



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, May 2, 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; and Alan Perkins, Fire Plans Examiner.

Other Staff: Logan Stang, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Nicki Martin, Planner I; Richard Hanson, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Todd Gedde, Mark Silnes, and Derek Gibson, VA Data (Case 1).

Mr. Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the meeting minutes from April 18, 2019. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented.

INTRODUCTIONS

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

**6685 Crosby Court
Development Plan**

Ms. Martin said this application is a proposal for the addition of six data storage units at the east end of Building 1 and the addition of a new 139-space parking lot on this parcel in the West Innovation District.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site and explained that only part of a gravel parking lot that exists on site would be paved for additional parking. She presented the proposed site plan that highlighted the five accessory structures (Igloo pods) to be added for data center storage in a secure manner that is climate controlled, visually screened, and separate from the building. The igloos require HVAC cooling units and mechanicals that have to face away from the building in order to have proper circulation and prevent overheating. The parking lot to be paved is in the area of the future office building. The installation of the igloo pods removes 19 spaces at this building adding to the insufficiency of parking overall so the 139 spaces will take care of the deficiencies for the site currently.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed character images from the east and north corner and noted the tops of the igloos are white and a series of egress points will be needed. She presented the proposed east elevation louvered screen wall at 10.5 feet in height to screen the units but allow for air circulation and that is why they are installed vertically.

Todd Gedde, VA Data, noted the louvers are not monolithic but rather colored panels to match the coloring pattern on the building. Mark Silnes, VA Data, said it is all one fencing material.

Mr. Papsidero inquired about opacity as the screening appears very transparent. Mr. Krawetzki asked to see a physical sample of the fence.

Ms. Gilger asked what necessitated the igloos. Mr. Gedde said there is a large amount of data and these very expensive tapes are constrained for climate control. He explained there is too much variation in the climate in a large building so that is not an option.



Ms. Gilger asked if they will be needing this additional storage on each building. Mr. Gedde answered they are considering that option.

Mr. Gedde said the igloos are white and are not very visible in these images. He said the brown sections are covered walkways but they are not attached to the building.

Mr. Gedde reiterated the public view is fairly limited. He confirmed they are not in the drive aisle, but are eliminating green space and 19 parking stalls, hence the need for more temporary finished parking. He clarified 'temporary' because they want to add a future office building.

Ms. Gilger emphasized that the Economic Development Agreement (EDA) states there needs to be certain amount of square feet of building on this site by the agreed deadline. She added igloos do not count towards square footage.

Mr. Stanford asked if these igloos have been installed in other locations and if the applicant would share what they look like. Mr. Gedde said the applicant is very restrictive about taking photos. He said these igloo pods are located at a Virginia and Oregon facilities but he is not permitted to show the equipment. Ms. Rauch asked if the screening was the same. Mr. Gedde said they vary depending on the requirements of the municipality, the ones in Hilliard and New Albany are different.

Mr. Krawetzki inquired about the differences in height of the screening or if the fence can be kept at the same height across the entire façade. Ms. Gilger stated the EDA allows higher fencing than what is permitted in Code. Ms. Husak clarified the screening has to be one foot above the equipment they are screening and is not considered fencing in the zoning code.

Ms. Husak indicated the screening appears 100% opaque but air still flows through it but the Administrative Review Team (ART) will need to make that determination at their review. Mr. Gedde said the louvers are vertical so they are non-pliable as compared to the horizontal louvers on the other side of the building.

Mr. Perkins said there needs to be a fire path gate to the building that can be found quickly. He noted with the parking eliminated right there the fire apparatus should not be affected as far as access. Mr. Gedde said there are two hydrants on each side but might move. Mr. Silnes said security requirements dictate they are not to allow gaps. He added all these parts and pieces can be challenging to fit within all requirements.

Mr. Papsidero asked Ms. Martin if Staff had shared comments. She said both she and Ms. Rauch have been working with them along with the architect to come up with this design but things have shifted. She stated this was the best aesthetic solution for meeting Code with the fewest number of Administrative Departures.

Mr. Gedde said they will bring in a physical sample of the screening and provide opacity numbers. Mr. Krawetzki encouraged the applicant to return with options. Mr. Gedde explained that the horizontal louvers allow for air intake and the vertical louvers serve as vents.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.]

**2. 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 noted the applicant was not present but she has had multiple conversations with her. She presented an aerial view of the site. She presented an image of the existing conditions. She presented the

proposed five-square-foot sign that has the images and text screen-printed in black on a white MDO board. She indicated this situation was similar to an approved sign for a neighboring building to the north, which is a new toy store. MDO is not an approved material so the applicant will be required to revise the sign material. Staff's expectation is that the sign will have some dimensionality. Ms. Gilger asked if the sign is already installed. Per the image provided, it is hard to tell and Ms. Martin said she would verify with the applicant.

Ms. Gilger asked for clarification if the ART had approved this similar material. Ms. Martin clarified the ART had recommended approval to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for a Master Sign Plan for the toy store. And then the ARB struggled with that decision as they determined this was not a good precedent to set allowing a lower quality material. They did so with the condition that the applicant would replace the sign with a better sign within a year to come into compliance. They wanted to ensure they did not set a precedent whereas if the applicant already had installed a sign that would not be approved that they could keep it.

Mr. Stanford asked if a different bracket could be used to hang the sign as the existing detracted from the sign. Ms. Husak said her concern was that the sign was white and flat which does not exist in the district. Mr. Stanford suggested the applicant could color the boxes and make the boxes project out for relief and added interest.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.]

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

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

Mr. Ridge said this application is a proposal for the construction of two patios and associated site improvements for an existing building zoned Bridge Street District Historic South. The ART will make a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board on May 16, 2019, for the Board's review on May 22, 2019.

Mr. Ridge presented an aerial view of the site. 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, which is a potential site for a future patio. He presented the current and proposed site plans whereas sites for both patios are proposed. 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 will be covered in the same limestone veneer used currently on the building. The proposed wrought iron railing has an arch design, which the neighbor currently has.

Mr. Krawetzki asked if the fencing will run right along the lane and what the height will be. Mr. Ridge said he would have to verify. Ms. Husak indicated the Liquor Control Board may require a certain height.

Mr. Krawetzki asked if the parking spaces were shortened. Ms. Rauch inquired about the width of the lane and Mr. Krawetzki the width of the sidewalks connecting the patio to the entrance. Mr. Ridge said he would need to verify with the applicant as well as obtain more information about the proposed landscaping.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the side yard setback. Mr. Stang verified the patio is considered a permanent structure and added he thought there was a zero side yard setback in the Historic South District

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 2:40 pm.