



## MEETING MINUTES

# Administrative Review Team

Thursday, January 14, 2021 | Live Streamed on YouTube at 2:00 pm

### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Rauch welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

Per the State of Emergency, laws were enacted including the Stay at Home Order for which the City will need to live-stream all public meetings until that order has lifted. Comments can be submitted on the City's website before or during the meeting.

### ROLL CALL

ART Members and Designees present: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Director (Chair); Brad Fagrell, Director of Building Standards; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect Manager; William Morris, Police Corporal; and Chad Hamilton, Fire Department Inspector.

Staff Members present: Chase Ridge, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner II; Zachary Hounshell, Planner I; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Assistant II.

Applicants present: (Case 1) Greg Chillog, Edge Group; Kevin McCauley and Matt Stavroff, Stavroff Land and Development Inc.; and Dean Baumgartner, Ford Associates; (Case 2) Mike Strange, Keller Williams Realty, The Strange Home Team; and (Case 3) Bernie Woytek, VaData; Jim Whitacre, Advanced Civil Design; and Andrew Innis, VaData.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Rauch requested a motion for the approval of the minutes from December 17, 2020. Mr. Stanford made a motion and Ms. Gilger seconded, to approve the minutes.

**Votes:** Aaron Stanford, yes; Colleen Gilger, yes; Brad Fagrell, yes; Jennifer Rauch, yes William Morris, yes; Chad Hamilton, yes; and Shawn Krawetzki, yes. The minutes were approved 7 – 0.

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1. **Dublin Village Center – West Facade 20-172MPR**

#### **6751 Dublin Center Drive Minor Project Review**

Ms. Martin said this an introduction for a proposal for modifications to the exterior of an existing shopping center. The site is located west of Dublin Center Drive, ±950 feet west of the intersection with Tuller Road and is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood. An aerial view of the site located in the northwest portion of the shopping plaza in the Bridge Street District (BSD) was presented as well as the site plan. The Dublin Village Center (DVC) consists of commercial- style buildings where AMC is the anchor tenant. The tenant space was highlighted, which is at the west façade of an existing commercial building.



Ms. Martin presented a graphic of the proposed site plan and façade as this is a proposal to update the façade as well as the site to meet the BSD standards including the addition of outdoor amenities for open space. The intent is to provide smaller tenant spaces within this larger commercial building for both office and retail tenants.

Ms. Martin presented the landscape plan including hardscape materials intended to mimic the dark gray brick found elsewhere in the BSD. There are two seating plazas on either side of the central walkway, which will provide the opportunity for the applicant to select future outdoor seating amenities, which would be either included in this proposal as a revision or as a condition subject to staff approval for the future Minor Project determination. Tenants will have access to lawn space on one side of the site and a mechanical enclosure on other side consisting of existing generators. The applicant is proposing to revise and modify the extent of that enclosure; they are still working through the exterior materials for that enclosure. Steel was originally proposed, however, given the example of materials used elsewhere in the district, the applicant has selected a material that is a low maintenance and sustaining product. Staff has recommended brick for the enclosure but the applicant is researching alternative products.

Ms. Martin reported that parking is to be modified on this site, reducing the number to 30 spaces. This will not have a significant impact on the parking required as there is an abundance of parking surrounding. The elevation is being modified to be more responsive to what is in the BSD. Modifications include new storefront systems, defined tenant space(s) using a new Phenolic panel proposed as the primary material, which is a polymer with colorfast qualities as well as being durable over time. The base for the modified architectural design will be clad in stone veneer. Staff has identified the Phenolic panel as not a permitted primary or secondary material to be used within the BSD, which permits brick, stone, and glass as primary materials and wood or fiber cement siding and architectural metal panels as permitted secondary materials. Staff asked the applicant to pursue other materials, specifically cementitious siding or an architectural metal panel. A portion of the building is proposed to be painted a dark gray and the remainder of the building will retain the existing color.

Ms. Martin stated Staff and the applicant are seeking the ART's input from today including the mechanical enclosure, landscape plan, overhead utility easement, and the proposed architectural modifications.

Ms. Rauch asked if the applicant had anything they wanted to add. Mr. McCauley, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc. said Mr. Chillog, the Edge Group was available for landscaping or hardscape questions and any architectural questions could be directed to Mr. Baumgartner, Ford Associates as they were both in attendance. Mr. McCauley indicated Ms. Martin did a great job covering the basics of this proposal. This project speaks for itself in that it is a great improvement for an area that can definitely use it. The original proposal was for a few multi-tenant spaces but after Covid-19, this is being offered to single users but there is flexibility and a variety of uses to offer. This location would be for tenants that want to be in the BSD but cannot afford what Bridge Street offers. Mr. McCauley said they can bring in tenants at a better price for rent.

Ms. Rauch said these are notable improvements and staff is really pleased with Mr. McCauley bringing this project forward. She asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Gilger noted the existing brick wall providing a nice screening for the dumpsters. She confirmed the tenant will have access to doors on the west and east facades. She asked about the removal of trash and the location of dumpsters. Mr. McCauley answered it depends on the number of users that come into this space ultimately, and how they need to divide the space. This is a square box, 200 square feet by 200 square feet, which could be sectioned many different ways. The dumpster area will need to be relocated for multi-tenants to the north side, or backside of this building where the loading dock is already set up for other tenants. The service bay and block wall will be eliminated and replaced with new window storefronts and a new utility enclosure. Ms.

Gilger asked if the doors will be kept on other side of the building so there is dual entry to this space. Mr. McCauley answered affirmatively and added parking will be available on both sides.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the electrical easement as the limits/restrictions were changed recently by AEP. Mr. McCauley answered the easement does not impact this project as this project is still outside those easements and made sure the new work on the monopoles is in place. Mr. Stanford requested the applicant provide an update from AEP before building permitting.

Mr. Krawetzi said there are four Maple trees and boxwoods on the landscape plan but the Maple trees do not enjoy urban sites and boxwoods will be very intolerant of salt. Mr. Chillog reported they have tried every plant on this site resulting in varying degrees of success so everything is trial and error. He is open to replacing the boxwoods with other plant materials. Mr. Krawetzki asked if the soil could be modified as it is going to be tough for the trees to get established without having a more open lawn area. He suggested Frontier Elms as an alternative material. Mr. Chillog agreed to continue to evaluate alternative tree and plant materials.

Mr. Fagrell said all the utilities are on the side of the building but the plan showed a rather large enclosure. Mr. McCauley said there are two electrical boxes on the brick wall behind the transformers. They intend to move that fence area to enclose the two transformers and hide the utility boxes too. This will clean up the area and make it look nice.

Ms. Rauch recalled Ms. Martin's concern about the exterior material and asked the applicant what they thought about choosing a different material. Mr. Chillog said the intent for the enclosure design is to play off of the architecture but they will investigate materials possibly using a combination of stucco with metal panels or wood. Mr. McCauley said they will continue to work with staff with that as a condition of approval and they are not opposed to a full masonry wall but prefer something more creative.

Ms. Rauch requested a different secondary material from what is proposed, too. There have been discussions with staff as well as the Commission on other cases and we are trying to stick to materials permitted. Mr. McCauley said they will use Hardi-Plank on the gates but they are not opposed to find a material similar to Hardi-Plank. The material they selected is far superior to Hardi Plank and a sample was sent to Ms. Martin. The high-end mahogany looking product comes with a 20-year warranty for non-maintenance. He explained the west side of the building gets baked in the sun and prefers not to paint every year with it getting beaten up from the sun and wind. He reported Ford Associates said this is the premium product. According to the manufacturer, this product is made from wood or paper and mixed with a velamine resin which is also a green product made in the USA. Mr. McCauley claimed this is a natural product as much as Hardi-Plank is a natural product when it is made with cement and wood. This product is wood and resin. It hasn't been approved but that does not mean it cannot be approved just like when Hardi-Plank was new and became acceptable. He noted three different examples in the BSD today where a similar product was used: Penzones, the conference Center, and Tuller Flats but the product they are proposing is better and looks phenomenal in his opinion.

Ms. Rauch said she appreciates the clarification and background on this product. She said the applicant would need to make their case for this new product to the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Commission will request to see where this product has been used successfully in the region. She explained that is what is needed to move forward with this project using an alternative material. Staff is supportive of this project overall and wants to help make that happen. She agreed, technology improvements happen over time.

Matt Stavoff, Stavoff Land and Development, Inc. joined the meeting and asked to comment on the quality of the product. He said they do not want to have to go before the PZC and extend this process. This product is very expensive so it is not being proposed based on cost. They believed the ART had the ability to approve. He said no Code can be set up to cover all products and it would be terrible for Dublin if new quality materials coming on the market were not introduced. Ms. Rauch said Mr. Stavoff's comments were helpful but reiterated

the applicant needs to provide locations where this specific material was used. Ms. Martin agreed to do more research. Mr. Baumgartner said they have a sample of the product and believes it has a better appearance and quality to Hardi-Plank but projects have not been built yet with this product. Ms. Rauch said it is hard to demonstrate durability of materials that are new. Ms. Martin requested confirmation the ART is comfortable with staff working with the applicant. Mr. Krawetzki offered to work with the applicant on the landscape plan.

Ms. Martin noted this project is eligible to use the Master Sign Plan approved for the Dublin Village Center already established but signs will need to be reviewed with the applicant outside of this Minor Project Review process.

Ms. Martin is comfortable with the feedback received to return to the ART for a determination next time. Mr. McCauley said the feedback is great for this introduction and they want to continue to work with staff to determine the appropriate materials. Ms. Rauch said she looks forward to the resolution regarding materials when the applicant returns.

## **DETERMINATIONS**

### **2. Cheesecake Girl 20-211MPR**

### **4345 W. Dublin-Granville Road Minor Project Review**

Mr. Hounshell said this application is a proposal for modifications to the exterior of an existing commercial tenant space located within The Shoppes at River Ridge shopping plaza. The site is located south of W. Dublin Granville Road, ±900 feet southeast of the roundabout with Riverside Drive and is zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial. An aerial view of the site located was shown as well as in the site plan.

Mr. Hounshell presented a graphic of the proposed elevation and noted the walkup service station as opposed to a drive thru. The double-hung window will be replaced with a window with the same finish as the other windows. Staff recommends benches. The awning materials/canopies that are currently a solid blue will be changed to a wide stripe design in light blue and white.

Mr. Hounshell said this application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria, and approval was recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant install outdoor benches, subject to landlord and staff approval.

Ms. Rauch asked the ART if they had any questions. [Hearing none.] She asked if the applicant if they had anything they wanted to say. Mike Strange, Keller Williams Realty, The Strange Home Team, said he is fine with Mr. Hounshell's presentation.

Ms. Rauch stated she likes the character of this building and benches will be good given people needing to social distance due to Covid-19. Mr. Strange inquired about the timing permitted with the completion of this project when approved as the applicant would like all the changes be done over six to eight months. They would like to have a sign up and open first and then do the other changes over time due to the costs. Ms. Martin answered there is not finite expiration date for the completion of the Minor Project but if permits need to be applied for, they should be working on that. Mr. Hounshell said the applicant will need to return to the ART for signage approval and agreed the six to eight month time span is fine. He recommended the applicant return sooner rather than later with the sign application. Mr. Strange said they have met with sign companies and plan to install the front sign to begin with and open. Proposed projecting signs will be installed when the awnings/canopies are switched out.

Ms. Rauch asked if any other members had comments or questions [hearing none]. Ms. Gilger made a motion and Mr. Stanford seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with the one condition as written.

**Votes:** Brad Fagrell, yes; William Morris, yes; Aaron Stanford, yes; Colleen Gilger, yes; Chad Hamilton, yes; Shawn Krawetzki, yes; and Jennifer Rauch, yes. The Minor Project was approved 7 – 0.

**3. VA Data Building 5  
20-214WID-DP**

**6645 Crosby Court  
Development Plan Review**

Ms. Martin said this application is a proposal for the construction of a fifth data center building, ±260,000 square feet in size, within the West Innovation District. The site is located east of Houchard Road, south of Dublin-Plain City Road, and is zoned ID-3, Research Assembly District. An aerial view of the 8-acre site was presented. This is the final building proposed as part of the Master Plan for VA Data that is being built over time. The applicant has made modifications, which includes temperature-controlled storage, a parking lot expansion, and igloos.

Ms. Martin presented a graphic of the proposed site plan, which differs from the previously approved buildings on the site, due to the nature of a second story building. While this building is complimentary to previous buildings on the site but the footprint is modified. This 268,800-square-foot data center building has approximately 19,300 square feet of office space and 249,500 square feet of warehouse and data center space.

The outdoor bridge and service area are limited in size. Given the substantial size of this building and will be screened with a 17 and a half foot screen wall in height. A front yard faces Houchard Road. Front setbacks are determined by street type. Per the Code in this district, parking is not permitted in front of a structure. The applicant expects a limited number of visitors to the site and high security of its uses. Staff is conditioning that parking be revised to be relocated to the rear of the building.

Staff anticipates the building will need to shift to the west to enable a better alignment with the previously built buildings, creating a continuous street wall.

The Code requires 106 parking spaces; the applicant is proposing 90 spaces. The minimum number of bike parking spaces required in the West Innovation District is six but the applicant is proposing 10 spaces. As this is the fifth and final addition to the site, the applicant is not eligible to defer parking as they had with the other applications.

The proposed building elevations are a combination of similar rectangular forms with flat roofs consistent with the established character of the data center complex. The combination of materials proposed is identical to what was used on previous approved buildings but the design of the accent panels is horizontal. Given the two-story composition of this building, staff is supportive of this alternative design as it meets the intent of the WID. The west and rear elevation are primary elevations. The north and south elevations perpetuate the linear forms of the structure.

Ms. Martin said this application was reviewed against the Development Plan Criteria, which it met with five conditions. Therefore, approval was recommended:

- 1) That the temporary access point along Houchard Road be removed and the landscaping and fence be restored with completion of the permanent access point on Houchard Road;
- 2) That the site layout be revised to relocate all parking to the rear of the building, subject to Staff approval and prior to building permit submittal;

- 3) That the applicant provide updated lot coverage calculations, meeting all Code requirements for the entire site, prior to building permit submittal;
- 4) That the applicant work with Staff to provide all required parking on-site, eliminating deferred parking, prior to submittal of a building permit; and, the applicant construct all required parking on-site, for this application and other previously approved applications, prior to issuance of occupancy for building five, unless otherwise approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission; and
- 5) That the applicant continue to work with the City's landscape zoning inspector to finalize landscape items with the building permit review.

Ms. Gilger asked if parking is permitted to get as close as the other buildings given this is the only two-story building.

Ms. Rauch asked the applicant if they wanted to address the board and provide any additional information. Bernie Woytek said he was with HBS, and he is the architect on this project. Temporary access point will make a permanent entry as a secondary access for emergency vehicles constructed with permanent gates. Lot coverage calculations and setbacks are now on the drawings for building permitting. The applicants appreciated help in spite of the interruption of the holidays. To address deferred parking, on the main site in the northeast corner there is a large parking lot area currently permitting deferred parking. In the spring all parking will be constructed before construction starts for this fifth building. Jim Whitacre, Advanced Civil Design, will work with the landscaping inspector. Limited visitor parking is provided since limited visitors will be on site. They are considering relocating the parking along Houchard. He asked if the board is open to discussing further. Ms. Rauch answered Code states parking has to be at the side or rear of the building. If anything different is proposed, the proposal gets kicked up to the Planning and Zoning Commission for review as the authority of the ART is limited. Mr. Woytek said okay. Moving the parking to side or front poses certain issues with engineering on the site. Mr. Woytek said Andrew Innis, Amazon, is also here.

Mr. Whitacre asked if they eliminate the parking in the front of the building, if staff would be okay with existing building location and not pushing towards Houchard Road. There would need to be an extension of utilities.

They thought since it is the only 2-story building, having it a little farther back relieves going from one story to two. Ms. Rauch said there is not requirement that the buildings must align. She suggested the applicant work with staff. Ultimately, it all needs to be approved on your site unless you get approval from the PZC.

Ms. Gilger noted the parking in this proposal is decreased. She asked if the other buildings had any parking deferrals and requested the total number. She asked if they plan to create deferral parking at the parking lot on the northern part of the site. Mr. Whitacre said they have flexibility once those 50 extra spaces are built. The parking for this building is operational so people would not have to park all the way out front. At the end of the day, there will be more than enough required parking on the site.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the temporary access point and stated if it is to become permanent, the applicant will have to obtain approval from Franklin County - otherwise he has no issues. There has been a lot of emphasis on security at this site and how we access it. The applicant was asked if there is any other security at this point. Ms. Gilger said her assumption was that was a temporary access during construction. Surprised to hear that is to be permanent. The applicant expects very limited visitors. Mr. Whitacre said only emergency personnel are anticipated at that access point. There will be secure gates with no free access. Mr. Fagrell asked if a lock box will be used. Mr. Whitacre answered they are waiting on the security team to respond.

Ms. Rauch asked if a condition should be modified or if the applicant wants to table this for now. Mr. Stanford said he is fine with modifying a condition as long as Washington Township Fire and the Dublin Police are

comfortable. Approval through Franklin County is needed in conditions. Mr. Hamilton said he had no issues with the gate but asked if it would be manned. If so, a small building would be needed. The applicant stated they will not allow a double lock. Corporal Morris asked how emergency vehicles use this access point if there is not a manned gate.

Ms. Martin stated if this proposal should require a manned gate the applicant would need to return to the ART for a separate approval as that cannot be approved with this application. She inquired about a condition for parking.

Mr. Whitacre reported the electric feeds come from the substation and if the building was moved to the front, they would need longer lines. Fiber optic leads for all runs from the substation on the east side and would need as much room as possible at the end of the road to provide some sort of lay down. As this is the last building, it will be very tight to provide layup area and construction staging. Mr. Woytek said the two-story building should be farther from Houchard Road. He said multiple reasons were considered to keep the building on the east instead of moving it further to the west. Mr. Whitacre said outside generators limit how far that can push forward, keeping the generators away from the road. Ms. Rauch agreed that was a good idea. She asked if the building could be shifted to align with the closer end. Mr. Woytek stated that yard and loading dock were there and as tight as it can be for proper airflow to the generators. He indicated his hands are tied with that. Ms. Rauch said she understood putting the yard on inside instead of the outside too.

Ms. Rauch requested thoughts from the ART.

Mr. Stanford asked if landscaping would work as a compromise. Ms. Rauch said the applicant did the initial plantings around the perimeter at the beginning of the project. Ms. Martin said there is not any landscaping, just lawn. Ms. Rauch asked if the applicant would consider additional screening. Mr. Woytek answered that could be a viable option to keep the building in its current location.

Mr. Krawetzki said he could not recall what landscaping was there originally but additional landscaping is possible. He suggested using evergreens as screening and the ART agreed.

Ms. Rauch agreed having the two-story building back farther softens it.

Reviewed revised conditions as follows:

- 1) That the temporary access point along Houchard Road be removed and the landscaping and fence be restored with completion of the permanent access point on Houchard Road, subject to approval of the Franklin County Engineer;
- 2) That the applicant work with Washington Township Fire to work through site security for emergency personnel for the Houchard Road access point;
- 3) That the site layout be revised to relocate all parking to the side or rear of the building, subject to Staff approval and prior to building permit submittal;
- 4) That the applicant provide updated lot coverage calculations, meeting all Code requirements, prior to building permit submittal;
- 5) That the applicant work with Staff to provide all required parking on-site, eliminating deferred parking, prior to submittal of a building permit; and, the applicant construct all required parking on-site, for this application and other previously approved applications, prior to issuance of occupancy for building five, unless otherwise approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission;

- 6) That the applicant work with Staff to provide additional landscaping, west of Building 5, consistent with the ART's discussion, and subject to Staff approval; and
- 7) That the applicant continue to work with the City's landscape zoning inspector to finalize landscape items with the building permit review.

Ms. Rauch asked the applicant if they agreed with the conditions. Mr. Woytek answered he was in agreement with the conditions.

Ms. Martin confirmed there were no public comments submitted with this application.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the third condition having to do with parking. Ms. Rauch answered the parking will be removed in that area.

Ms. Rauch asked if any other members had comments or questions [hearing none]. Ms. Gilger made a motion and Mr. Stanford seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with the seven conditions, as written.

**Votes:** Chad Hamilton, yes; William Morris, yes; Shawn Krawetzki, yes; Brad Fagrell, yes; Jennifer Rauch, yes; Aaron Stanford, yes; and Colleen Gilger, yes. The Development Plan was approved 7 – 0.

#### **COMMUNICATIONS and ADJOURNMENT**

With no communications to convey, Ms. Rauch adjourned the meeting at 3:22 pm.