



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, May 16, 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 Manager; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant; Brad Fagrell, Director of Building Standards; and Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal.

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

Applicants: Todd Gedde, Mark Silnes, and Derek Gibson, VA Data (Case 2); and Michelle Alvarez, Extravagifts (Case 3).

Mr. Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the meeting minutes from May 2, 2019. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

1. Sprint Wireless Macro Co-Location Installation 19-031ARTW 6013 Glick Road Administrative Review - Wireless

Mr. Hansen said this application is a proposal for a co-location for a Wireless Communications Facility south of Glick Road, approximately 1,000 feet southeast of Dublin Road to add three antennas to an existing 150-foot monopole and the installation of two cabinets to an existing raised platform.

Mr. Hansen presented the proposed installations for 145 feet up the monopole, which meets the criteria.

Mr. Hansen said approval is recommended for the Administrative Review – Wireless with the following condition:

- 1) That the devices and supporting electrical and mechanical equipment shall maintain a neutral color that is identical to or closely compatible with the color of the supporting structure.

Mr. Papsidero asked Mr. Hansen if the applicant agreed to the single condition prior to the meeting. Mr. Hansen said he does not anticipate any push back and confirmed there will not be any further expansion on the ground beyond what was proposed.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion. Mr. Fagrell motioned, Mr. Krawetzki seconded and the motion was passed. (Approved 8 – 0)



**2. VA Data
19-032DP**

**6685 Crosby Court
Development Plan**

Ms. Martin said this application is a proposal for site modifications to allow for the addition of five accessory igloos with mechanical screening and a new 139-space parking lot for an existing data center campus in the West Innovation District.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site. She presented the proposed site plan that highlighted the parking area to be paved and the five accessory structures (Igloo pods) to be added. She said the igloos are for long term data center storage, which is climate controlled, visually screened, and separate from the building in a secure manner. The parking lot plan needs to be updated to include bicycle parking and Code-compliant parking spaces.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed east elevation with the alternative design based on the ART's discussion at the previous meeting and the louvered screen wall design that was also updated for appearance and opacity.

Todd Gedde, VA Data, brought physical samples of the metal louvers and the perforated screen panel that is installed immediately behind the louvers that will be powder coated to match. Ms. Martin explained that while this system is not 100% opaque, the louvers can only be seen from one direction and that is opposite to those driving into the campus. The screen panels help with opacity and security but need to be perforated for air flow needed for the igloos. Ms. Martin indicated the screen panels do not meet the 100 percent opacity requirement, which will require an Administrative Departure approval. The fence will be one foot higher than the equipment but still does not exceed the maximum height. Ms. Martin presented the Administrative Departure analysis.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for the following Administrative Departure:

1. §153.133(C)(1) – Screening for Service Structures – Opacity/Height

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for a Development Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant update the parking lot plan to meet all applicable Code requirements including drive aisle width, parking space size, and required bicycle parking.

Mr. Fagrell asked if the trailers will be eliminated for the expansion of the parking area. Mr. Gedde said the construction trailers are still needed so they will be moved off to the side off of the asphalt. He confirmed the paving material will be asphalt and the walking paths will be maintained.

Mr. Fagrell asked if the igloo structures are meant to be permanent. Mr. Gedde answered affirmatively and added they meet the standards for the industrialized unit program of Ohio.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion to approve the Administrative Departure. Ms. Goss motioned, Mr. Krawetzki seconded, and the motion was passed. (Approved 8 – 0) Mr. Papsidero called for a motion to approve the Development Plan with the one condition. Ms. Goss motioned, Ms. Gilger seconded, and the motion was passed. (Approved 8 – 0)

RECOMMENDATIONS

**3. Extravagifts
19-033ARB-MPR**

**24 N. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Ms. Martin said this application is a proposal for the installation of an approximately 5.33-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site and an image of the existing conditions. She presented the proposed revised double-sided projecting sign that has the images and text in black on a white High Density Urethane (HDU) sign panel. She added the sign will be sandblasted for a raised border and there is an adequate clear distance for any pedestrians below.

Mr. Papsidero asked the applicant if she had anything she wanted to add. She answered she is confident Ms. Martin covered it all in her presentation.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] He called for a vote on the Minor Project Review. (Recommended for Approval 8 – 0) Therefore, this application would be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

**4. Galbreath Realty
19-034ARB-MPR**

**75 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Mr. Ridge said this application is a proposal for site improvements for an existing historic property to include two new raised brick patios on the north and west sides of the existing building, parking lot improvements, and updated landscaping. He added the Architectural Review Board is the final reviewing body and would be reviewed at their next meeting on May 22, 2019.

Mr. Ridge presented an aerial view of the site, which is in Bridge Street District – Historic South. He presented photographs taken from Eberly Hill Lane out towards S. High Street that showed the limestone veneer and from the west-facing surface parking lot, both of which are potential sites for a future patio. He presented the current and proposed site plans whereas sites for both patios are proposed. He explained the front face of the proposed north-facing patio closest to South High Street will align with the existing front porch and the other patio will be constructed of the same materials.

Mr. Ridge noted the carriage walk is a connection point and to allow for the overhang of the parked cars. He presented the graphic for the proposed elevation for the site improvements intended along Eberly Hill Lane including the raised patio as well as for the site improvements proposed for the elevation facing to the west. He presented images of the proposed Belden Brick Indian Red Clear pavers for the raised patio and the base to be covered in the same limestone veneer currently used on the building. The proposed wrought iron railing has an arch design, which is the same as used by the neighbor.

Mr. Ridge ended his presentation by stating an approval is recommended to be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board for this Minor Project Review without conditions.

Mr. Krawetzki inquired about the dimensions of the carriage walk landscape beds. Mr. Ridge replied two feet, one inches. Mr. Krawetzki said it will be difficult to get anything to grow in that confined space. David Galbreath, Galbreath Real Estate said he was considering Boxwoods for that planting bed. Mr. Krawetzki advised against it as the Boxwoods would require constant pruning to keep them small enough and eventually they would grow too large to be healthy. He asked if the size of the bed could be increased to a minimum width of three feet. Mr. Ridge noted the drive aisle was 24 feet wide and only 22 feet was required so the applicant could possibly have more room for the planting bed.

Mr. Stanford confirmed the right-of-way was not being affected by these requested modifications.

Mr. Galbreath indicated there is a tenant considering this location but their decision is contingent on the north-facing patio closest to South High Street being approved. He explained there is a severe slope on the west side. He said they find standing water there when it rains, which then backs up into the building so

the same area being raised 18 inches to accommodate a patio creates a more useable area and helps water to drain into the lines below.

Mr. Papsidero asked if a condition can be added to request the rear planting bed meet a width of three feet. He asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.]

Mr. Ridge said approval is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant revises the design of the west patio to increase the width of the west-facing landscape beds to a minimum of three feet.

Mr. Papsidero called for a vote of a recommendation of approval of the Minor Project Review with the one condition. (Recommended for Approval 8 – 0) The Minor Project Review would be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Papsidero noted this was the last ART meeting where recommendations would be made to the higher authorities due to the recent amendments to the Code. He adjourned the meeting at 2:25 pm.