5. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks. The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.

Request. Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve "B" to be setback ± 3.33 feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.

6. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.
Request. Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
7. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.
Request: To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
8. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.
Request. To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.
9. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments
Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.
Request: To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.
10. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane
Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.
Request: To permit roof planes of ± 111 feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.
11. §153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.
Request: To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.
12. §153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.
One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.
Request: To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.
13. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.
A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.
Request: 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.
14. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.
The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.
Request: Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.
15. §153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.
Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.
Request: Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended to the PZC for the Site Plan with a Parking Plan and the following eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant evaluate opportunities for provision of required publicly accessible open space;
- 2) That the applicant provide a public access easement to and over the proposed Pocket Park;
- 3) That an on-street van accessible parking space be provided based on the provision of three new parking spaces;
- 4) That bicycle parking spaces be provided as required by Code;
- 5) That exterior lighting specifications for all proposed fixtures be submitted with building permits;
- 6) That exterior lighting be provided in the area of the Pocket Park to meet the minimum foot candle requirements of Code;
- 7) That details and specifications for the proposed vehicular canopy be submitted with building permits; and
- 8) That the applicant verify the proposed height of the retaining walls surrounding the open space along Winder Drive and request any necessary approvals should they exceed Code-permitted height.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion to approve the three Administrative Departures. Mr. Krawetzki motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, to approve the three Administrative Departures. (Approved 8 - 0). Mr. Papsidero asked for a recommendation of approval to the PZC for the following: Development Plan without conditions, 15 Waivers, and a Site Plan with eight conditions that also included a Parking Plan. (All were Recommended for Approval 8 – 0)

**4. BSD HC – Commercial Building
19-004ARB-MPR**

**25 North Street
Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for exterior paint modifications to an existing two-story, commercial building zoned Bridge Street District - Historic Core that is south of North Street, ±150 feet east of the intersection with N. High Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §§153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site as well as photographs of the existing beige building from the southwest and southeast. She said the structure was built in the 1960s with simple Vernacular architecture with an asphalt shingle gable roof, clad in Stucco except for wood shingles along the second story of the west elevation. The structure has a rectangular footprint, built into a hillside. The main entrance is on the west elevation with secondary entrances on the north and east elevations.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed paint color of gray “Downing Slate” for the stucco and wood shingles with off-white trim “Divine White” selected from the Sherwin Williams Historic Color Palette.

Ms. Martin said this application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria, the Architectural Review Board Standards, Alterations to Buildings, Structure, and Site, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. The Minor Project was found to be consistent with the applicable review criteria.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for the Minor Project Review without conditions.

Ms. Goss encouraged the applicant to holistically update the exterior in addition to the proposed paint modification. Ms. Martin said she would convey that message to the applicant since he was not present.

Ms. Gilger asked where the building was located specifically and Ms. Martin answered the structure is located behind Brazenhead.

Mr. Papsidero asked if everyone was supportive of recommending approval of this application to the Architecture Review Board without conditions and all were in favor. The ARB will review this application January 23, 2019, for final approval.

CASE REVIEW

5. ID-2 - Noah's Event Venue 17-108WID-SP

**PID: 274-001353
Site Plan Review**

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for the construction of ±8,000-square-foot conference center and associated site improvements on a 4.15-acre parcel, zoned Research Flex District. He said the site is on the northeast corner of the intersection of Shier-Rings Road and Eiterman Road and presented an aerial view. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.042(E)(7).

Mr. Stang reported the application was last reviewed by the ART in November 2018 and they expressed concerns with the architecture. The applicant resubmitted a revised design and materials two weeks ago with very minor changes to the site plan based on staff comments.

The applicant, Chris Winkle, Noah's Event Venue, explained they moved the driveway as far as they could from the intersection, per staff's comments. Colleen Gilger asked if they gained any more space for parking but Mr. Winkle answered they did not.

Mr. Winkle shared the new proposed materials, which included a lighter-colored, metal siding with wood finish, black corrugated metal to be used to screen the mechanicals, and two different concrete wall panels to provide additional interest to the facades. One panel is an exposed gray aggregate for the corners that extends up 18 inches along the roofline, with the remainder proposed to be smooth-surfaced, gray panels.

Shawn Krawetzki said the revised materials look good and Donna Goss agreed.

Mr. Stang presented renderings of the west as well as from the southwest perspective that included a projecting sign the applicant is proposing for the corner.

Mr. Winkle said the plant palette had not changed. Mr. Stang explained there was a sidewalk around the entire building but now the applicant has provided an eight-foot planting area around the foundation with a five-foot walkway that will include wood benches. Mr. Krawetzki inquired about the type of trees the applicant plans on installing around the façade. He said a fistiget or tight type of growth is needed like Kindred Spirit Oak but Red Cedar should be okay.

Mr. Stang said the applicant is scheduled to return to the ART on January 31, 2019, for a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their meeting on February 7, 2019.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 2:50 pm.