



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, August 2, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner/Chief Building Official; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Earl Lee and Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan (Case 2)

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the July 19, 2018, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented.

III. PRE-APPLICATION

1. BSD SRN – Rebol Canopy

6608 Longshore Street Pre-Application Review

Nichole Martin said this pre-application is a proposal for construction of an architectural canopy structure for a future tenant space within the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is on the southeast corner of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Longshore Street. She said this is a request for a review and feedback for a possible future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site and noted the tenant space was on the northwest corner of the building, across from RAM Restaurant and Brewery.

Ms. Martin presented preliminary renderings received from the applicant that show the metal canopy proposed. She presented the site plan that showed the building footprint, where the canopy would be placed, and noted how the canopy cantilevers into the right-of-way at the corner where there is a post but connects to the building at each end.

Shawn Krawetzki inquired about the type of material that was used for the canopy on this brick building. Ms. Martin answered it was a type of weathered metal but was not provided any details. Mr. Krawetzki said he was concerned about metal staining the sidewalk. He explained that as metal weathers, it will stain other surfaces but if the oxidation process is complete then it can be sealed and would not pose a problem.

Ray Harpham stated he liked this interesting proposal as it is a good way for the applicant to make their mark on the building. He said the applicant will need to ensure any metal used will not stain the ground surfaces, though. Aaron Stanford said he also liked the canopy design as he found it interesting as well. He requested the dimensions of the distance of the canopy from the building as he had concerns about the amount of sidewalk that would be left for pedestrians while still tying back to the building. Ms. Martin indicated that per the dimensions noted for the patio, the canopy might be coming out from the building possibly four to five feet. Mr. Papsidero suggested that maybe if the corner was angled out more it might help ease up part of the sidewalk. Mr. Krawetzki added the canopy does not need that depth.



Mr. Papsidero asked what use was intended for this tenant space and Ms. Martin answered a restaurant use.

Claudia Husak asked if the patio had been approved and Ms. Martin answered the patio had not been submitted for approval. Ms. Martin indicated that Crawford Hoying Development Partners intend to bring the patio forward on the applicant's behalf. Ms. Husak said if the patio is not part of this application then it should be removed from the site drawings.

Mr. Papsidero thought the patio might be problematic. Mr. Harpham suggested the applicant should state that now though, if they intend for it to encroach the right-of-way. Mr. Papsidero asked if the Economic Development Agreement will provide any flexibility for protrusion out into the right-of-way. Ms. Burchett indicated that was possible but there still needs to be a six-foot clear zone for pedestrians. Ms. Husak stated all the dimensions will need to be provided by the applicant for a proper review.

Ms. Martin said she was concerned with how the applicant plans to manage the stormwater that will come off of this canopy.

Ms. Martin presented renderings of both elevations from different angles and pointed out the streetscape, which includes trees with tree grates.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or items for consideration by the ART. [Hearing none.]

IV. CASE REVIEW

2. BSD SRN – Hen Quarter 18-048MPR

6628 Riverside Drive Minor Project Review

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for modifications to an approved patio enclosure including the installation of glass garage doors, face-block sill walls, and aluminum storefronts. She said the site is northeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted the tenant space is located in building C2, east of Riverside Drive at the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She presented the approved eastern and southern elevations of the tenant space as approved through the Minor Project Review that encompassed the patio and site improvements including the canopy with the filigree pattern.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and noted the footprint of the building is the same with the garage door system. She said the Coreten metal panels will be installed on a block base, will have a weathered appearance but will be lacquered; and indicated this material has been used in other projects in the region. She said the metal columns will be painted to match the existing canopy. The metal clad fascia, she noted, will match the profile and color of the existing canopy as well. She added there will be aluminum storefront windows on each end with the frames to match the paint color and will have additional detailing as an artistic feature provided by a dusted vinyl that makes the glass appear to have been etched. She stated the filigree pattern along the top edge of the canopy will remain.

Ms. Burchett presented illustrations showing the garage doors down and what the patio enclosure looks like when they are up.

Earl Lee, Moody Nolan, presented a sample of the tile to be used on the fascia wall and said it would not appear as changed really from the original metal planters that were proposed but will have a sealed finish. He reiterated that the vinyl used on the ends will not appear as bright as it does in the current renderings; it will look a lot nicer and will appear as etched glass and he shared a sample. Additionally, he indicated, the outside will appear more visible to the patrons.

Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan, presented the material that will be used on the sill along the top of the fascia wall and the metal that will be used on the rest of the building.

Ms. Burchett asked what happens if the metal is scratched. Mr. Lee said the Coreten material is sealed. Shawn Krawetzki asked how often the material will need to be resealed. Mr. Lee answered they have never had an issue but it would probably depend on the quality of the initial sealant; to reseal it would require a power wash first and then the sealant added. He noted a dark stone is used on the ground. Ms. Umbarger assured the ART that the material is sealed in the shop and the quality is good.

Aaron Stanford asked if the material will hold up to salt used on the roads in the winter. Mr. Lee explained the material is raised up due to the raised grade. Mr. Stanford asked if that portion is trimmed. Ms. Umbarger answered Ariscraft stone is installed there.

The ART noted the filigree design proposed originally for the west end had changed. Mr. Lee agreed and said they have gone to an 'essence of a chicken' design rather than incorporating the whole hen into the design. He said the glow from the fire inside will really make this glass look pretty and the building being illuminated at night will also add to the aesthetics.

Mike Altomare inquired about the internal fire pit and if the plan had been submitted and the applicant answered affirmatively. Ray Harpham asked if the fire will be produced from gas and Ms. Umbarger answered affirmatively. Mr. Lee said they will not be burning wood but rather providing the appearance of embers beneath rocks, which will provide an ambient glow; there will not be any flames.

Donna Goss commended the applicant on doing a wonderful job incorporating the garage doors as it was a drastic improvement from the original proposal and was really nice.

Mr. Papsidero agreed the design of the new proposal appeared very sharp. He asked if there were any other questions or concerns by the ART. [Hearing none.] He stated the application is anticipated to be before the ART for a determination on August 16, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 2:22 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on August 16, 2018.